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A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.—NO. 1.

We have had it in view to write a series of articles under the above head for some time past, but did not find an opportunity till now. The Lord permitting, we intend to give the matter a more thorough examination, and present our great plea more fully than any one has done in any series of articles for a long time. We do not claim any originality, or undertake to present anything especially new, but shall endeavor to bring old things up in a new form, and present them to thousands of our readers as they have never been presented to them. Many of them have come up and enlisted in the cause long since the great plea for reformation was first made. These need a full showing up of the matter from the beginning. Thousands of others there are, in every direction, who understand nothing of the great principles and objects of the grand movement of the nineteenth century. The older and better instructed of the brotherhood, so far as their hearts are in the great work, will enjoy and be strengthened by a thorough re-examination of the plea for this great work.

We propose to give some attention to the state of things religiously at the commencement of the great work, styled "the Reformation," and then examine the state of things outside of the brotherhood, or among the parties around us, religiously, at the present time.

I. We proceed then, first to give a brief sketch of the state of things religiously, when the great plea for reformation was first made, as follows:

1. The ministry at this time consisted of about three classes: the learned, doctrinal, and partisan preachers, sworn to defend certain dogmas and parties. These fed their flocks by preaching what they called "doctrinal sermons," in which they made nice distinctions, close discriminations, and displayed great tact in defending their doctrine, and warding off the attacks of their antagonists. In one pulpit a spiritual doctor would be found feeding his flock upon a disquisition upon Trinitarianism, and thus renewing their spiritual strength. In another pulpit you would find the good man feeding his flock, and comforting them with a sermon on Unitarianism. Another learned divine builds his people up in the most holy faith of Calvinism. Another, equally learned and pious, comforts and builds up his flock with a sermon on the opposite doctrine of Ameianism, etc., etc., and if we could believe them, all this was from the Lord, and in the name of preaching the gospel.

2. The learned, moral or political lecturer, who cares nothing about what they call "doctrine," or party, and who looks upon the Bible as a good old book, from which to extract a text, to place at the head
of almost any kind of a lecture, and thus constitute it a "sermon," and who preaches mainly on the passing events of the day. This preacher gets his gospel mainly from the secular newspapers, the passing events around him, and whatever he can find that will entertain an audience. His chief glory is, that he can preach a sermon on anything, no matter whether in the Bible or out of it, for he fills his mission when he entertains his audience.

3. The old fashioned called and sent preacher, without talent, learning, or historical knowledge, who generally opened his discourse by stating that he did not know what he was going to say, but what the spirit gave him he would give the people. This class outnumbered by more than one half either of the former classes. These preached about everything or anything that came into their heads, and, worst of all, ascribed it all to the Holy Spirit. Inconsistent as it was with their profession, they would ask the Lord to forgive what they had said amiss, and bless what had been said agreeable to his will, and frequently ask the people to excuse their blunders, to receive the good and throw away the bad.

We only now make a brief statement on this subject, but shall discuss it at large in the proper place.

II. The most popular theory among all the different parties, was, that faith was not the act of the creature, but a direct gift from God—that man could no more believe than he could make a world, till the Lord imparted this direct gift. The main drift of all the preaching on faith was to prove to men that they could not believe—to inspire in the people a desire to have faith and to implore the Lord to give them faith. In this state of things, the infidel was every day gaining ground. His process of reasoning was short and easy. If man could not believe, he was not responsible for his unbelief, for it is self-evident that a man cannot be punishable for not doing what he cannot do. If the Lord will not give the ability to believe, he cannot condemn men for not believing. The infidel, therefore, cheerfully accepted the theory that he could not believe, and consequently was not accountable or punishable for his unbelief.

III. The most popular and almost the only theory in regard to conversion, was that it was wrought by a direct power of the Holy Spirit upon the soul—that the conversion of a sinner was as much a direct act of God, and a miracle, as the creation of the world. This theory set aside all human volition, agency and responsibility in conversion, as well as the gospel, the ministry, the church, and all individual instrumentality in bringing sinners to God, with all tracts, publications of every sort, Bible and missionary societies. Consistently with this theory, the only thing the saints could do, either preachers or private members, for the conversion of man, was to intercede with the Lord. This left thousands seeking the Lord for many years, without finding salvation or the least relief.

IV. The practice of infant baptism prevailed largely, and through this means thousands were being identified with religious systems and communities, not only without their consent or action, but before they knew there was a God, a Savior or a church; and under the delusion that they had been baptized and thus identified with the people of God, were prevented from yielding themselves to be the servants of God, after they were capable of making a profession. Through this means, an immense mass of unsanctified or unconverted humanity has been gathered into establishments called "churches."

V. Some religious organizations have made special provision for the unconverted part of the church, by connecting with it a probationary department, in which unconverted members are put upon trial, as seekers of religion. If they stand the storm, conduct themselves well and observe the rules of the church, while in this portico, or outer department of the church, for the space of a half a year, without religion, or unconverted, and then, by any means, can persuade themselves that they "have expe-
rienced a "change," "obtained a hope," or "got religion," they can be received into the most holy place, and be considered full members.

VI. Every church had a human creed, containing not only the doctrine of the church, but the law for receiving members, excluding the unruly, and the entire government of the church. By this the law of the Lord was as completely superseded, as by the unwritten traditions of the church of Rome, or the traditions of the elders among the Jews. These creeds, confessions and formularies, had usurped precisely the place in modern churches occupied by the law of God in the primitive church, and rendered the word of God comparatively of none effect.

VII. The professors of the religion of Jesus were divided into numerous conflicting and contending parties, which, in the place of the work appointed by the Lord for the church, the conversion of the world—were only strengthening the hands of unbelievers, by their strife and partyism. These were spending much of their time in warring upon each other, defending their peculiarities, and explaining their partisan positions. The endless ruin being wrought by these parties cannot be described in a volume, much less in a short paragraph.

VIII. Sectarian names abounded, some taken from great men, others from a peculiarity in government or doctrine, and some from a locality. These had so far set aside the designations of the people of God, that you would hear scarcely any one called a Christian, disciple, and so forth, or any church styled the church of God, the body of Christ, and so forth, without some human appendage.

We will probably conclude this brief statement of the religious condition of the country in another article.

The vainglory of man is more frequently a prompting motive with us than the desire of doing good, so seldom do we obey the injunction: "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."

---

THE BIBLE.

BY A. CAMPBELL.

The Bible is the oldest and best book in the world. It is translated into more languages and read by more people than any other volume ever written. Its history and its prophecy comprehend the entire destiny of the world. It presents to us man in his natural, preternatural, and supernatural conditions and characteristics. It records the three great religious ages of the world, by developing three dispensations of religion—the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. Man as he was, man as he is, and man as he shall hereafter be, are its three grand themes. It reveals God, by unfolding the mysterious relations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in the three great works of Creation, Providence and Redemption.

The Bible is divided into two great departments, usually but improperly called the Old and New Testaments. The former of these contains the inspired writings of Moses, the first of historians and the greatest of lawgivers, together with those of the ancient Prophets; while the latter contains those of the apostles and evangelists of Jesus Christ. Regarded as the Jewish and the Christian scriptures, it comprehends sixty-six distinct and independent treatises. Thirty-nine of these constitute the Jewish, and twenty-seven the Christian records. The Christian scriptures are the work of only eight persons, six of whom were apostles, and two of them evangelists of Jesus Christ and companions of the apostles. The Jewish scriptures were written by more than thirty persons, all of whom, save one,* were Jews. We put down the immediate authors or writers of the Bible at not less than forty, as the lowest number, though we cannot with absolute certainty name them all. From the birth of Moses till the death of John the Apostle is a period of full sixteen hundred and sixty years. These books were, therefore, in progress of completion not less than fifteen

*Job, it is presumed, was an Idumean or Arabian sage.
hundred years, and grasp in their historic outlines a period of forty-one centuries. A volume of such immense compass, exhibiting details of persons, places and events so numerous and various, and of such transcendent interest to mankind, seems to possess claims upon the attention and consideration of every human being capable of appreciating its history, its biography, its prophecy, its doctrine, or even its general literature, above those of any other volume in the world.

The Jewish scriptures comprehend history, law, and prophecy. The Jews were wont to distribute them into "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." The Christian Scriptures pre-eminently consist of historical and epistolary compositions. Of all the Jewish writers, Moses, and of all the Christian writers, Paul, is the largest and most conspicuous. Both the Jewish and Christian Scriptures begin with history and end with prophecy. Facts or events, past and future, are, therefore, the main subject on which inspired writers dwell. The historical books of the Old Testament are, in all, seventeen. The prophetic books are also seventeen; while the properly didactic and devotional are but five. The first five books of the New Testament are also historical, the last prophetical, and the rest epistolary. These last are miscellaneous in their character, containing sometimes history, doctrine, precepts, and exhortations. The whole volume, indeed, in its spirit and tendency, is devotional. Whatever God has said in the form of declaration, precept, promise or threatening, is designed to make the man of God pure and perfect, and thoroughly accomplished for every good word and work.

The plan of the Bible, as an instrument or means of salvation, is admirably adapted to the human constitution and to the circumstances which surround man. The end to be obtained is happiness; but that end cannot be accomplished without sanctification or personal devotion to God. It is, indeed, as impossible for God to make any man happy, without making him holy, as it is for him to lie. Now the Bible is all arranged with a supreme reference to this fact. And as piety or holiness consists in a habit of life correspondent with the divine will and character, and is not natural to man as he now is, it must be preceded by a change of heart. But this change of the affections being the result of faith or a belief of the testimony of God, that testimony for such a change must necessarily furnish motives. But these motives presuppose gracious acts of kindness on the part of God. Sacred history, then, records these acts—whether in the form of things said or done, commanded or promised by God. Faith apprehends and receives this testimony concerning these facts. These facts, when believed, produce corresponding feelings or states of mind, sometimes called repentance or a new heart; and this new heart leads to those good actions denominated piety and humanity, or holiness and righteousness. The links in this divine chain of moral and spiritual instrumentality are, therefore, five—facts, testimony, faith, feeling, action—the end of which is salvation. The whole revelation of God is arranged upon this theory or view of man's constitution. Thus God acts, the Holy Spirit testifies, man believes, feels, and then acts according to the divine will. Thus becomes he a new creature. This view of man's constitution explains why the Bible is a volume of facts historical and prophetic—why it begins with history and ends with prophecy—why, in one sentence, God works, then commands, then promises.

To illustrate this by the gospel, it is only necessary to state the order of things narrated in the apostolic writings:

1. Jesus died for our sins.
2. The apostles announced this, and it is proved by the Holy Spirit, in his resurrection from the dead, and subsequent operations.
3. Jews and Gentiles believe these announcements as reported to them by the apostles and evangelists.
4. They immediately repent of their sins, and inquire what to do. Their hearts are changed.
5. They then become obedient in faith. They are saved.

The plan of the Bible can only be clearly understood when man’s condition and constitution are clearly and fully apprehended. For, in truth, the Bible is a glorious system of grace—an absolutely complete and perfect adaptation of spiritual means to a great and glorious end. This, however, is not the only grand comprehensive view of the volume of God’s inspiration which we desire to lay before the reader. We wish to look into the mechanism of this sublime instrument of renovation and salvation.

Jesus Christ is the center of the whole evangelical system. He is “the Root and the offspring of David”—“the Sun of Righteousness”—“the bright and the Morning Star”—“the Alpha and the Omega” of the volume. “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit” of all sacred history and of all divine prophecy. Now the history of the Bible is very rationally or philosophically arranged, both in its prospective and retrospective character, with a single and sublime reference to Jesus Christ. Let us analyze it.

The first promise to fallen man respects a Messiah—in these words: “I will put enmity between thee, O serpent, and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. HE SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD, AND THOU SHALT BRUISE HIS HEEL.”

The whole Bible but demonstrates, illustrates, and applies this grand promise. Eve’s son of blessings is now to be elicited out of the human race; and just so much of the history of the human race as is necessary to his identification, development and glorification is given, and no more. Let the reader take this lamp in his hand, read all the historical books of both Testaments, note every fact, incident and document therein found, and see if they do not arrange themselves in a proper position, either to identify, develop, or glorify this benefactor of our race. We shall glance at Genesis for an illustration.

The single book of Genesis contains the only information we have of the human race for the long period of two thousand three hundred sixty and eight years. It begins with creation and ends with the death of the patriarch Joseph. The other books of Moses bring us down to the year of the world 2553. All this history antedates any authentic records of the human race now extant in any nation or language.

But the portions of Genesis assigned to the different epochs of human history, are most singularly and significantly disproportionate. Why is it that eight-fiftieths, or eight chapters of fifty, are devoted to the history of creation and of the flood, and to the religious and political conditions of the human family, for the long period of one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years; while the single history of one Abraham occupies thirteen-fiftieths, and that of his descendants, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph twenty-four fiftieths!—Indeed, the fortunes of this Joseph occupy a larger space than that assigned to the first two thousand years of the world. This great disproportion in the details of things can be satisfactorily explained only in one way. That apprehended, and the plan and structure of the inspired writings can be properly understood and appreciated.

“The testimony of Jesus,” says a divine oracle, “is the spirit of prophecy.” It is, I presume, as truly the spirit of sacred history. Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega of the Bible, because the Bible is the history of redemption. Everything takes precedence, occupies space, and engages attention in the direct ratio of its bearings upon the development and consummation of human redemption. Take, for example, the antediluvian age: from the moment the gracious intimation that the woman’s offspring would one day “bruise the serpent’s head” is given, its development becomes the all-engrossing theme both of history and of prophecy. Persons, places, and events occupy a prominence and conspicuity as they happen to be connected with that grand central idea of the whole Bible. The altar, the victim, and the priest appear in the history of Cain and Abel; while blood and faith triumph in Abel’s martyrdom. Cain’s history, so
far as it is given, is but the shade in the picture, and a few samples of his descendants illustrate the whole history of men in the flesh. He founded a city, and called it after the name of his son Enoch. From Enoch descended the sons and daughters of men. Polygamy was the consummation of his principles in the fifth generation. His offspring were brass and iron manufacturers, and the first that invented portable houses, instruments of music, and that handled the harp and the organ. Tu-baleain, or Vulcan, and his sister Naamah, inventor of the distaff and the spindle, are amongst his renowned issue. Not one saint is named in the whole posterity of Cain, the first-born of woman and the prototype of religious persecutors.

The history of Cain and Abel being given, because of its connection with the altar and the sacrifice, the historian, prompted by the Spirit of revelation, opens the illustrious lineage of the promised seed of woman; and that becomes, from this moment, the backbone of the whole Bible—the grand meridian line of all divine history and prophecy. Seth is born to fill the place of Abel, and his progeny is counted, one by one, down to Jesus of Bethlehem and of Nazareth. Thus the patriarchal chain of Messiah's ancestors down to the flood are Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah. From the fall of man to the flood, all that is transmitted to us of human affairs, or of divine providence, connects itself with these ten patriarchs. After the flood, Noah's three sons engross our attention. Their connection with all the ancient nations of the earth is briefly but most interestingly sketched. But so soon as reasons are given in the history of Shem, of Ham, and Japheth, for a special providence in dispersing them over the whole earth, and in selecting the younger of these three to stand at the head of the postdiluvian line of the child of promise, the historian confines himself to the royal and sacerdotal line of the Messiah.

He next counts off ten other progenitors of our Lord. These are Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, Reu Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abraham. The promise given to Eve and repeated to Shem, is still further developed and committed to Abraham.

To the end of Genesis we have five other noble links in this patriarchal chain. These are Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Phares and Ezrom. Genesis then gives us in all five-and-twenty of our Lord's ancestors, and just so much of human affairs as is necessary to their favorable introduction to our notice. Joseph's history, so pre-eminently connected with the whole drama of man's redemption, and terminating in the migration and settlement of the symbolic nation in Egypt, is more minutely and particularly detailed than any one individual history in the five books of Moses. His other books, occupying but forty years' incidents, add no new names to the illustrious line. After the books of Joshua and of Judges, the book of Ruth is inserted to connect Judah and the promise made to him with David through Boaz, Obed, and Jesse—making the line from Ezrom to succeed thus: Aram, Aminadab, Naashon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, Jesse, David.

The beautiful story of Ruth, the Moabitish saint, inserted for the express purpose of connecting David with Judah, Abraham and Seth, and of completing, through him, the illustrious line down to the Virgin's Son, is itself a demonstration of the truth of our assumption, viz: that the plan of the Bible is to reveal God to man, and man to himself, by placing one family under a special providence, and in making all its fortunes first the subject of prophecy, and then of history, from the beginning to the end of the world." God meant more than any man has yet comprehended, when he said, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. This is my name forever, and my memorial to all generations." The history of that family is, then, a documentary revelation of the attributes of God, and especially of his

†See Ruth, iv. 18, 22.
truthfulness and covenant-keeping character; while all other histories of all other families serve as night to day in the contrast, to present his people in all the most favorable attitudes before us, and to induce all men to place themselves under the wings of his almighty protection.

Soon as David ascends the throne, and his family obtains the scepter of the twelve tribes, the royal lineage is in safe-keeping. The books of Samuel, the Kings, and the Chronicles, down to the end of Old Testament history, not only faithfully preserve the records of the nation, but afford a thousand developments of human nature and of divine providence, full of instruction to all mankind in all ages of the world.

Matthew and Luke open the New Testament history by giving from the archives of the nation and the rolls of lineage, the ancestry of Jesus up to Adam; the former, by his legal father, Joseph; the latter, by his natural mother, Mary. By the legal paternal line he is the sixtieth in descent from Adam; while by the maternal line he is the seventy-sixth. The apostolic writings give the history of the Jews down to the crucifixion of their promised Deliverer, the repudiation of them as the nation and people of God, and the adoption of believing Jews and Gentiles, as one in the Lord Jesus, in their stead; while the prophecies of the New Testament indicate the destiny of Israel according to the flesh, as well as Israel according to the spirit, till the final consummation. Such is the plan of the Jewish and Christian scriptures.

From the plan of the Bible, as well as from its philosophy, its claims upon the faith and admiration of mankind may be strongly argued. Its philosophy is, that without piety no man can be happy; and that with it, any man, in any outward circumstances, may be happy to the full extent of his capacity for human enjoyment. But human enjoyment is neither animal nor angelic enjoyment. Animal or sensitive enjoyments are supreme and exclusive in the brutal creation, but subordinate in man. Intellectual pleasures are necessarily dependent upon the ministry which the intellect performs. If the intellect is made subordinate to the animal instincts, passions, or propensities, or if the intellect is subordinate to moral and spiritual enjoyments, its pleasures are essentially different.

The philosophy of the Bible is, therefore, the philosophy of human happiness, and the only philosophy which commands itself to the cultivated understanding of man. No mere rationalist, philosopher, or sage, ever proposed such a view of happiness to man. It is peculiar to the Bible. It is an original and divine conception, and proves the divine authorship of the book. From the object and character of the book of revelation, its divine authority can be most triumphantly argued. It is a book equally worthy of God to bestow, and of man to receive. Dictated by infinite benevolence, characterized by supreme intelligence, and perfectly adapted to the genius of human nature, it is worthy of universal reception, and of the most profound and grateful homage.

Its plan is superhuman and divine. No one class of men of any one age could have formed such a plan as that of writing the history of one family for seven thousand years, and of incorporating with that history a scheme of eternal redemption from sin. And yet it is as clear as the sun in a cloudless sky, that Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Ezra, Nehemiah—with all the Jewish historians, prophets, and poets, during a period of fifteen hundred years, were, without concert, conference, or voluntary co-operation, prosecuting just such an object without seeming to comprehend it. And not they only, but all the patriarchs before Moses, all the renowned fathers of mankind from Adam to Moses, were orally transmitting such in-
formation to their descendents; and all the scribes of the Jews, from Malachi to Matthew, were in their chronicles of Jewish times recording such incidents and events as make out the entire history of the family of Jesus Christ from Adam to Joseph, his legal father, and to Mary, his natural mother. This was done but once in all time, and for a purpose just as peculiar and singular as the Bible itself.

A skeptic or an infidel might as well argue that king Hiram's thirty thousand woodsmen and builders, and king Solomon's one hundred and fifty thousand hewers, stone-cutters, and carriers of burdens, with his three thousand three hundred supervisors and directors, were severally and individually working, each one after a plan of his own; and that without concert or pre-arrangement, all their materials were fitted up into a temple the most splendid and magnificent that ever stood upon this earth—the wonder of the world and the glory of architecture—as that shepherds, husbandmen, fishermen, artisans, historians, lawgivers, kings, living in different countries, in ages very remote, speaking diverse languages, and of every peculiarity of character, could have, either by accident or design, got up such a volume as the Bible, marked in every page by a peculiar originality of character, a most striking unity of design, pervading an almost infinite variety of circumstantial details, and in a style the most simple, artless, and sublime. The fortuitous concourse of atoms into a universe, indicative of designs and adaptations as innumerable as the stars, as countless as the sands of the sea, would be a rational hypothesis, a plausible and credible theory, compared with such an assumption. The divine inspiration of the holy scriptures is, indeed, fully proved by the divine wisdom and knowledge contained in the record itself; the author is known in his works. God's book is full of divinity. It reveals what human wisdom cannot fathom, but what human wisdom must believe and approve. God has not only affixed his sign manual to the mission of apostles and prophets in the miracles which they wrought, and in the prophecies which they uttered; but he has stamped upon the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which it contains, and incorporated with all its gracious and sublime developments, its holy doctrine, its heavenly spirit, and its divine precepts, the indubitable indications of its superhuman, supernatural, and divine origin. But we shall, for the present, only attempt to prove its divine origin by the indirect method of reducing to an absurdity a contrary hypothesis. Paul is my example and my authority for an occasional assault upon the fortress of error, by showing what will result from its admission to be truth, or, which is the same thing in other words, by assuming the truth to be a lie. He says, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is not Christ raised. If Christ be not raised, then all men are in their sins—preaching is useless, faith is vain; we apostles are all liars, and all that have died in attestation of it have voluntarily destroyed themselves." So let us reason in this case, in as few words as those found in that admirable argument in proof of the resurrection. We assume that the gospel is true or not true. If it is true, it ought to be obeyed; if it is not true, it ought to be disproved and repudiated. All the world so far agrees with our postulata. Well, now, say it is not true—in other words, it is a falsehood, a lie. What then?

1. There is not a credible history in the world; because no history possesses so great a number or variety of the attributes of truth or reasons of faith as the gospel history. The original witnesses were plain, common-sense, ordinary, matter-of-fact men. They were eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the facts which they attest. Their occupations of life were favorable to having good eyes and good ears. They were chiefly fishermen. The facts which they relate, and which constitute the gospel, were sensible facts—subjected not to one sense, but to several senses. So speaks one of them: "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked up-
and our hands have handled of the word of life, declare we unto you."§. They had nothing to gain, but everything temporal and fleshly to lose by the proclamation of these facts. They made themselves, "of all men the most miserable." Their life, if their doctrine be not true, is more marvelous than their doctrine: no man ever gave stronger evidence of truthfulness than they. If they cannot be believed, no historian can. There is, then, no credible history in the world.

2. In the second place, there is no sincerity in martyrdom. It is an indisputable fact that the Messiah and most of the apostles were martyrs. They died for what they said, and not for what they did. Mankind in all ages concur in the opinion that the strongest proof of any man's honesty or sincerity is his dying voluntarily in attestation of the truth of what he affirms. We allege that martyrdom does not prove the truth of a man's opinions, but only that he sincerely believes them. Sincerity is no test of truth in any matter of theory or speculation. But in all matters of sensible facts tested by the senses, seen or heard by many persons and on many occasions, sincerity in the avowal of them is proof of the certainty of them. Now as martyrdom proves sincerity, and sincerity on the part of witnesses of sensible facts proves the facts—the gospel, being founded on sensible facts, seen often, and seen by many, is true, or there is no sincerity in martyrdom.

3. If the gospel facts are false, then learning and talent are of no value. The value of talent and learning consists in the power they impart to their possessor to acquire and communicate truth. Now it needs not to be proved, that innumerable multitudes of the most talented and learned men in all the ages of Christianity, from its first promulgation till now, have been enrolled amongst the friends and advocates of the Bible. Nay, indeed, in all ages the literature and science of Christendom have been on the side of the Bible, and mainly employed in its service. If, then, the Bible be not true, learning and talent neither protect us from error, nor assist us in the acquisition of truth!

4. But again, on the admission that the gospel is not true, there is no connection between goodness and truth—no excellency in truth. The best men in the world have always been those that believed in the Bible. The most humane, benevolent, public spirited, philanthropic, and virtuous men that ever lived, whose virtuous examples have been an honor to human nature, have been believers in the truth of the Bible. Now if the Bible be a cunningly devised fable, then there is no necessary connection between truth and moral excellence, any more than between error and virtue. There is, then, no excellency in truth.

5. Still farther, if the Bible be not true, falsehood, imposture and error are better than truth. The reason is obvious—the Bible is either true or false. If false, those who believe it believe a lie. But that lie has done more to civilize, refine, purify, and adorn human nature, than all the atheism, infidelity, and philosophy of Egypt, Chaldea, Greece and Rome. Surely, then, the Christian lie is better than all the philosophic truth of all ages and all nations. Hence we infer that if the Bible be false, error and fraud work better for mankind than honesty and truth.

6. But again, if the Bible be false, as all who reject it affirm, then there is no reason in the universe; or, what is the same thing, creation is a maze without a plan, and nature works in vain. We must judge of the unknown by the known. Now the fortunes of our planet are our data for the fortunes of all other planets. The fortunes of its inhabitants are, so far as nature or reason is our guide, the fortunes of the inhabitants of all other planets. Amongst earth's inhabitants there is one class of beings for whose creation and comfort all others do exist. Man is the name of that class of beings. He is the end of this terrestrial creation. If he be lost—forever lost—all is lost. Crops of vegetables annually spring.
out of the earth, and return to it again.
Races of animals feed upon them, and die.
They, like their food, but enrich the earth.
Day and night succeed each other. Years
revolve. The earth turns upon its axis,
wheels around its orbit, feeds and buries all
its tenantry. Man himself and his food
alike perish forever.

Now what is gained by the whole opera-
tion? If man lives not again—if the Bible
be not true, nature labors in vain: and if
there be a Creator, he works without a plan,
and toils for no purpose. Nature is an abor-
tion, and the whole machinery of the uni-
verse a splendid failure. There is no rea-
son for creation—for nature; and there is
no reason in either. If, then, the Bible be
not true—if this history it gives of man,
his creation, his fall, his recovery, be not
true—in one word, if the gospel be a
lie and the Bible false, no living man can
give one good reason for the existence of
our planet, or that of any sun or system in
that collation of worlds and systems which
compose this mysterious and sublime uni-
verse.

But if the Bible be not true, it is not
even to say:
1. That there is not a credible history
in the world.
2. That there is no sincerity in martyr-
dom.
3. That human learning and talent are
of no value.
4. That there is no excellency in truth.
5. That falsehood, imposition, and er-
er; are better than truth; and,
6. That there is no reason in the uni-
verse; but we must also add, that THERE IS
no God!

Nature ends in ruin—the world is full of
sin and misery—there is no reason for any-
thing—man lives for no purpose—no kind
intimation has been given him of any great
and good FIRST CAUSE; which is but equiv-
alent to saying there is no good being above
man—no one of almighty power, who could
speak to him, enlighten him, or comfort
him, touching his origin, his nature, his re-
lations, his obligations, or his destiny; and
that is equivalent to saying that there is no
supremely Good One, no Creator or Proprie-
tor of man. For who can imagine a su-
preme intelligence, of almighty power and
of infinite benevolence—who made man and
inspired him with such desires after the
knowledge of himself—with such longings
after happiness perfect and complete—and
who has himself the faculty of speech, the
power of communicating the knowledge of
himself to man; and yet has never spoken
to him, never enlightened him on the only
point vital to all his interests, his eternal
destiny; and compared with which all other
enjoyments possible to man as he now is, are
not in the proportion of an atom to a uni-
verse, or a moment to a boundless eternity!
Such an hypothesis is at war with every ora-
cle of reason, with every decision of com-
mon sense, and with all the analogies of the
universe. It cannot be: it is impossible.

There is a God—there is a Book of God—
there is truth in history—there is sincerity
in martyrdom—there is value in talent and
learning—there is an excellency in truth—
truth is better than error, falsehood, and im-
posture—and there is reason in the universe,
and a glorious destiny for man.

The Bible has been proved to be a divine
revelation as many millions of times as there
are individuals who have believed it to the
salvation of their souls. But it never has
been proved to be false to a single individual
of the human race. Nor can it ever be so
proved. No man who understands what he
says, can in truth affirm that he believes it
to be false. Who can believe anything to
be false without oral or written testimony?
But no living man has either oral or written
testimony contradicting the testimony of the
apostles and prophets: therefore, in the ab-
sence of such testimony, he can no more
believe it to be false than a blind man can
see the sun. A man may doubt whether it
be true; but to believe it to be false, or to
be assured that it is not true, is altogether
impossible.

Some persons object to the Bible, because,
as they say, its divine inspiration is yet a
subject of debate. Such thinkers and rea-
soners are grossly defective in reason and
education. Did ever any one hear of any-
thing that has been proved to all the world? Is there a single historic fact that is believed by every human being? If there be not one, then every historic fact is yet in debate. But shall we say that no proposition is proved, because it is not proved to the whole world! The gospel will never be out of debate while there is one infidel or skeptic in the world! This is, however, no more a disparagement of its truth, or its claims upon all mankind, than it is an argument against any proposition, fact, or testimony, that all the world has not yet acquiesced in its truth.

We cannot believe by proxy, as nations, as empires, or as worlds. We must each one believe for himself. Hence the evidence must be considered, understood, and appreciated by every individual for himself. But the fact that millions of all orders of mind, the greatest and most gifted of our race, have believed it to be true—multitudes of them even to martyrdom for its sake; and that not one individual can believe it to be false, is a consideration that ought to silence every modest inquirer, and, were it possible, cover with shame those reckless and senseless dogmatists who declaim against a book of whose contents and whose history they truly comprehend nothing; because it is yet in debate. On their showing, there is nothing credible or worthy of universal acceptance, because there is nothing that is not a matter of doubt or disbelief with some person. But we argue not the question of the Bible’s truth with such opponents. We have not given a tithe of the topics from which its truth is irrefragably argued. Enough, it is presumed, to convince the candid, whose minds can discern the force of argument, is contained in the preceding hints and reflections.

Christianity has stood erect in the midst of all sorts of adversaries—Jews, Pagans, Turks, Infidels, &c.; and, like the pillars of Hercules, the rock of Gibraltar, or the everlasting mountains, bids defiance to all the billows of the ocean, and to all the tempests of Satan, to shake it from its immovable basis.

1. The action, commanded by the Lord, usually styled “baptism,” was lost sight of by a large number, who maintained, that sprinkling or pouring water upon persons was valid baptism; that “the mode” mattered nothing. Some had water sprinkled on them, some had it poured on them, others were immersed in water, while others had moistened fingers laid upon the forehead, and some again, knelled in the water and had it poured or sprinkled on them, and yet others knelled in the water and were immersed three times face foremost. All this was done in the name of the Lord! At one time, the preachers would tell the people that it was a matter of no consequence which mode they adopted. Then again, they argued most furiously, each in favor of his “mode,” as they called it. This led to immense confusion. The people thought if the preachers themselves could not decide what the Lord commanded to be done and agree upon it, no other class need trouble themselves in trying to settle the matter. The most common idea was, that the Lord had not decided “the mode,” and many treated the subject as a mere matter of taste, or convenience.

2. The design of baptism was obscured and pretty much lost by almost all classes. It was generally regarded as a “church ordinance,” but by many it was looked upon as a mere christening. Some spoke of it, as “an outward sign of an inward grace;” while others pronounced it “a sign of regeneration;” and others thought it “a visible sign by which those in the church are distinguished from the world.” The original design of it, as set forth in the scrip-
tures, was scarcely ever mentioned, or any place understood.

3. The commemoration of the Savior's death, in the communion, was almost lost. Some churches practiced it monthly, some quarterly and some annually, and scarcely any weekly, as was the practice in the first church. Such peculiar notions were attached to it, that many of the most-pious, devout and conscientious, scarcely ever could bring themselves to believe they were prepared to commune, and many such belonged to the church for many years without ever communing at all.

4. Prayer was turned into a proselyting institution, and we may say, relied upon as a chief means for converting sinners. The remedy for inquiring persons was almost invariably the same. They were invited to the altar of prayer and taught to pray and be prayed for. When they came once and were prayed for and found no peace, they were directed to come again, and thus to continue coming again and again, as thousands have done, till the day of their death, without finding any relief. They never opened the New Testament to see whether the apostles practiced thus, or required something else to be done.

5. It was largely maintained that the Bible was a sealed book—a mystery—a secret—and many sermons were preached and much scripture quoted to prove it to be such. How they expected the people to understand the scriptures quoted from this book of mystery, to prove it to be a mystery, we stop not now to explain. But it is a fact, that in thousands of instances, they quoted scripture to the people to prove that they could not understand scripture.

6. Many maintained, with the utmost pertinacity, that the Word of God was a dead letter—that it was powerless and could effect nothing towards converting and saving man till it was quickened, made alive, and rendered effectual by some direct power or agency from heaven. In the place of believing what Paul said, that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes"—that "the preaching of the cross to them that perish is foolishness, but to them who are saved, the wisdom of God and the power of God," they were constantly nullifying its power and doing all they could against it, by trying to prove that it was powerless.

7. An immense amount of preaching was done to prove that the sinner could not do anything—that he could not have a good thought, do a good deed—that he was so totally depraved that every desire, thought, word and deed was evil and only evil continually—that he could not believe, repent or turn to God till some direct and supernatural power was exerted to quicken him into life—till some irresistible influence forced him into the service of the Lord. This excused every sinner in his sins, as it made it unavoidable on his part, and thousands under the influence of such teaching, professed willingness to be Christians, and said they were waiting for power to make them such.

8. A new class had recently arisen, and to escape all these difficulties at one bound, maintained that all would be saved whether they had any faith, rendered any acts of obedience, or did any good in this life or not. They claimed that this could be clearly proved by many scriptures, both from the Old Testament and the New. Many who had been annoyed by long seeking and finding nothing, waiting for "irresistible grace," or some kind of miraculous power, to save them, and finding none, trying to do something under the influence of the theory, that they could do nothing, laid hold of the new idea, that all would be saved with avidity, as a relief. These were readily joined by a class of men determined never to forsake their sins, and who despised religion in any form, as one of the best means yet discovered to destroy the pure and holy religion of the Bible.

9. Almost all the religious parties existing were confederated into a general organization, mainly in the hands of the preachers, and controlled by a few great men, who have the power at any time when they shall disagree, to rend the body asunder. This
unscriptural organization makes a necessity for a class of officers unknown to the New Testament. These confederations had no more fellowship, co-operation or communion, than England and Russia, or Mexico and Turkey, and acted just as distinctly from and independent of each other.

In the two articles we have now laid before our readers, we have aimed to make a very brief statement, or give a brief outline of the state of affairs, in which we have set forth the principal topics that will claim our attention in our plea for the great Reformation of the nineteenth century. We shall aim to give these topics a pretty thorough discussion, and show conclusively in what the Reformation consists, with the grand prospects now in view. Meantime, if any of our opponents still have objections, we have room for them and a consideration of them.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A SKEPTIC AND A CHRISTIAN, ON THE FORE-KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

NO. I.

Skeptic.—Did not God know, when he made man, that he would sin?

Christian.—I presume he did, for he saw the end from the beginning, and knew all things.

S.—Why did he create man, knowing that he would sin?

C.—It may be that I cannot tell why he created man, knowing that he would sin. But it matters nothing whether I can tell why he created, or not; you and I have to admit the fact that he did create. The fact that he did create, proves that it was the best that possibly could have been done, whether in our weakness we can see why he did it, or not, for what the allwise God, in his infinite goodness, does, is the best that can possibly be done in any given case. I cannot see why he does many things that we all know he does. I cannot see why he sends forth vegetation, as he does sometimes in the spring, and sends a frost to kill it; why he causes a forest to grow up, and sends the hurricane to tear it down; why he should cause an infant to be born, and send a plague to kill it; why he should raise up a city, and cause an earthquake to open its mouth and swallow it down, with all its inhabitants, &c., &c., unless it be to teach us that the "book of nature" has some mysteries in it, as well as the Bible.

S.—All these things are the legitimate result of natural laws.

C.—Truly, but who made these "natural laws"?

S.—God made them, of course.

C.—Very well, did he not forknew that they would produce these disastrous results, with ten thousand others equally fatal, when he made them?

S.—I suppose he did, for he foreknew everything.

C.—Why did he, then, create these laws, knowing that these terrible results would follow?

S.—He created them—he created—I say he created—the fact is—reason teaches—

C.—The fact is, reason teaches nothing. No other than a reasonable or rational being can teach, nor can any other than a reasonable or rational being be taught, but reason itself teaches nothing. A man may be endowed with the best reason in the world, but unless he is taught from some other source than his own intuitive reason, he will never know much.

S.—You have diverted my mind from the argument I was aiming at, and I shall not follow you now, but proceed to state the argument that I started out with. You have admitted that God foreknew whether I shall be saved or lost, did you not?

C.—I presume I did.

S.—If he knew I would be saved, I will be saved; if he knew I will be lost, I will be lost. Is not this so?

C.—I presume it is so.

S.—Then where is the use of me troubling myself, or attempting to do anything about it?

C.—The Lord knew, before you were created, whether you would be a beggar or
have abundance of this world's goods, did he not?

S.—I suppose he did.

C.—If he knew you would be a beggar, you will be a beggar; if he knew you would possess abundance, you will possess abundance.

S.—Certainly.

C.—Then where is the use of your troubling yourself, toiling and striving, or attempting to do anything?

S.—There is use—there is use—I say—reason teaches—the laws of nature—the fact is—

C.—The fact is, sir, that when you are sick, the Lord knows whether you will get well or die, as you admit; if he knows you will get well, you will get well; if he knows you will die, you will die. Where is the use, then, of your troubling yourself to send for the doctor, take medicine, use every means and appliance in your reach? Why not leave the whole matter, and rest upon the foreknowledge of God?

S.—Might not God foresee that I would send for the doctor, take the medicine and thus get well, and thus make it necessary for me to use the means?

C.—Certainly he might, and so he might foreknow that all men are free; that they act voluntarily, that some of them will believe the gospel, submit to it and thus be saved; but others will not believe and obey, but voluntarily reject the gospel and thus be lost. Upon the same rule then, that you have anxiety for your temporal support, when you admit that God foreknew whether you would be a beggar or have abundance, labor and toil that you may not come to want; and upon the same principle that you send for a doctor when sick, take his medicine, use all the means and application in your power to recover, when you admit that God knew at the start, or before you were created, whether you would get well or die; if you would be a consistent man, you should believe the gospel of Christ, do what it teaches, and you will have the promise of God that you shall be saved, and you will be saved, whether you can understand the foreknowledge of God or not?

S.—I can not see, if God foreknew all things, where the use is in my being anxious about it.

C.—There is precisely the same use for you to be anxious in regard to religion as any temporal matter. Your view in regard to foreknowledge will interfere in one case just as much as in the other. I once heard of two preachers riding together on horseback, and their case illustrates ours so well, that I will relate it. One of them had taken your position, and the other had opposed it. They came to a deep creek, and it was doubtful whether they could ride it. After looking at it for a few minutes, said the one opposing your view, to the other, "If God foreknew that you would be drowned in this creek, you will be drowned in it, I will therefore get you to ride in first." After hesitating for a moment, the other replied, "God foreknew that I would not ride in first." In the same way, I would recommend you to decide that God foreknew that you would not reject the gospel, that you would not live in your sins, but that you would consecrate yourself to the service of God and thus be saved.

S.—Can it be true, that God can foresee what a man will do, when he acts free?

C.—Certainly; and that is the chief wonder in foreknowledge, that all men are agents, act entirely free; decide whether they will be good or bad, righteous or wicked, and yet that it can perceive the end from the beginning, amidst all possible contingencies. Judas Iscariot acted as freely and voluntarily as ever any being did, yet the spirit of Omniscience looked down through the long cycles of ages, and foretold what he would do. Peter, in denying his Master, acted as freely as ever any being in the universe did, yet the Lord saw before that he would do it, and so told him.

S.—I will see you again on this matter. Good night.

The more we drink at the fountain of truth, the larger draughts we are enabled to take.
A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

NUMBER III.

THE MINISTRY AND PREACHING—NO. 1.

The ministry and preaching at the time of the commencement of the Reformation of the nineteenth century, were of such a character as not only to demand attention first, but a careful and deliberate consideration in these papers. In a previous article the ministry has been classified as follows:

1. The learned, doctrinal and partisan preachers, sworn to defend certain dogmas and parties.

2. The learned, moral and political lecturers.

3. The old fashioned called and sent preachers.

It is proper now to consider these three classes of preachers separately, their preaching and the result that naturally followed.

1. The learned, doctrinal and partisan preachers. This class of men were students, laborious and untiring—close, careful and prudent reasoners. They knew more of logic, argument and debate, than any other class of men. In one word, in the popular sense, they were more profound than any other class. In the true sense, they were not profound. They were, and the same class still are, unsafe men as commentators, expositors, interpreters or translators of the sacred writers. Their standard, polar star or grand criterion, was the particular dogma, theory, philosophy or creed, to which they had sworn. With them, the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the universe around them, must all bend to their creed. They entered no investigation with the pure and holy purpose of ascertaining truth, or of discriminating between truth and error. They never attempted a comment, interpretation or exposition with the simple, pure and holy purpose of ascertaining the true meaning of it, or simply the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The highest conception they had, the loftiest and most noble object of which they appeared to be capable, in their readings, comments, and interpretations of the oracles of the living God, was to find some proof in support of their creed, theory or philosophy.

This class appeared to have but one thing firmly and immutably settled, i. e., that their creed, theory or philosophy, no matter what it might be, was infallibly true. In all their reasoning, arguments and discussions, as well as in all their comments, expositions and interpretations, this one thing is taken for granted, and, with them, everything else must be interpreted in conformity with it. A large proportion of their preaching is simply to try and prove the one thing, to convince their hearers that it is true. Their reading of the scripture is in search of proof of the same thing; their comments, expositions and criticisms are almost all for the same purpose. The Bible is searched from side to side, not to ascertain its meaning, but to find proof of the one central theory, philosophy or creed. Thousands of books are searched from side to side; libraries are ransacked throughout; learned authorities produced; but all for the same purpose—not to ascertain the truth, but to find proof of the creed. Everything seeming to favor the creed, is lauded as the very highest authority, and everything against it is not only not wanted, but no authority at all.

These preachers all claimed to be ministers of Christ—all authorized—nay, more, divinely authorized preachers of the gospel. While one of these divinely authorized ambassadors of Christ—ministers of the gospel—was engaged in one house, preaching the Calvinistic gospel of Christ, another one was engaged in another house, preaching precisely opposite doctrine—the Arminian gospel of Christ. While one divinely authorized ambassador is engaged in one part of a city or town, in preaching the Trinitarian gospel of Christ, another one is in another part of the same city or town, preaching the opposite doctrine—the Unitarian gospel of Christ. One of these di-
vinely authorized embassadors of Christ, if he could, would have you believe that the grand pivot on which the universe turns, is Calvinism. Another would have you believe the fate of all nations hangs upon Arminianism. Another thinks the eternal all of mankind is poised upon Trinitarianism. And yet another thinks he has found the grand panacea in Unitarianism. Thus the thing proceeds till vast numbers are found, not only preaching a great variety of theories, philosophies and dogmas, but every imaginable form of contradictions, incongruities and absurdities, and all in the name of the Lord, or with divine sanction, if we could believe them.

Sensible men of the world desire to treat them all politely, and pass round and give them all a hearing. They perceive that many of them are men of honor, learning, shrewdness and adroitness in managing their various arguments. Still, after going round and listening to them for years, they generally fall into some one of the following conditions:

1. To fall in with someone of the preachers and conclude that he is right, and decide to hear him and no one not "of the same faith and order" with him, and thus become a partisan.

2. To come to the conclusion that he can understand none of them—to decide that there is but one thing certain about it—and that is, whether owing to his native obtuseness, want of common sense, or some other cause, he is certain that he does not and cannot understand the preachers, and it is useless to try.

3. To come to the conclusion that opposites—direct and palpable opposites—as Calvinism on the one hand, and Arminianism on the other; the five points of Calvinism on the one hand, and the counter five points of Arminianism on the other; Trinitarianism on the one hand, and Unitarianism on the other—cannot both be true. One or the other must be false. The conclusion is easy, that there is no certainty in any of it. A man thus declares, He is then pronounced a skeptic. The preachers all then very zealously engage in trying to convince him that the Bible is true. But when the matter is carefully considered, it is not the Bible that he is perplexed with; it is not the Bible he is in doubt of; but their absurd, inconsistent and contradictory theories, philosophies and creeds. The absurdities the man has stumbled over, are not in the Bible, and had no existence till long since the last chapter in the Bible was written.

This class of preachers never appeared to perceive that while their creeds were in the way of thousands of the best people in the world, and stumbling-blocks over which for them to fall, that no man would be saved by believing their creeds, or lost by disbelieving them. It appeared never to come into their minds, that they admitted that there were many good Christians, whom they believed already saved, and many more who would be saved, who did not believe their creeds. In other words, it never appeared to come into their minds, that there was no salvation in their theories, philosophies or creeds—that a man could be a Christian if he had never heard of them. It appeared never to have occurred to them, that there was any way to settle the matter, and get these great, and, in many instances, good men, out of their difficult and most ruinous course, only to continue the discussion till it should be settled, which, among their disputed theories, was the true one. It never appeared to come into their minds that there were two insurmountable difficulties in their way, as follows:

1. That the matter can never be settled so as to determine which of their theories is the true one.

2. If they could determine which is the true one, and would adopt it, there is no salvation in it. The belief of it would save no one, and the disbelief of it would damn no one.

This class of men were inspiring in the people the spirit of dogmatism, of partyism and schism, instead of love, joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit. All the scripture they ever used, was used in a partisan sense.
The converts they made were not converts to Christ, but to their creed—their belief. The love of their converts was not love to Christ, but to their creed. Their love was not to the children of God, but to those agreeing with them in theory. In the place of it being a blessing to human society for any one of these parties to succeed, it was an injury; because they mistook their devotion to their creed for devotion to Christ, and their devotion to a party for devotion to the people of God. They mistook their party cause for the cause of Christ, their little party work for the work of Christ, and the party itself for the church of Christ. No set of men since the apostles' time needed reforming more than these, not because they were bad, designing or wicked men, but because they were mistaken and misguided, to such an extent as to be most disastrous to the cause of Christ.

As much, however, as this class needed reforming, they were more inaccessible to reformation, and more difficult to change, than almost any other class that could be found. They knew they had no learning, talent and industry. They knew they had studied hard, reasoned closely and gained many victories in discussion. They thought they had proved their doctrine by clear scripture a thousand times. They had a thousand fine sermons prepared with great care, all proving their doctrine and reasoning it out with the utmost exactness and accuracy. The labor of the lives of many men had been spent in propagating, advocating and perpetuating their theories. It is now no small matter for a man who has spent a lifetime in preparing material of this sort, to come vaguely to the conclusion, that all he has ever preached, or ever may preach, in support of his long cherished theory, is not preaching the gospel, even if the theory is true; and consequently that all the work done, and all the material and skill on hand to do more work of the same sort, is lost and cannot be made available. Still, this is the case with every man who has made preparation for the defence of a creed, theory or philosophy, whether true or false; the defence of that theory is not preaching Christ—the gospel—and all the work done of that kind, is clear loss, and also all the capital for future operations. Whatever work he may have done incidentally, preparing for real gospel work, and capital he may have for real gospel preaching, can be made available. But all the capital merely for the defence of a dogma, theory or creed, no matter whether true or false, is utterly useless, when a man becomes a gospel preacher in the New Testament sense.

What, then, is to be done with these men and their theories, philosophies and creeds, in case of reformation? We answer, set the men to preaching Christ—the gospel—nothing but the gospel. Let Christ be the grand center, the life, or soul, in their preaching in future, as their peculiar theory has been in the past. Let them keep their dogma, if they have any use for it, but let them know that preaching it is not preaching the gospel—is not preaching Christ, and not what Christ commissioned the ministers of the New Testament to do. Let them understand distinctly, that no man is considered a Christian in the kingdom of Christ, because he believes their theory, or is to be rejected because he does not believe it. In other words, he must understand that in the kingdom of Christ, theories, philosophies of men, no matter whether true or false, are not bars of fellowship. In Christ Jesus, neither Calvinism, Arminianism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, avail anything, "but a new creature"—a Christian. In Christ Jesus no man is tried, measured or excommunicated by the Westminster, Augsburg or Philadelphia confession, or any creed made by mortal man, but by the law of God. By that law men shall be judged in the last day. Heaven and earth would sooner fall than one jot or tittle of that law fall till every word be fulfilled.

Look on labor as honorable and dignify the task before thee, whether it be in the study, office, counting-room, work-shop, or furrow field. There is an equality in all, and the resolute will and pure head may ennable either.
A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A SKEPTIC AND A CHRISTIAN, ON THE FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

NUMBER TWO.

Skeptic.—I admit, Mr. C., that you confused me in our previous conversation, threw me off my guard and made me appear quite ridiculous. I should not care for this had not our mutual friend, who I am happy to see with us again, and who, I supposed, simply taking notes for his own satisfaction, published every word of our conversation in the A.C. Review. I shall now be on the lookout, if all I say is to be published, measure every word and put it in its proper place.

Is not the foreknowledge of God taught in the Bible?

Christian.—We read of the foreknowledge of God in the Bible.

S.—Is not God foreknowing the same as his fore decreeing? or is not his foreknowing a thing the same as fore decreeing it?

C.—Certainly not. I foreknow that men will die, but I do not fore decree it. They would die just as they do if I foreknew nothing about it. When you are approaching a river you foreknow that you will find it in a channel and running down stream, but you do not decree either that it shall run down stream or in a channel. But it would be in a channel and run down stream if you had no foreknowledge about it, or even did not know of its existence.

S.—I can not see any difference between the decree of God and his foreknowledge.

C.—I think there is a clear difference and the distinction may be easily made.

S.—Where is the difference?

C.—To decree that any thing shall be done, is to require or cause it to be done. If God decrees that any thing shall be done, he requires or causes it to be done, and it is according to his will that it is done. But he may foreknow that a thing will be done that he did not only not decree, require or cause to be done, but forbid to be done. In one word he may foresee, or, which is the same, as foreknow that a thing will be done contrary to his will, but he can not decree that a thing shall be done contrary to his will. I doubt not he saw, or foresaw, that Adam would sin; yet he forbade it, and it was contrary to his will.

But I have shown you that there is nothing practical in all this, in our previous conversation; that you can apply all your difficulties on foreknowledge to all your temporal pursuits and undertakings, down to the least and last item, and thus make them an excuse for not attending to the ordinary avocations in life. Before you plow, plant or sow, you might just as reasonably sit down and say, “The Lord foreknew all about this before I was created; if he knew that I will have a crop, I will have it, and it is useless for me to plow, plant,” etc. But in all this department you act consistently, in deciding, acting in the way most conducive to the accomplishment of the grand object you have in view. But this is not what the Bible means by “foreknowledge.”

S.—What then does the Bible mean by foreknowledge?

C.—When the Bible speaks of “the foreknowledge of God,” it is certainly not speaking of what he knew before in contrast with what he did not know before, in the ordinary sense of knowing and not knowing, for, in that sense, he knew all things.

S.—What then is the sense in which the Bible uses the term “foreknowledge?”

C.—That which the Bible calls “the foreknowledge of God,” is that which God has before made known. Hence the term, “foreknowledge,” is a New Testament term, invariably referring to something which God had before made known, in the Old Testament, by the prophets.

S.—Are you certain of that? I should like to see an example or two to that effect.

C.—I will cheerfully give you several examples. One of the most difficult of this sort I now think of is Acts ii. 23. “Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, you have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.”
What is meant here by “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God”? The same thing precisely is expressed, in different words, Acts iii. 18, as follows: “But those things which God had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.” Peter being his own expositor, “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,” amounts to the same as, “those things which God has shown by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.” From this you perceive that the foreknowledge of God, mentioned in the New Testament, is that which God had shown by the mouth of all his prophets, in the Old Testament.

Another example, perhaps more clear, is found, Gal. iii. 8. “And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith preached before the gospel to Abraham.” What is the meaning of “the scripture foreseeing”? Certainly the same as God foreseeing, or foreknowing. It is simply the Lord foreshowing in the scripture, that he would justify the heathen through faith. This he did by saying to Abraham, “In thee and in thy seed shall all nations be blessed.” This is the foreseeing, or foreknowledge of God, as found in a promise, in the Old Testament. This promise, though short, contained the Savior, the gospel and the entire New Institution. It is the foreknowledge of God, the eternal purpose, the mystery, or secret, in promise. Instead of Paul saying, as is the literal amount of it, God foreshowing that he would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel to Abraham, he says, “the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith.” The sum of it is, that it was the eternal purpose of God to justify the heathen through faith, and that purpose was foreshown by the promise of God in the scripture.

Another example, of the same sort is found in the same chapter, verse 22: “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” What is the meaning of the expression, “the scripture hath concluded”? It is certainly that God has set forth a conclusion in the scripture. That foreconclusion, set forth in the scripture, is the same as the foreknowledge of God. He before concluded, or determined, all under sin, that the promise might be given to them that believe,” or, as expressed in another place, “that he might have mercy upon all.”

The eternal purpose of God, in view of man’s sin and fall, was to send Christ, to justify man through faith in Christ, in the gospel, through means of the New Institution. The promise to Abraham, the predictions of the prophets, set forth, in promise, or prophecy, contain that, which in the New Testament is called, “the foreknowledge of God,” or what is literally the knowledge of Christ, the gospel and all the good things to come, as found in the Old Testament, or before shown in the scriptures.

S.—I do not perceive, sir, that your solution contains any thing practical any more than my own.

C.—If the foreknowledge of God simply is the gospel, in promise, in prophecy, in a mystery, or secret, which, when the proper period came, for its introduction into the world, full development and unfolding among all nations for the obedience of faith, and if the period has come, long since, and a full revelation of the secret, unfolding of the mystery and development of the entire New Institution has been made for all the world, declaring that “in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him—that Jesus is now the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him; we say, if this is all so, there is certainly something practical in it.

S.—You think then, that the gospel was contained in the promise, in prophecy, in a grand purpose, till Christ came; and that during this period it was a mystery, or secret, and that the knowledge of God set forth in the promise and prophecies, is referred to in the New Testament, as the
foreknowledge of God—that the gospel as fully revealed by the apostles, is the foreknowledge, mystery or secret revealed.

C.—I do, and that instead of our trying to peer into some inscrutable supposed foreknowledge, about which we can know little or nothing, purely speculative, we would all do well to receive the gospel of Jesus as a full and perfect revelation of the purpose, the foreknowledge, secret or mystery of God, not made known to the sons of men for ages as now revealed—as Paul says, “But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” See Rom. xvi. 26. Or as Peter expresses it: “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to you; searching what or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them, did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported to you, by them who have preached the gospel to you, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.” 1st Peter i. 11, 12.

Books.—Young persons learn a great deal by being in the presence of books. A love of knowledge comes with reading, and that, in a young mind, is almost a warrant against the inferior excitement of passion and vice. Books are windows through which the soul looks out, and a house without books is like a room without windows. It is a pleasure to have books; and a library growing larger every year is an honorable part of a young man’s or a young woman’s history.

Education.—What sculpture is to a block of marble, education is to a human soul, the philosopher, the saint, and the hero; the wise, the good, or the great man, very often lie hid and concealed in a plebian, which a proper education might have disinterred and have brought to light.—Spectator.
thousand years continuance, which culminated in the Christian dispensation.

It must not be supposed, however, because "the fulness of time has come," that those things which preceded it are no longer of any consequence. As well might we, when we arrive at the meridian of life, ignore all the lessons we learned in childhood and boyhood. It is true, "when we were children, we spoke as children, but now that we are men, we put away childish things;" but we should never put away the lessons of childhood. Precisely so it is in reference to the dispensations which went before Christianity. We should put them away, but not the lessons they teach. Paul speaks of them as the shadows of something better to come. Now a shadow, pre-supposed light some place. This light is the "sun of righteousness," whose first rays are disclosed in the garden of Eden. The four thousand years, embracing the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, form the great shadow, which for a time obscured the "true light" from the eyes of men; but as the "sun" rose higher and higher, the shadow grew shorter. Finally the "sun" reached the zenith of his glory; was crowned Lord of all; then the shadow was under his feet; then "those things that are shaken, were removed," that "those things that can not be shaken, may remain." Hence, looked at from our stand-point, Christianity is all the more beautiful, because of the dark ground in which it is set. Its light is the more brilliant in contrast with the starlight and moonlight ages which preceded it. These ages are not the Light, but simply a voice crying in darkness, prepare ye the way of the Light, make the paths straight.

In the book before us, Bishop Whately has done a great work for the Christian religion. He begins the investigation at the right place, and he treats the whole subject as one who thoroughly understands its importance. In fact, taken as a whole, we unhesitatingly pronounce it the best work that has appeared upon the subject, during the nineteenth century. As a general thing, his statements are clear and concise; his arguments forceful and logical, and his conclusions rational and scriptural.

We must not be understood, however, as endorsing all he has said, but there is so much to commend, and so little to condemn, that we feel half way inclined to pass over the objectional features with only a wish that they could have been otherwise. Nevertheless, as a candid reviewer, we must examine impartially every thing by that infallible Book, which is a "lamp to our feet, and a light to our pathway."

We pass over the first chapter of the book, "The Pagan Religions," with only a brief notice, since it is the succeeding chapters with which we are more particularly interested.

His argument here is to show how perfectly helpless man was, without some clear and well-defined Revelation, other than the light of Nature.

This portion of the book is a splendid induction of facts, in proof of that fearful commentary of Paul in the letter to the Romans, on the degeneracy of the race; "Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened."

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things."

"Wherefore God also gave them up unto uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen."

"For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature; and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even
as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despotic, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” Rom. 1st chap. from 21st verse to 31st inclusive.

No one can fail to see that such a condition could not be relieved without an “extraordinary providence,” such as the Jewish dispensation in the first place, and then the gospel, which was to bring “life and immortality to light.”

Whatever may be the opinions of men to the contrary, one thing seems clearly established by our author, viz.: that the Pagan world had no well defined ideas of a future state.

“The belief, then, of a life to come, though nominally professed, can not be considered as practically forming any part of the creed of those ancient nations with whom we are best acquainted. Cicero acknowledges that the epistle of Sulphicius to him on the death of Tullia, comprehended every argument for comfort which the case admitted; yet we find in it no allusion to the one topic which would have been uppermost in the mind of a believer. It is no wonder, therefore, that when at Athens, Paul came to speak of the resurrection of the dead, some of his hearers mocked; and that when Festus heard him declaring the same doctrine, he exclaimed, ‘Paul, thou art beside thyself.’ So far, indeed, were the promulgators of Christianity from finding the belief of a future state already well established, that they appear to have had no small difficulty in convincing of this truth even some of their converts. Some of those who denied a resurrection, may, indeed, with good reason, be supposed to have looked for some other kind of future existence; but when Paul finds it necessary to urge, ‘if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable—let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die,’ it is plain he must have been opposing such as expected nothing beyond the grave. And when he exhorts the Thessalonians not to sorrow for the deceased, ‘even as the rest (of mankind) who have no hope,’ he have the testimony, if we will receive it, of one who knew better than we can, the real sentiments of the heathen on this point.” Page 50 and 51. It is abundantly clear that whatever is said upon this subject by Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and in fact by all the Pagan philosophers, can be regarded, at most, as only indicating the probability of a future existence. Further than this, their writings do not justify any conclusion. Many modern philosophers suppose that the lights of nature furnish sufficient evidence of such a state, and from this hypothesis conclude that the heathen world did possess this knowledge. But this reasoning is clearly a petitio principii—a begging the whole question. It is not whether they might have known there was a future state, but whether they actually did know there was. To say that such was the fact because there is a possibility it might be so, is to take for granted the very thing to be proved. Besides, there is considerable doubt as to the possibility of such a thing.

We can scarcely be regarded as competent judges upon a subject of this kind. We have a clear revelation of a future state; hence, it is exceedingly easy for us to imagine, with the idea already in our minds, that the lights of nature would furnish us with it. But this we have no right to do. We must place ourselves in the position of the Pagan, who had to find out what we already know, before we can fully understand the difficulties in our way. A great deal of sophistical reasoning has been introduced into our theological polemics upon this subject. It is readily granted, when
the existence of a future life is once revealed, that the analogies of nature go far to corroborate the evidence of the revelation; but that it was possible to obtain the knowledge without the revelation, is, to say the least, very questionable; hence, the argument for a DIVINE REVELATION is conclusive and irresistible.

"The Mosaic Dispensation" next engages the attention of our author. If Bishop Whately had done nothing else, he deserves, and should receive the gratitude of every lover of sound criticism, for his masterly analysis of the "Jewish Theocracy." It is the alphabet of the Christian religion; the type used in setting up the composition which announced the "glad tidings of great joy to all peoples" the vestibule to the church of the living God. It should, therefore, receive a large share of attention in any discussion upon the Rise, Progress and Corruptions of Christianity. That our author has performed his work nobly, will appear abundantly evident to every unprejudiced reader.

It is necessary to state one fact here in reference to the method of Bishop Whately's reasoning. He is evidently an admirer of the novum organum of Bacon. His style is rigidly inductive. He does not appeal to facts to sustain his conclusions, but very properly lets the facts speak for themselves. And this we conceive to be the only safe method of ratiocination. If it could be universally adopted, especially upon religious subjects, the old controversy between Meum and Tuum would soon be reduced to the diminutive dimensions of the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Almost all the theological pugilism of the present time has its origin in a certain weakness of human nature, very properly stated by Plautus—"Mens nichil, suas quique caras."

Bishop Whately is in a great measure free from this "weakness," and consequently we are at once disposed to follow him as an honest and earnest inquirer after truth.

That he thoroughly comprehends the meaning of the Jewish dispensation is so manifestly evident in his analysis, that the veriest novice in Biblical criticism would scarcely question it. But we will let him speak for himself: "For our present purpose it will be sufficient to mark out the most important points which distinguished the Mosaic dispensation—the religion of the Israelites—from what came before it, and from what followed it; on the one hand, from the religion of those worshippers of the true God, who lived before the time of Moses, and on the other hand, from the gospel dispensation—the religious system under which we are placed.

"The Law was designed to prepare the way for Christianity—a religion intended for all mankind—according to the promise made to Abraham, that some person or persons descended from him, should prove a blessing to all nations. Yet the Law itself was given to one people alone. And accordingly, when the apostles of Jesus Christ, who were themselves Jews, converted vast multitudes of Gentiles to Christianity, teaching them, among other things, to acknowledge the divine origin of the Mosaic Law, they yet taught them that the ordinances of that law did not extend to Gentiles." Pages 65 and 66. He then proceeds to show that the religion of the Jews was a local religion—intended for one people—the continuance of which depended upon the perpetuation of the one "place which the Lord should choose, to set his name there"—the Temple. "Hence," says our author, "the final destruction of that Temple abolished manifestly and totally, the Mosaic system of religion.

"And it is very remarkable that that religion is almost the only one that could have been abolished against the will of the people themselves, and while they firmly resolved to maintain it. Their religion, and theirs only, could be, and has been, thus abolished in spite of their firm attachment to it, on account of its being dependent on a particular place. The Christian religion, or again, any of the Pagan religions, could not be abolished by any force of enemies, if the persons professing the religion were sincere and resolute in keep-
ing it. To destroy a Christian place of worship, or to turn it into a Mahommedon mosque, (as was done in many instances by the Turks,) would not prevent the exercise of the Christian religion. And even if Christianity were forbidden by law, and Christians persecuted (as has in times past been so frequently done,) still they might assemble secretly in woods or caves, or they might fly to foreign countries to worship God, according to their own faith; and Christianity, though it might be driven out of one country, would still exist in others." Pages 68 and 69.

"Again, the Moses Law was distinguished from every other revelation ever bestowed on man, by the great number and minuteness of its regulations, and the multitude of its ceremonial observances. It gives exact directions to the Israelites as to their diet, their dress, and their mode of life in many particulars.

"One purpose answered by these numerous ordinances, was to keep them quite distinct from other nations; that they might be better preserved from falling into the idolatrous worship of their neighbors, and might be marked out, both to them, and themselves, as the Lord's peculiar people. Not one word said about any rewards in a future life—every blessing is temporal. "But it shall come to pass if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." Then follows a curse, in every case where a blessing was pronounced before. And should they continue in disobedience, their captivity in Babylon, the destruction of their Holy City by Titus, and finally their dispersion throughout all the earth, a "hiss and a by-word among all nations," are clearly and unmistakably indicated. Thus we see, that whatever views the Jews themselves may have entertained, in reference to a future state, there is not one word in the Mosaic religion that even looks beyond the grave. Of course this observation does not include what was typical:
But the types could not be understood, until the anti-types had appeared. From this induction we are enabled to discover what "fantastic tricks are cut before high heaven," by the venders of our modern theological orthodoxy, who seek to fasten upon us the Mosaic Law, "by the deeds of which no flesh shall be justified." Unfortunately for the cause of truth, our English version of Romans iii. 31, is an entire perversion of the original. As it now stands, it is positive proof to the eye of sectarian casuistry, that the Law of Moses is binding upon the Gentiles, and is a part of the Christian religion. And yet, strange to say, the Doctors of this same Mosaic Jurisprudence will presume to decide how much of the Law is unnecessary, and how much must be obeyed.

If in the passage of scripture referred to, the article had been translated where it occurs, and left out where it does not occur, we should have had a very different meaning. It would then read thus: "Do we then make void law (nomen) through the faith (the pisteos)? Yea, we establish law (nomon)." Here we discover that the faith does make void the law (specifically) the Mosaic Law; but not law (generically), that which is applicable to every creature. For no one we presume, would now pretend to say that he keeps even what are usually called the "Ten Commandments." By common consent, the whole Christian world continues to violate the fourth, in substituting the "Lord's Day" for the Jewish Sabbath. Every precept in the Jewish religion, that is now binding upon the Christian, would be equally so, were it not found in the Mosaic Law at all. Such precepts are right in themselves, whether found in the Koran, the Book of Mormon, or the Old Testament scriptures.

When we come to contrast the Christian dispensation with the Jewish, the difference is so marked, that we naturally wonder how any one could ever become involved in the meshes of that ignis fatuus, which lurks along the sloughs of sectarian mysticism, and by such Rev. Doctors as Nathan L. Rice, and his worthy coadjutors, very artistically yeleped "identity." We would very cordially recommend to such a candid and careful study of Archbishop Whately on the "Introduction of the Gospel." If this antidote does not prove sufficient to remove the obnoxious poison of Infant rontism based upon the spurious plea of "church identity," then indeed we are fearful their case is a hopeless one.

"The chief points," says our author, "which distinguish the Christian Dispensation from the Mosaic, are these three: 1. Spirituality; 2. Universality; and, 3. Unity. The New Kingdom of God was to be, "not of this world," but spiritual; it was to be open to all mankind as its subjects, and it was to admit all of them to equal privileges."

That this distinction is a comprehensive and just one, will not be denied by those who are at all competent to judge. And now what a lesson to us is there in this generalization. Could the Christian world be made to realize the momentous consequences involved in it, instead of the cold formalism, Pharisaical exclusivism, and Jesuitical favoritism, which now hang like an incubus upon the progress of the church, we should have a "building of God," composed of "lively stones," a "spiritual house," "a holy priesthood," whose delight would be "to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Under the first distinction, an eternal divorce is declared between church and state; "Render unto Caesar, the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's," is an unalterable precept of the Kingdom of Christ. How humiliating then, to every lover of our blessed Lord, is the present prostitution of the ministry to the base and perfidious purposes of political demagogues? Were the Czar of Russia to exchange his throne for the position of one of his serfs, it would be but a faint representation of the fall of a minister, who leaves his holy calling to mingle in the world's strife for political power. And yet, we are thoroughly convinced that much of this thing, now done, is sanctified by an ap-
peal to facts furnished by the Mosaic Law. Les extremities se touchent.

Again, were we to test the religious systems of the nineteenth century by Mr. Whately's second distinction: Universality, how few could establish any claim to the royal appellation, Church of Jesus Christ? We are fearful that the establishment to which Bishop Whately himself belongs, would be found too narrow to cover this broad distinction. Of one thing we are profoundly convinced, viz.: No human creed will ever be found sufficient to meet this requirement.

And just here, it is proper to say, we were not a little chagrined, after all the good things the Bishop had said, to find him making an apology for catechisms and human creeds. But it is just what we might have expected. For, whenever the clergy of these special establishments behold their "craft" in danger, they immediately cry out from their stentorian lungs, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" Nevertheless, we confess to have formed a better opinion of our author. We will do him the justice to say, however, that he touches the subject lightly; so much so, indeed, as to leave the impression upon the mind of the candid reader, that in his opinion, these useless appendages might be entirely dispensed with, and the cause of Christ not suffer materially.

But we will let him speak for himself:

"It is, indeed, allowable and proper that a Church should employ, for the instruction of its people, convenient summaries and expositions of Scripture doctrine—such, for instance, as Catechisms. For this is to supply an omission, which (as above observed) was purposely left in Scripture. But then these Catechisms, &c., must contain the very doctrines of Scripture, and none other. And being the compositions of uninspired men, no authority must be claimed for them, except from their agreement with Scripture. And the same rule applies to Forms of prayer and to Creeds.

"Creeds, which have been sometimes called "Symbols," sometimes "Confessions of Faith" or "Articles of Religion," are state-ments of such doctrines as must be acknowledged by any one who would become or remain a member of the Church which adopts that creed. In different Churches, in the earliest times, different creeds were in use; and alterations were made in them from time to time. Not that any Church had a right to alter the Christian Faith; but that it was necessary to meet, and guard against the peculiar religious errors which arose in various ages and countries. But as none of these creeds is to be found in Scripture, so, there is none that can claim any authority, except from its conformity to Scripture.

"The doctrines, then, which a Christian Church teaches, and is bound to teach, are to be those of the Christian Scriptures; neither more nor less.

"But, on the other hand, Church ordinances and regulations are only required to be not at variance with Scripture. For it is indispensably necessary for a Church to make enactments on many points respecting which nothing is precisely laid down in Scripture; but only the general principle, "let all things be done to edifying."—Pages 165 and 166.

The whole ground upon which this remarkable passage rests for support is, that it "is indispensably necessary for a Church to make enactments on many points respecting which nothing is precisely laid down in Scripture." Pray, how then, most Rev. Bishop, can such enactments "conform to Scripture," since "authority must be claimed for them, except from their agreement with Scripture?" If there is enough said to determine this "agreement," then there is enough said to determine what to do, without the "enactments."

But the "doctrines," "are to be those of the Christian Scriptures; no more nor less." Very well. But who, sir, is to determine this matter, since, in these Scriptures, nothing is precisely laid down?" No doubt the Bishop can throw some light on this subject.

May not the fact that nothing is "precisely laid down" be the very reason why noth-
ing should be "precisely done?" But we
will let the Bishop himself give evidence
upon this point.

He says: "Why it was that the Most
High thought fit to make a revelation to
this one people, and not at once to all
the world, we can not explain, and must not
presume to decide. Indeed, we can not
explain why the Gospel was not preached
to the very first generation of mankind;
and why Jesus Christ came into the
world, just when He did; nor yet why
many nations, in various parts of the world,
have been left, even to this day, in the
darkness of idolatrous superstition; or in-
deed why any such a thing as EVII should
exist at all.

"All this, we must conclude, would have
been explained to us in Scripture, if it had
been necessary for us to understand it."

Again, on page 210, when speaking of
the Philosophical speculations, respecting
the Trinity, et id omne genus, he uses the
following language:

"It is wiser and safer, as well as more
pious and humble, and more agreeable to
Christian truth, to confess, that, of the
mysteries which have been so boldly dis-
cussed by many who acknowledge them to
be unfathomable, we know nothing beyond
the faint and indistinct revelations of Scrip-
ture; and that if it had been possible and
proper, and designed, that we should know
more of such matters, more would have
been there revealed."

Then, according to Bishop Whately, "if
it had been necessary for us to understand"
"why any such thing as evil should exist at
all," "it would have been explained to us
in Scripture." Or when any thing is in-
distinctly revealed in Scripture—not "pre-
cisely laid down,"—it is not "designed we
should know more of such matters, else
more would have been there revealed."—
Well done for Bishop Whately. But what
now becomes of "Catechisms" and "Creeds?"

One of the Bishop's reasons for the
"Corruption of Christianity," is so appro-
pos just here, and is withal such a master-
ly defense of the Bible, as a sufficient rule
of faith and practice, that we will reserve
what we have to say in addition, for anoth-
er paper, in order that we may give his arg-
ument entire.

"In addition to these sources of corrup-
tion, the tendency already mentioned, to
introduce philosophical speculations into
Christianity, has shown itself again and
again under various forms, in all ages of
the Church, and has given rise to a multi-
tude of heresies.

"Philosophy is not at all opposed to true
religion, as long as men confine their spec-
ulations to matters which properly come
within the province of reason. But in what
relates to Divine revelations, reason should
be confined to these two points:—1st, To
judge of the grounds on which any pro-
fessed revelation should be received or re-
jected, as being "from Heaven or of men;"
and 2dly, To determine what it is that we
are enabled and required to learn from the
revelation which God has actually given.

"The restless spirit of philosophizing,
however, was not easy to be subdued, or to
be confined within these limits. Even
during the times of the Apostles, and still
more after their departure, many philoso-
phers, on embracing Christianity, trans-
gressed their proper limits, and sought to
exercise their ingenuity on that sub-
ject—one of so much interest and import-
ance—in order to maintain their superiority over
the vulgar, even in the knowledge of divine
mysteries. They acknowledged, for the
most part, that the Christian revelation had
made known things pertaining to God,
which could not otherwise have been known;
but these things they seem to have regard-
ed as fresh materials for human reason to
work upon; and when the illumination from
Heaven—the rays of revelation—failed to
shed full light on the Gospel dispensation,
they brought to the dial-plate the lamp of
human philosophy.

"Accordingly, we find in very early times,
curious questions raised concerning the in-
carnation, and the nature and person of the
Lord Jesus. One system, so ancient as to
be alluded to by John in his Epistle, rep-
resented Jesus Christ as not really 'come in the flesh,' but as a man in appearance only. Other systems made Jesus to have been born a mere human being, on whom, at his baptism, a certain emanation (which they called Christ) from the divine fullness descended and dwelt in Him. And endless were the questions raised, and the different hypotheses set up, as to the manner in which the divine nature was united with the human in Jesus Christ; whether He was properly to be called one person or two; whether the Virgin Mary was properly to be styled the mother of God; whether Christ should be regarded as of one substance, or of like substance with the Father; whether the Deity suffered at the crucifixion; in what way the sacrifice of Christ was accepted as a satisfaction for sin; why this sacrifice was necessary; besides (in later times) an infinite number of equally subtle speculations as to the nature of the Trinity—the divine decrees—and, in short, everything pertaining to the intrinsic nature of the Supreme Being, and the explanations of all his designs and proceedings. And yet the motions of the earth, and the circulation of the blood, were not discovered till many ages after. The cause of the vital warmth in animals, philosophers are not even yet agreed on; nor is it decided whether light, heat, and electricity are substances or qualities of bodies. But as to the substance of the Supreme Being, and of the human soul, many men were confident in their opinions, and dogmatical in maintaining them; the more inasmuch as in these subjects they could be refuted by an appeal to experiment.

"All these various systems of philosophical theology were discussed in language containing technical terms more numerous than those of almost any science; some of them taken from the sacred writers (we may say, in every sense of the phrase, taken from them, since hardly any theologian confined himself to their use of the terms,) and others not found in Scripture, but framed for each occasion. These were introduced professedly for the purpose of putting down heresies as they arose. That they did not effect this object, we know by experience; which, indeed, would lead us to conclude that heresies were by this means rather multiplied. We are inclined to think, that if all Christians had always studied the Scriptures carefully and honestly, and relied on these more than on their own philosophical systems of divinity, the Incarnation, for instance, and the Trinity, would never have been doubted, nor even named. And this at least is certain, that as scientific theories and technical phraseology gained ground, party animosity raged the more violently. The advocates of the several systems did not, like the ancient heathen philosophers, carry on a calm and friendly dispute, but (to the disgrace of the Christian name) reviled, and (when opportunity offered) persecuted each other, with the utmost bitterness. For each of them having not only placed the essence of Christianity in faith, but the essence of faith in the adoption of his own hypothesis, and strict adherence to his own use of the technical terms of his theology, was led hence to condemn all departures from his system, as involving both blasphemy against God, and danger to the souls of men. And they employed, accordingly, that violence in the cause of what they believed to be divine truth, which Jesus, Himself, and his Apostles, expressly forbade in the cause of what they knew to be divine truth. "The servant of the Lord," says Paul, "must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves, if God, peradventure, will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth." (2 Tim. ii: 24, 25.)

"But those who lose sight of the real character and design of the Christian revelation, generally lose also the mild, patient, and forbearing spirit of the Gospel.

"There is no one of the numberless systems we have alluded to that has not been opposed, and strongly condemned, by the advocates of some different one, but they have not usually been condemned on what appears to us to be the right ground."
"The proper objection to the various philosophical systems of religion,—the different hypotheses or theories that have been introduced to explain the Christian Dispensation,—is not the real difficulties that have been urged (often with good reason) against each separately; but the fault that belongs to all of them equally. It is not that the Arian theory of the Incarnation, for instance, is wrong for this reason, and the Nestorian for that, and the Eutychian for another; and so on; but they are all wrong alike, because they are theories, relative to matters on which it is vain, and absurd, and irreverent, to attempt forming any philosophical theories whatever.

And the same, we think, may be said of the various schemes (devised either by those Divines called the Schoolmen, or by others) on which it has been attempted, from time to time, to explain other religious mysteries also in the divine nature and dispensations. We would object, for instance, to the Pelagian theory, and to the Calvinistic theory, and the Arminian theory, and others, not for reasons peculiar to each one, but for such as apply in common to all.

Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate, are, confessedly, and by their own account, beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly revealed in Scripture; but it is a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own.

One of the many evils resulting from this is, that they thus lay open Christianity to infidel objections, such as it would otherwise have been safe from. It is too late, when objections are alleged from the difficulties involved in some theory, to reply, that the whole subject is mysterious and above reason, and can not be satisfactorily explained to our imperfect faculties. The objector may answer, Then you should have left it in the original mysterious indistinctness of the Scriptures. Your own explanations of the doctrines of your Scriptures, you must not be suffered to make use of as far as they are admitted from attack; and then, when they are opposed, to shelter them from attack, as sacred mysteries. If we enter on the field of philosophical argument, we can not be allowed afterwards to shrink back from fair discussion on philosophical principles.

"It is wiser and safer, as well as more pious and humble, and more agreeable to Christian truth, to confess that, of the mysteries which have been so boldly discussed by many who acknowledge them to be unfathomable, we know nothing beyond the faint and indistinct revelations of Scripture; and that if it had been possible, and proper, and designed, that we should know more of such matters, more would have been there revealed.

"And we should rather point out to objectors what is revealed, is practical, and not speculative,—that what the Scriptures are concerned with is, not the philosophy of the human mind in itself, nor yet the philosophy of the Divine nature in itself, but (that which is properly Religion) the relation and connection of the two Beings:—what God is to us,—what He has done and will do for us—and what we are to be and to do in regard to Him.

"How great must be the errors arising from men’s overlooking, or not carefully attending to this circumstance, it is hardly necessary to point out. The rustic, who persists in maintaining that the sun itself actually moves, because he sees it rise and set, i.e., sees that it is in different positions relative to himself; and the child, who, while he is sailing in a ship, fancies that the land flies from him, or advances towards him, are not more completely mistaken in their notions, than those theologians who reason upon the accounts which the Scriptures give us of the Deity, as if these were intended to explain to us what He is, absolutely, in Himself, and not merely what He is in relation to ourselves.

"And the liability to error is greatly increased by this circumstance: that even the relations in which God stands to his
creatures are so imperfectly comprehensible by our understanding, that it is necessary to explain them by analogical language, and by the use of such types and comparisons, as may furnish to our minds a kind of picture or image of heavenly things, whose correspondence with the original can not, of course, be in all points complete, any more than a picture can, in all respects, resemble the solid body which it is designed to imitate. If, therefore, we extend the analogy further than was intended, and conclude, that the things which are represented as corresponding in some points, must needs correspond throughout; or if, again, we conclude, that the things must be alike, because they are analogous, and bear similar relations to something else—we shall fall into the grossest absurdities; such as we often see in children, when they interpret literally the analogical explanations which are given them.

"If any one will be at the pains to collect instances for himself, from recollection of his own infancy, and from what he has observed in other children, of the mistakes which are in this way continually committed by every child, and will carefully reflect on these, not as a mere source of amusement, but with a view to his own instruction, they will serve as a mirror to show what sort of mistakes he himself also has to guard against, in the notions he forms respecting the Almighty.

"To take one out of innumerable instances; how many there are who speak and reason concerning the glory of God, (that being a phrase which occurs in Scripture,) as if they supposed, that the desire of glory did literally influence the Divine mind, and as if God could really covet the admiration of his creatures: not considering that the only intention of this expression is to signify merely that God's works are contrived in the same admirable manner, as if He had had this object in view: and that we are bound to pay Him the same reverent homage and zealous obedience, as if He were really and literally capable of being glorified by us. And yet it is chiefly from a literal interpretation of this phrase of the "glory of God" that some divines have undertaken to explain the whole system of Divine Providence, and to establish some very revolting and somewhat dangerous conclusions.

"The difference between Religious knowledge, properly so called, and what may be more properly styled theological Philosophy, may be thus illustrated.

"Different theories, we know, have prevailed at different times, to account for the motions of the planets, and of the moon, and other heavenly bodies;—the tides, and various other subjects pertaining to natural philosophy. Several of these theories which supplanted one another, have now become obsolete; and modern discoveries have established, on good grounds, explanations of most of these points. But the great mass of mankind can not be expected to understand these explanations. There are, however, many points of daily practical use, which they can understand, and which it is needful for them to be informed upon. Accordingly there are printed Tables, showing the times of the sun's rising and setting, at each period of the year;—the variations of the tides in different places, and the like. And all these are sufficiently intelligible, without any study of Astronomy, even to plain, unlearned men. The practical knowledge thus conveyed involves no astronomical theory, but may be equally reconciled with the Ptolemaic or the Copernican systems of the universe. It is not the less possible, nor the less useful, for any one to know the times when the sun gives light to this earth, even though he should not know whether it is the sun that moves, or the earth.

"Now it is just such practical knowledge as this that the Scriptures give us of the Christian Dispensation. They afford practical directions, but no theory. But there is this important difference between the two cases. The human faculties could, and at length did, (though it is beyond the great mass of mankind,) discover the true theory of the appearances and motions of
the heavenly bodies. In matters pertaining to Divine Revelation, on the contrary, though there must actually be a true theory, (since there must be reasons, and those known to God himself, even if hidden from every creature, why He proceeded in this rather than in that,) this theory never can be known to us; because the whole subject is so far above the human powers, that we must have remained, but for Revelation, in the darkest ignorance concerning it. Many curious and valuable truths has the world discovered by philosophy, (or as our translators express it, 'wisdom;'*) but 'the world, (says Paul,) by wisdom knew not God;' of which assertions the writings of the ancient heathen philosophers, now extant, afford sufficient proofs.

"And, we would further remark, that if it had been possible and allowable for us to follow up, by metaphysical researches, the view opened to us by Revelation, and thus to enlarge our knowledge of God’s dealings with man, Paul, (as well as the other Apostles) would not have censured, but favored, such researches, and would have set us the example of so speculating. And if he had done this, even in those discourses of his, which are not recorded in writing, we may be sure that his Gospel would not have been considered as ‘foolishness’ by the Greeks, even those of them who did not fully agree with him.

"This, therefore, supplies a useful, practical rule in judging of anything we may read or hear: whenever we meet with such a representation of Christianity as would not have been a stumbling-block to the Jews, or such as would not have been foolishness to the Greeks, we may at once conclude that this can not be the Gospel which Paul preached; for he would not have been opposed as he was, had his doctrine favored either men’s pride and worldly ambition, or their spirit of presumptuous speculation.

"It may be remarked, as another reason for condemning such presumptuous explanations, and metaphysical theories of Christianity, as we have alluded to,—all of them equally,—that if such explanations be allowed, it is evident Christianity must not be one, but two religions; that for the few profound theologians, and that for ordinary men; such as the humble shepherds to whom the holy angels announced the birth of Jesus,—the fishermen and publicans who associated with Him,—and the ‘common people’ who (we read) ‘heard him gladly.’ Now, there is nothing more characteristic of the Gospel Dispensation than its oneness; one Lord,—one faith,—one hope,—in short, one and the same religion proposed to all who heartily receive it.

“All such speculations, then, we should reject, if we would (in the words of the Apostle Peter) ‘desire as new born babes, the sincere (adolon, unadulterated) milk of the Word, that we may grow thereby.’ If we would learn the very Gospel which the Apostles taught, just as it was received by their hearers, we must in heart and spirit accompany the simple shepherds in their visit ‘to Bethlehem, to see.’ (not what human philosophy has devised, but) what the LORD hath made known to us.”—Page 204 to 216.

FACTS OF NATURE AGAINST ATHEISM.

BY G. L. PURDY, M. D.

GEOLOGICAL FACTS OF NATURE.

Before entering upon this part of the argument, I will merely state in regard to the former part of the argument, that the deductions of astronomy are in the main correct and established; and all that man knows of it, he learned for himself, for God has never revealed the facts of astronomy to man, nor has he revealed the facts of any other science. The Bible is a revelation of man’s moral relation to God—not a book of science, and as we think, neither a book to reveal himself merely as God—for if a man will not believe nature, he will not believe revelation. All sciences are the results of the labor of the God-like mind of man. Astronomy does not completely prove the
truth of the propositions upon which these arguments are based, namely:

"Order which did not once exist and began to be, that is, an effect originated in time, proves mind."

"The order discovered by the works of nature, is of this exclusive kind."

"The works of nature, therefore, prove mind."

Astronomy proves a part of these propositions—it proves that order now exists in the "starry heavens," but does not prove when this "order began to be"—it can not lead us back to this period, and for aught we have learned from astronomy, order may have existed there forever, for there has been no permanent variation discovered among the starry spheres since astronomy has revealed their sublime teachings, their perfect order, and their wondrous harmony. But of one thing it does teach, that is, order does exist, and order must be the effect of mind. We, however, are not left without a witness at this break in the testimony, and will call upon the "witness stand," the sister science of astronomy—geology—a science that deals in the infinite of time, as astronomy deals in the infinite of space; that deals in dead creations and the worlds of time that have existed in the history of the earth, as astronomy deals in the worlds of space; a science that proves beyond successful refutation, that there was a time a way down the dim vista of the past eternity, when order in the earth did not exist—the "chaos" of the Bible ruled supreme—a time so distant that the geologist computes it by millions upon millions of years, as the astronomer measures the distance of the most remote star, just visible in his monster telescope, by billions upon billions, if not trillions upon trillions of miles. Oh, unfathomable lapse of time! Oh, unmeasurable immensity of space! Oh, matchless order that prevails throughout "wide nature's bounds," surely thou teachest, or art able to teach of thy Author as an eternal and allwise God. Yes, surely thou canst teach man, who in size, compared with the infinite of time and space, is but a mere microscopic speck, but just discoverable with the most powerful instrument, but who in intellect outweighs them all—an intellect that allies him to God, that places him at the head of all created things on earth—that intellect makes him greater than all the immensity that surrounds him; makes him an originator, and a co-worker with God—that there is a God.

But to return to the subject after this apparent digression; the geology of the earth, as surely as the Bible, tells us there was a "beginning," but when that "beginning" took place, neither of the two informs us; they merely tell us there was a "beginning." Geology unmistakably points to a God—the Bible says there is a God. Geology does not tell us how, nor when, God came into existence—neither does the Bible. Geology only commences at the beginning of the earth—the Bible does not carry us back beyond this period. The developments of geology teach of an intelligent cause, as being the author of the earth, and where work in the construction of the earth was progressive—the Bible tells us of the same kind of a God. The God of geology, aside from the moral relation of man to God, is the God of the Bible, and when the "two records" are rightly interpreted, do not disagree, for God can not contradict himself. Now, here are several parallel cases—cases where the "two records" those of nature and revelation agree—the one does not surpass the other, which when rightly interpreted, will throw a flood of light upon this vexed question—nature will stand where God designed her.

But if nature is not read and understood, she will no more teach man of the character of God, than the Bible will, if it is not read and understood.

There is a point to which nature and the Bible carry us, but beyond this, the mind of man can not go, unless upon the wings of fancy alone. This point is, when, and how, came God to exist? The mind of man can not grasp the idea of a self created and self existent being, or thing. This idea belongs to God alone; it is not a part of
the God-like mind of man. But of one thing we are sure, we are assured of it by both nature and revelation, from the evidence of both; and nature being the oldest, must have the precedence upon this point; we know that at a certain time of God's existence, he began to create the earth, progressed with it, and completed the work after a definite plan.

This plan geology has traced in all its departments, and found the evidence conclusive of intelligence; the adaptation of means to ends; order and progression throughout the whole, no traces of mistakes or experiments being found; but upon the other hand, it has revealed everything to be formed after a definite and well matured plan; the higher orders of life succeeding the lower in a proper order, as the progressive state of the earth from chaos to completion, could maintain them. In short, geology teaches us nothing but the results of a wise design, of perfect order, and of perfect workmanship, from the beginning to the completion of the earth.

As I have already occupied considerable space, perhaps too much, with these rather desultory and introductory arguments, I will now proceed to the main arguments, those bearing more directly upon the point under discussion. In order to make the arguments as clear as possible, I will take an accomplished geologist and set him to exploring the formation of the earth—its strata piled one above the other, and charged with the fossil organisms of dead creations, and the remains of extinct "time worlds," to trace the history of the earth from "the beginning" to its completion. We will deny our geologist any benefit, whatever, from "revelation," but he must be well versed in all pertaining to his mission, otherwise he would not be competent to decide the question, and when so decided, we will abide the decision. The qualifications claimed for our geologist are: A full acquaintance with all the laws of natural philosophy, aided by all the sciences that will assist him in interpreting nature. These are his legitimate property, and can not be taken from him, for they are not of revelation—the Bible reveals no science—man has learned them for himself.

Will the reader now refer back to the syllogistic form in which the basis of these arguments is stated, and particularly note the two premises to be proved. The whole syllogism is italicized for the sake of perspicuity. The term ORDER, bearing the relation that it does here, will legitimately bear no other definition than "a regular disposition or arrangement of things." The propositions of the argument are now plainly, and we think, truly stated, and the evidence of their truth will now be educed.

We will let our geologist begin his exploration far beneath the light of day, at least seven and a half miles below the earth's surface, among the primary or alzoic rocks, which lie beneath the lowest fossiliferous strata, in which the first traces of life are preserved.

He looks around, and finds everything different from those at the surface of the earth. No trace, whatever, of life is seen; all about him are the hard adamantine rocks, grey with hoary age. But upon a closer gaze he finds something about these rocks that tell him they were not always rocks, but that they had previously existed in another state. Upon their rugged sides they bear the traces of having at one time been in a melted state, once existed in a liquid or viscid form. The evidence of this fact is unmistakable; it is as plain and trustworthy as the evidence of a piece of casting having once been in a state of melted iron, or that a piece of ice had once been unfrozen water, or still further, that cooled lavas, or lava rocks, were once in a fluid condition. If we deny the evidence of the first, we must also deny the evidence of the latter three. Then, according to the testimony of these rocks, there was a period yet farther back in the long eternity of past time, when there were no rocks, the substance of which the earth is composed was in a molten state. What is the direct and incontrovertible evidence upon this point? 1st. The geologist finds an increase in
the temperature of the earth of one degree for every forty-five feet he descends toward its center, which rate of increase would at the depth of forty-eight miles obtain a heat of 7,000 degrees, which would be intense enough to melt all known rocks.

2d. Volcanoes have thrown portions of this molten mass—that still constitutes the center of the earth—upon the surface, and which, when cooled under great pressure, has formed rocks not distinguishable from the primary ones; and

3d. The earth is of just such a form as it would obtain under these conditions; that of an oblate spheroid, that is, flattened at the poles and enlarged at the equator. We will illustrate this fact in physical law, by the well known example of a ball of melted glass, or any other viscid substance that will become solid upon cooling, being rapidly whirled upon a spindle, which would represent the earth’s axis around which it was whirled, while cooling, and which when thus cooled will invariably have the form of an oblate spheroid. Then the solid portion of the globe is the result of the cooling of a hot fiery mass, that at one time possessed no solidity whatever. But beyond this state of homogeneousness, a state without order, we cannot, with any certainty, trace its previous history or state, for nature has left no landmarks here to guide us; and space will not be consumed in writing about hypotheses, or theories founded upon fancy; the stubborn facts are what we are dealing with.

The geologist has now given us two starting points; the first point is established in the homogeneous state of the globe where order did not exist, and the second point is founded upon the formation of rock where “order began to be.” Thus the vacancy in the premises of our argument, which astronomy did not fill, is now closed up by geology; that vacancy was the beginning of the present order in nature.

Our geologist, after thus establishing the beginning of order, and making our premises perfect, will trace, step by step, the secular disposition or arrangement of created things in the earth,” and ascend “through nature up to nature’s God.”

There is nothing to claim the attention in these primary and unfossiliferous rocks, (those that contain no remains of animal and vegetable life,) aside from a certain arrangement among themselves. Leaving these, he ascends up the stream of time for perhaps untold ages, and arrives at the lower silurian rocks, which represent a period in which the earth for the first time could support the lowest forms of life, orders of life belonging to the first or lowest class of the four great classes into which animal life is divided—these great classes are the radiated, articulated, moluscan, and vertebrated. In the silurian rocks are also found the first traces of vegetable life in its lowest form—that of the algae or sea weeds.

(I will state here that space will not permit me to notice the many genera and species into which the four great classes are divided; a few of the principle orders are all that can be mentioned. For a more extended notice of these, and the systematic order in the mechanism of the earth, the reader is referred to my “essays on Geology,” now publishing in the “Waverly Magazine.” They were commenced in the number for the 7th of December.)

Ascending a little higher in the stratas of the earth, an advance in the order of creation is met with, the second great class or type of life is added to the first, and the lower orders of the second exists with the higher orders of the first, whose genera and species have been greatly multiplied.

The geologist ascends the stream still further—a distance that perhaps represents millions of years of time—and meets with still another great advance in creation; the addition of the third great class or type of life—the moluscan—and which, henceforth, will exist with the other two, its lowest orders first, then its higher and higher ones, until its class is completed.

Slowly the geologist again wends his way up the stream of the dim and misty past, meeting by the way, change upon change in
strata, in vegetation, in order, in genera, and in species, but each change is a step in advance, each advance a higher degree in the scale of organization, as the condition of the earth could support it. Thus wending our way, we at last arrive at the upper silurian rocks, where we meet the introduction of the last of the four great classes or types of life—the vertebrated—or that great class that have the brain and spinal cord enclosed in separate cavities. This great class naturally divides itself into five great orders; the fish, reptile, bird, mammal, and finally man. This is the division given it by the great naturalist, Cuvier, in consequence of its being one of natural succession, and was so formed by him many years before the geologist had learned it was the order of nature, the order in which they were created, lived, died, and are now entombed in the earth for the purpose of teaching man the wonderful wisdom of their producing cause. This division places the lowest order first, then the next highest in organization, until the class is filled, man standing at its head, he being the highest of the type, and the last created.

In the upper silurian rocks, the first and lowest order of this class is found—the placoid fish. The four great classes, or grand types of life, have now been introduced after a definite and intelligent plan, and now exist together, and have so continued up to the present time, without any alteration in the grand types; they are the same to-day they ever were. Orders, genera, and species of these classes have died out, and new ones have been created as the condition of the earth and progress of creation demanded, yet the four great types of life have not been altered in the least.

The strata of the earth is a vast sepulchre of the dead; they hold in their strong embrace the remains of dead orders, genera and species, and we might say, of dead creations and dynasties, that have fulfilled their missions in the great creative plan, have died, and been succeeded by others of higher organization, and these in turn have been succeeded by others still higher in the scale of life, leaving their remains as a record of the workmanship of an intelligent God.

We will, hereafter, drop from our notice the first three great classes of life, the fourth being sufficient for our purpose now. It may not be out of place, however, before leaving them, to state that at one time during the progress of creation, the radiated class was the master existences of the earth, then the articulated took their place and reigned for a season, then the molluscan over them, so to speak, the kingdom of the articulate, and built their own empire upon its ruins. Each of these classes were at one time the reigning dynasty upon the earth, but were succeeded in the old red sandstone age by the vertebrated class, which has kept the precedence ever since.

From the close of the silurian system to the ending of the carboniferous system, the fish in its many orders, genera and species, were the ruling dynasty of the animal kingdom. Among these were huge monsters clothed in an impenetrable armor of long scales, that would repel a musket ball as readily as a stone wall; they were armed with weapons of offense as well as with those of defense, and lived by preying upon their weaker neighbors. This period was emphatically the dynasty of the fish, an order of existence well adapted to that crude condition of the earth, a condition that would support nothing higher.

Let us for a moment leave the dynasty of the fish, and look at nature in another aspect of mute intelligence; an intelligence portrayed in the vegetation of this period. In the period of creation known as the carboniferous period, and represented by stratas amounting to 10,000 feet in thickness, the earth produced a most monstrous vegetation in size, such as it had never borne before, nor since. At this period the now lowly club mosses, rivalled the forest oak in size; the now humble ferns, were then as large as our second class trees; our now unpretending seeds were then as tall as the pinnace mast; and the now fragile rush,
was then a hardy stem of twenty feet in height. This forest, though monstrous in size, was of low organization. The true woody tree had but just been introduced—the lowest order of the pine class.

But why this monstrous forest? many, perhaps, may ask. The answer is, behold a portion of it in the coals you heap upon your grate, and feel its effect in the warmth it sheds throughout your room; or see its power in the ponderous engine as it moves the adjusted machinery that labors for the benefit of man; or experience the pleasure of being drawn with rapid speed along the iron rail, else in a floating palace across the billowy deep, and ask no more, why did this forest grow?

This forest of giant plants that for so long an age was formed by nature's laws into beds of coal, and stored up in the earth—for what! merely to remain there! or to serve some wise and intelligent purpose; or, on the contrary, was its being there a mere accident or freak of chance, or did it create itself? The voice of nature comes reverberating down the corridors of the past in an unmistakable and emphatic No; but says, "it is the effect of an intelligent cause, and to serve some wise purpose in the future—that purpose the benefit of man, as he is the only creature that can use it."

How did it happen, unless by the direction of an intelligent cause, that this luxuriant vegetation, that was food for neither man nor beast, should be produced at this particular time, a time when neither man nor beast was present, and a time too, when the condition of the earth was best fitted for this purpose? To those versed in the facts of nature and nature's laws, the answer is very obvious. Its production at this time would not interfere with the animal life then existing, but at any subsequent time, when herbiferous animals existed, it would interfere with them from the fact, that it of itself was not food for them, and would occupy the ground and prevent the growth of such as would be suitable food for them. Thinking that we can prove, during the course of the argument, that the producing cause of nature is possessed of intelligence enough to foreknow the whole creative plan in all its details, ere its execution was commenced, we will anticipate a portion of the argument here, and state that nature's cause, foreseeing that the future coming man would need coal, that the present forest would not meet his wants, created it at this time when its creation would not interfere with the operations of man, nor be a detriment to other parts of creation.

From all the investigations of nature that have been made, we have learned that no actual void exists in nature. Every part of nature is filled with created things that subserve a purpose in its plans. From the above view of nature, who will say that the carboniferous forest grew and formed itself into coal for the use of future man, by chance; or that the coal created itself? Do not all these facts of nature unmistakably point to an intelligent cause, and also, portray the wisdom and power of that cause?

Salem Station, O.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING.

The foregoing article, like its predecessor, is esteemed very highly for its good spirit, fine literature and scientific character. Though it falls far short of proving the proposition at which the highly intelligent and gifted writer aims, it is not by any means set aside as possessing no value. It is a valuable document and proves much, though it proves not what is claimed for it. Had the writer simply undertaken to show that the "book of nature," or the works of God in nature, as opened to our view in astronomy and geology, when understood, corroborate the revelation of the existence of God, the creation of the world and of man, his argument would have been very convincing. Now that we have the idea that there is a God, his argument in support of it is very fine and satisfactory. It is difficult for any one, in possession of the grandest of all ideas, and the one without which
so much of the universe as is open to man is a mystery; the idea that there is one God, to reason as if he had not that one idea. He who has that idea generally reasons, when he tries to reach it through the "light of nature," so called, in such a way as to beg the question. He assumes the thing to be proved—the precise question in debate. The astronomer may gaze, through his most powerful telescope, at the most remote body ever seen by mortal vision, and the geologist may look into the remotest parts of the earth ever reached by man, and then fall infinitely short of the revelation that there is one God. This stupendous idea is not written in the bowels of the earth, or on any of the heavenly bodies, or on any other place in the book of nature, sufficiently legible to be read by any man who has not previously obtained, from another source, the original idea, that there is a God.

It is cheerfully granted, that the design, order and arrangement, seen in nature, clearly prove the existence of mind, to enlightened men, whether they would ever have discovered it without the original idea of God or not; but by what means can we show that the design, order or arrangement, seen in nature, is the result of one mind, instead of a congress of minds? How can it be shown to be the result of one God, any more readily than a thousand? That the creation of the universe is the result of intelligence, or of mind, to persons highly elevated by intellectual culture, already in possession of the original idea, of the existence of the Deity, is clearly evinced by the purpose, design, order and arrangement, as well as the adaptation of so many thousands of means and instrumentalities to certain ends. But all this makes no approximation to the discovery of the existence of the one God of the Bible. After that discovery is made, the grand machinery of nature, its movements, harmony, order and arrangement, clearly evince to educated mind, that it is no work of chance, or accident, but is the result of a high order of intelligence, wise purpose. But, while there is certainly nothing in nature conflicting with the existence of that intelligence in one person, or one mind, there is nothing that proves that it does exist in one mind, or that it does not exist in a thousand minds.

It is very true, that science is not revealed in the Bible—that the Bible does not teach science, or correct any false views we may have of it; and it is equally true, that there is a vast amount in the Bible, which, while it conflicts not with real science, is taught in no science, and can be learned originally from no source but the revelation found in the Bible. We read in the Bible that God is a Spirit, but this is not written intelligibly on a single page in the book of nature, and "spelling it out," from any "light of nature," would be as dark and uncertain a work as the "spelling out" revelations by modern "spirit manifestations." Paul said of the law of Moses, "it is good if a man use it lawfully," and so of the book of nature, it too is good, if a man use it lawfully; but it is useless to try to read from it what is not legibly printed in it.

What did science teach the wise men before the Christian era, or at the commencement of it? Their sciences have been mainly exploded and shown to be false. Their ideas of astronomy were most stupid and even laughable. What did they know about geology? Shall we conclude that we can learn from astronomy or geology that there exists one Deity, where even astronomy and geology have never been understood, where the Bible has not gone in advance of them? True, the Bible does not teach astronomy or geology; but the people do not learn astronomy and geology where the Bible has not gone before. Where the people have not the idea of the existence of God, they have no astronomy or geology to teach them; and a good missionary, with his Bible, would teach them that there is one God, and one Lord Jesus the Christ, long before our able and worthy correspondent could teach them astronomy or geology, even if they could look up through the book of nature to nature's God.

It is certainly honor enough for nature, to admit that when examined by highly scien-
tific minds and correctly understood, it cor-
roborates the revelation of the existence of
God, as found in the Bible, without claim-
ing that it reveals the existence of God.
The Bible does not come forward and cor-
roborate what was previously revealed in the
book of nature; but nature, when under-
stood, as she is and can be only by a few of
the more highly favored, corroborates what
has been clearly revealed in the Bible, in
reference to the existence of God, the
creation of the universe and its manage-
ment.

Our worthy correspondent refers to the
state of the earth "where order did not exist,"
and through the light of geology, clearly
as he thinks, discovers "where order began
to be." Suppose we admit all this, though
it is by no means immutably settled among
goalists, what then? What is there in
this to discover to man the existence of the
Deity? Suppose we should trace back, as
can easily be done, and perceive the fact
in history that, as we pass backward, the
portion of the earth populated becomes
smaller, till we find no account of any in-
habits in but a single locality, and, in
number, verging to a point; the evidence
would be as clear, at least, as the evidence
in geology, showing that there was a time
when order did not exist, and a period later,
when order began to exist; that there was
a time when man did not exist, and a later
period when he began to exist. This grant-
ed, the human race did not exist from eter-
nity. It had a commencement. When we
come to the period when man began to exist,
and find the light previously prepared for
his eyes, sounds for his ears, the earth for
his feet, and all the grand preparations for
him and adaptations to him, and view it in
the light of the Bible, it is very satisfac-
tory, corroborating what is revealed in the
Bible and harmonizing with it. But where
is the nation without the Bible, that learn
anything of these matters, plain as they ap-
pear to us? The nations that have not the
Bible are as ignorant of these things as they
are of the contents of the Bible.
The true state of the case is, that the
revelation of the existence of God, the
creation of man, the material universe and
all spiritual existences, as found in the Bi-
ble, are indispensable to a sufficient develop-
ment of human greatness and capability to
deal in the wonderful works of the Al-
mighty, as discovered to the astronomer, in
the order, movements and arrangement of
the heavenly bodies, or the structure of the
earth. Had it not been for the influence
and power of the Bible, in elevating, enno-
bling and purifying man; developing his
mighty being, possessed of body, soul and
spirit, a combination material and immate-
rial, opening the way for a full display of
his wonderful powers and capabilities, the
author of the splendid articles we are now
commenting upon, would never have writ-
ten such articles or anything to compare
with them. It is due to the Bible that he
acknowledge his obligations, and not give
the glory to science, which has no existence
where the Bible has not gone, and which
never would have existed had not the Bible
existed first. With the Bible in our hands,
the original idea of one God, whose exist-
ence is from everlasting, who made the
worlds and upholds all things by the word
of his power, and with the loftiest attain-
ment in science and literature, men may look
up through nature to nature's God. But,
without the Bible, a tithe of what is now
known of nature, would never have been
discovered, to say nothing of looking up
through nature to nature's God.
The facts that order did not once exist,
that at a subsequent period it began to ex-
ist, that man did not once exist, that at a subse-
quent period he began to exist, in themselves,
make no revelation of the existence of one
God. That revelation lies far beyond.
Where does nature tell, even after we have
the fact that order began to exist, how it
began or who caused it to begin? Where
does nature tell, even after we have the
fact, that man began to exist, how he
began or who caused him to exist? On
these transcendent sublime themes, nature
is dumb and blind. Not one syllable in all
her archives is written, explaining who
caused order to come out of chaos, or man
to come into existence, whether one being
did it, or a convention of beings. From the
stupendous, grand and magnificent charac-
ter of the universe, persons of highly ex-
alted and well cultivated minds, would
readily infer that the cause producing such
mighty results must be one of great power,
whether existing in one being or thousands,
but there is nothing from which to get the
idea of omnipotence. Such an one would
readily conclude, from the order, regularity
and arrangement of the universe, that the
cause, whether located in one being or
thousands, must be a wise cause, but there
is nothing to give the idea of infinite
wisdom. From anything nature says, the conclu-
sion would be more liable than any other
that had the work been greater, the
power might have been insufficient, and
had it been more difficult, the wisdom might
have been inadequate. There is no type in na-
ture to make the impression on the mind of
man, that the cause of order is infinite in wis-
dom, or that the cause in creation is infinite in
power, even to the most enlightened of man-
kind; much less is there anything to establish
the unity of that cause in one person or one
mind. There is an immense chasm here,
that human reason, aided simply by what is
improperly styled "the light of nature,"
has never leaped over and never can.
A first cause, or uncaused cause, or an
unoriginated cause, is an idea for which
there is no type in nature, and an impres-
sion cannot be made without a type. So far
as the most gifted, enlightened and exalted
of mankind can investigate, nothing is found
without a cause. So fully is this indorsed,
that the expression, "there cannot be an ef-
fect without a cause," has become an axiom.
So far as we can trace in nature, we can find
nothing that is not preceded by a cause.
From this, if we reason at all, we would in-
fer precisely the opposite of the truth—that
there is no unoriginated cause, or first cause.
Without the revelation God has made of
himself, in the Bible, we could have known
nothing of his existence, or of his being the
first cause of all things. In all the explora-
tions of men, in the works of men, they
have found a regular succession of causes
and effects. This would lead them to the
conclusion that there was no effect without
a cause. As children come from fathers
and mothers, so far as investigations can
trace, separate from history, the conclusion
would be that all children came from pa-
rents, and consequently that there were no
original parents. Nature, aided by all the
sciences, leaves us greatly in the dark; and
even science itself would have been left
greatly in the dark, had it not been for the
Bible and the consequent development of
mankind.

We are not aiming to review Dr. Purdy,
nor are we at variance with him except up-
on a single point—that, that the existence
of God can be learned from nature origin-
ally. All the balance is good.

CREEDS AND CREED-DENOUNCERS.

"WHAT is your creed, Sir?"

A question likely enough to be asked is
this, and one to which some reply is due.
"Tis easy enough to answer, "I have no
creed;" or, "the New Testament is my
creed;" or, "I object to all creeds, and
should therefore object to my own, if I had
one;"—but people now-a-days will scarcely
be satisfied with this, and will possibly run
off with the idea, that he who thus replies is
a kind of compound of Christianity and Athe-
ism; neither the one nor the other, but a
medley of both; having designs upon
Churches, and Societies, and Faiths, which
he has not honesty enough openly to avow.
The bond of union with one class of pro-
fessing Christians, will be a creed that enters
presumptuously into the most inscrutable
mysteries of the faith, and dogmatizes, as
with a lordly boast, where the reverence of
silence would best become. And thus, some
of the devoutest of men may, for conscience
sake, be constrained to stand outside a
church, which demands assent and consent
to groundless speculations, as to wholesome
Bible truths. With another class the bond
of union will be a wholesale denouncing of
creeds as heretical and bad, as unmixed
evil; gendering strife and contention in the
church of God. Yet these may as really
have a creed as those whom they denounce;
a creed summed up in a solitary sentence
thus;—"I believe that all creeds are schis-
matical, and are greatly to be abhorred." Why, this very renunciation of creeds may become a creed condemnable and as exclusive as the Athanasian itself.

The said Athanasian creed, as inserted in the Book of Common Prayer, has for its preamble this:—"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith; which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." Then follows a summary of doctrines declaring what is the Catholic faith, with this conclusion:—"This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved." Now I may be supposed to believe all therein contained—but by what or by whose authority do I affirm of him who may deny, or take exception against, some of its statements, "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly?" Here lies the essence of that creedism so condemnable, so dividing and distracting—a creedism which happily is now going somewhat out of fashion—which may exist in musty manuscripts, or in antiquated church books, but which is seldom seen in actual earnest working.

From one extreme men rush into the opposite. Deploiring the evils that have resulted from the exaltation of human formulas bonds of Christian union, some earnest Reformers of modern times have gone as wide of the mark in the other direction. These maintain that the only statement which, under any circumstances, we can insist upon from a professed convert to the faith, is this:—"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And these hold, that he who will with his mouth confess so much, and will so far submit as to be immersed, in obedience to Christ's commandment, must, without further inquiry or stipulation, be recognized as a member of the church of God. Truly do they teach, that this simple confession stands out in lofty prominence above all confessions beside. Here is the foundation-truth, on which all true doctrine concerning redemption and the church must rest. "Upon this rock" said the Lord Himself to Peter, "will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

In the face of all opponents, moreover, would result from the exaltation of human formulas, to be landed here? Surely there's a happy medium somewhere! Another preacher among the Reformers of America was a Dr. Thomas; and he maintained and defended the doctrine, "that man is made up of body, blood, and breath; that the word soul in the Scriptures means breath; that the righteous, when they die, pass into a state of unconscious sleep until the resurrection; that pagans, infants, and idiots are annihilated." These things he held and taught. Because he could confess that Jesus was the Son of God; because he had attended to a much neglected ordinance; and because he had speaking gifts, and accounted of himself that he was called of God to preach—are we bound to recognize him as a preacher, and to see in him a fit advocate for the ancient order of Christian service and worship? To such conclusion I cannot see that Scripture leads us.

In the debate on creeds, held in America, between Mr. Alexander Campbell and Mr. N. L. Rice, Mr. Campbell is rather hardly pressed by his opponent on these points. A glance at a portion of this debate may not be without its use, as it may serve to show more clearly where the difficulty rests. Mr. Rice is now the speaker:
"I will now proceed to offer some further arguments, showing that creeds are not necessarily heretical and schismatical. I have already stated the important fact, that in Mr. Campbell's church, by which all creeds are repudiated, there is more heresy, and more schism, than in any Protestant church that has a creed. The door into it is wide enough to admit all who profess to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and are willing to be immersed. Not only Calvinists and Arminians, some of whom the gentleman boasts of having, but Arians, Socinians, Universalists, &c., &c., may enter. His foundation is broad enough for them all to stand on.

I will read an extract or two from his Christianity Restored:—

"And will you receive a Universalist too? No; not as a Universalist. If a man professing Universalist opinions, should apply for admission, we will receive him, if he will consent to use and apply all the Bible phrases in their plain reference to the future state of man and angels. We will not hearken to those questions which tender-strife, nor discuss them at all. If any person say such is his private opinion, let him have it as his private opinion, but lay no stress upon it; and if it be a wrong private opinion, it will die a natural death much sooner than if you attempt to kill it."

"The gentleman tells us, he will receive a Universalist; but he will not receive him as a Universalist. Well, he is a Universalist, and nothing else. He will not receive him as what he is; of course he will receive him as what he is not. To illustrate the idea, you propose to sell a sheep to a man. He tells you he will not buy him as a sheep; but call him a horse, and I will take it! I never read this paragraph without being reminded of a certain man of olden time, who had the singular fortune to be called a duke and a bishop. One day an acquaintance heard him using profane language, and said to him with much surprise—"Do you, a bishop swear?" 'O' replied the dignitary, 'I do not swear as a bishop: I swear as a duke.' 'But' replied his quizzical friend, 'when the devil comes for the duke, what will become of the bishop?' . . . . . . Now suppose one of your reformed preachers should, on next Sabbath, preach the Universalist doctrine. You call him before the church to try him for heresy. You ask him—"Do you use these Bible phrases and words in their plain reference to the future state of men and angels? He says 'I do.' Now what can you do with him? You must let him alone! He will preach the same doctrine again on the next Sabbath. What will you do? How can the gentleman, on his principles, exclude him? I assert, that without an entire abandonment of his principles he cannot exclude him. Mr. Campbell must be a pope; or each little church, an infallible council to determine men's faith; or errorists of all grades must be allowed to be members and ministers amongst them. For the principle is—that each individual is to go by the Bible, not as Mr. C. or the church understands it, but as he understands it for himself. Then his church must be a Noah's ark—full of beasts, clean and unclean; especially the latter! He cannot prevent it. All sorts of doctrine will be, as they have been, preached by all sorts of men. His door is wide enough to admit all; and his foundation broad enough to afford them room to stand."

—Debate between A. Campbell and N. L. Rice.—pp. 803—805.

To this bold assault Mr. Campbell thus replies:—

"How often have you heard the saying quoted by Mr. Rice, that 'all sorts of doctrine, by all sorts of men, are preached amongst us!' This is one of his standing texts, taken from the Millennial Harbinger. Well, it is not exactly quoted. There is one word of much limitation left out 'almost all sorts of men.' In saying this I follow an illustrious example. Paul, in his day, was just thus plain and candid. He gave specifications of almost all sorts of doctrine, preached even while he yet lived. Some preached that the resurrection was actually passed, and had overthrown the faith of some. Some were, for the sake of filthy lucre, preaching what they ought not. Some preached that the world was immediately coming to an end; some said the law of Moses and circumcision should be observed by Gentile converts, &c.; and Paul sent it all over the world, and for all ages too. We are then a great deal like our great Apostle, and a little like the primitive church too, in this particular."—Debate.—pp. 809—810.

Surely Mr. Campbell must have felt himself hard driven, or he would not have replied in this sorry fashion. His opponent is charging him with countenancing or allowing all sorts of doctrine to be preached by all sorts of men. Mr. Campbell quotes in vindication of himself the Apostle Paul. But did not Mr. Campbell know, that the very cases he has cited met with Paul's strong discountenance and reprobation? This important point of difference he has utterly ig-
nored, and his statement in consequence is sadly calculated to mislead.

"Some preached that the resurrection was actually passed, and had overthrown the faith of some." True: Hymenæus was one of these: and how Paul dealt with this false teacher is very plain:—"Their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is passed already; and overthrow the faith of some. . . . . Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme."—II. Tim. ii, 17, 18.

"Some were for the sake of filthy lucre, preaching what they ought not." True: and of these he writes; "there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake."—Tit. i, 10, 11. Does this look like his sanction or allowance?

"Some said the law of Moses and circumcision should be observed by Gentile converts." True: but Paul was not the man to smile affably upon them, and in the name of the Lord to wish them God speed. Not even before Peter was he daunted;—"When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed;" and of the rest of these Judaizers, he says;—"To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you."—Gal. ii, 5, 11.

"I follow," says Mr. Campbell, "an illustrious example, We are then a good deal like our great Apostle." Had the example of Paul been to the effect that such men were to be borne with—that they were still to be recognized as brethren and as teachers—then fairly enough he might have quoted such an example in reply to the charge of Mr. Rice—but when with him excommunication was the penalty of persistence in false doctrine, then 'tis difficult to see how his conduct can be produced, to justify a practice the veriest opposite of this.

In the same body, or denomination, are some who deny the personality of the Holy Spirit. All the Holy Spirit these know of, is a book, the Bible. And sometimes they will utter their disbelief in this wise—"O we carry the Holy Spirit in our pocket!" This woeful heresy has its varying shades; and while one who holds it as really as another, may object to such a clear expression of it as the one just given, it may be difficult to discern on what grounds he so ob-

jects—except indeed it be on the ground that it is impolitic or inexpedient to speak out so plainly. Mr. Campbell, whose writings have exercised such an influence in this body, and who is held by them in the highest esteem—he most fully acknowledges the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. An extract from his Christian System may prove this:

"As there is man and the spirit of man, so there is God and the Spirit of God. They are capable of a separate and distinct existence . . . . The Spirit of God is not an impersonal power, but a living, energizing, active, personal existence. Hence in all the works of God the Spirit of God is the active operating agent . . . . To us Christians there is, then, but one God, even the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ even the Saviour; and one Spirit, even the Advocate, the Sanctifier, and the Comforter of Christ's body—the church . . . Each name of the sacred three has its own peculiar work and glory in the great works of Creation, Government and Redemption." p. p. 23-25.

And elsewhere his words are as emphatic as the most orthodox could desire:—

"No one, Mr. President, believes more firmly than I, and no one, I presume, endeavors to teach more distinctly and comprehensively than I, this mysterious, sublime, and incomprehensible plurality and unity, in the Godhead. It is a relation that may be apprehended by all, though comprehended by none . . . I have no more faith in any man's profession of religion, than I have in the sincerity of Mahomet, who does not believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit, as co-operating in the illumination, pardon, and sanctification of fallen, sinful, and degraded man . . . . I would not, Sir, value at the price of a single mill the religious of any man, as respects the grand affairs of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit. . . . The revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is not more clear and distinct than are the different offices assumed and performed by these glorious and ineffable Three in the present affairs of the universe."—Debate between A. Campbell and N. L. Rice, p. p. 615, 616.

But the question is, what is to be done with those who deny the personality of the Holy Spirit, as that phrase is by almost all Christians understood? What, in consistency with his other teachings, could Mr. Campbell advise to be done with them? Suppose he say, "excommunicate, if you can not convince,"—will not the excommu-
nicated person quote against him his own words, as given in another place. May he not select this passage from Mr. Campbell’s published writings?

"But the grandeur, sublimity, and beauty of the foundation of hope, and of ecclesiastical or social union, established by the Author and Founder of Christianity, consisted in this—that the belief of one fact, and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The belief of this one fact, and submission to one institution expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the Church. . . . The one fact is expressed in a single proposition, that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah. The one institution is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."—The Christian System, p. 121, 122.

"I have confessed," such an one may say, "my faith in that one fact." I have submitted to that one institution. And if this be all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church, what right has Mr. Campbell or Mr. Anybody else to thrust me out of it, because I don’t agree with him on some other point of doctrine? But a way has been found by which this difficulty may be met, and the errorist still retain his membership and ministry in the church. Call his false doctrine his "private opinion," and no more need be said about it! A patented way of untying Gordian knots! That this is really so, and that I must try to teach them out of it, because I don’t agree with him on some other point of doctrine?

But refuge will be taken by those who are so tolerant of error, in an outcry about "purity of speech." "We choose to speak of Bible things by Bible words" they will say; and they will so entrench themselves herein, that it may seem as though their opponents were setting up another method of attack or of defence, than what the Scriptures authorise. But what do they really mean by this—or how much do they mean? Bible words are Hebrew or Greek words—they do not mean that they speak in Hebrew or in Greek. To him who denies that Christ is equal with God, the phrase "divinity of Christ" will be decreed to be the language of Ashdod or of Babylon; but doesn’t this depend upon translation?*

By him who denies what is understood as the doctrine of the Trinity, the word "Trinity" will be picked out and cavilled at as Babylonish but is it more Babylonish than

* What if shentetos of Col. 2, 9, be translated divinity, will "divinity" then be of the vocabulary of Ashdod? And that it might be thus translated, a glance at the Lexicon may show.
Mr. Campbell's phrases, "each name of the sacred Three," these glorious and ineffable "three?" By him who denies what is understood by the expression, "personality of the Holy Spirit," "personality" will be the word objected to, and he will gravely tell us that he prefers to speak of Bible things by Bible words. But how shall we get on when we go to hear him preach? Will he only read the Bible? Directly he ceases to do this, he ceases to speak of Bible things by Bible words. If he write a book, by what method will he proceed? If he do anything, other than reprint the Scriptures, out of his mouth will he be condemned. Take for example only three lines from Mr. Campbell himself, who has said so much and written so much on purity of speech:—"The Father originates all, the Son executes all, the Spirit consummates all. Eternal volition, design and mission belong to the Father; reconciliation to the Son; sanctification to the Spirit." This may be all quite true, and may be very well put—but suppose one ready to cavil against the doctrine here proclaimed—how easily he might do it with the arguments that Mr. C. has put into his hands. "Why, Mr. Campbell," he might say, "this is all 'scholastic jargon,' you must speak to me of Bible things by Bible words. Originates, executes, consummates, eternal volition, design and mission belong to the Father”—where is your chapter and verse for all this—you bewilder me—"I want purity of speech." And so by a skilful turning of the argument into a dispute about the use of language, any heresy he held might go unrebuked and unrefuted.

Without doubt the use of the Scripture language has been too much departed from. It is also well to have some one to stir us up to amend our ways in this matter. And the Doctors of Divinity may thank Mr. Campbell that he has stood sentinel against their easy progress further in a somewhat dangerous direction. I would simply be understood, as pointing out a too common and fallacious use of what in great part may be true, and of what might be turned to valuable service, if kept within its proper bounds.

To return to our starting question—"What is your creed, Sir?" Ah, there's the rub. To say what is not the true and proper course is often easier than to say what is. "That's the wrong road," we may be able to say, when we are not competent to add, "and that's the right." If the question however must be answered, I must crave of my readers time—more time.

For the present, to the admirers and denouncers of creeds alike, after it may be, displeasing all, and leaving all dissatisfied with his performance, the writer bids adieu.

A REVIEW OF THE FOREGOING.

We are indebted to our worthy brother, David King, of Birmingham, England, for the foregoing. This, as the reader will see, is Tract No. 14, by Sanders J. Chew. The topic is "Creeds and their Denouncers." We do not care to make two bites of a cherry, and, as we in this country, or at least some of us, desire the people to see both sides, we spread out this document in full before our readers, that they may have the fullest and fairest opportunity to judge for themselves what kind of argumentation the brethren have to encounter on the other side of the Atlantic. We will state in addition, that if this learned Tract writer desires to reply again and even again to our remarks, he can have space in our columns.

We are pleased with his motto—"Looking for Daylight." It is delightful to see men looking for daylight, especially where it is so evident that they do not enjoy it, as in this case, though they may make some rather ridiculous stumbled, blunderings, and get some prodigious falls, while in the dark and looking for light. Still, if they do not look for it, they will not be likely to find it.

The subject of creeds and their denouncers is one in which much interest is taken in our time, and we rejoice that impression enough has been made in the mother country, and Birmingham, to call out a Tract. This shows that the leaven is working; and, we trust, will continue to work till the whole lump is leavened.

The writer starts out with the question, "What is your creed, sir?" He proceeds: "It is easy enough to answer, 'I have no creed,' or "the New Testament is my creed," or "the Old Testament is my creed," or "I object to all creeds, and should therefore object to my own if I had one;' but people now-a-days will scarcely be satisfied with this, and will possibly run off with the idea, that he who thus replies is a kind of medley of Christianity and Atheism; neither the one nor the other, but a medley of both; having designs upon churches and
societies, and faiths, which he has not honesty enough openly to avow." We have been accustomed to hearing loud and censorious things like these, to such an extent, in former years, in this country, that we now simply read them with mingled feelings of pity and regret; pity for such misguided men and sincere people who will be prejudiced by them, and regret, that there should be men, claiming to be teachers of those ignorant and out of the way, above the middle of the nineteenth century, possessing so little genuine religious enlightenment, combined with such an amount of hard feeling and vindictiveness. We regret that they have not attained to a better understanding and spirit. Divine influences have operated upon their minds to very little purpose, if the bad temper, censorious and vindictive feeling displayed may be taken as evidence.

We should be pleased to see the man who can show that there is any evidence in saying, "The New Testament is my creed," that he who says it, is a "compound of Christianity and Atheism," or in saying, "I have no creed," or "I object to all creeds, and should therefore object to my own if I had one," that he who says it, is a compound of Christianity and Atheism! Can not a man believe the New Testament as certainly as he can the Augsburg, Westminster or Philadelphia Confession? When you ask a man what he believes, and he replies that he believes one of these Confessions, you do not run off with the idea that he is a compound of Christianity and Atheism! But should he say, he believes the New Testament, or the New Testament is his creed, in the estimation of our learned Tract writer, the evidence is conclusive that he is a compound of Christianity and Atheism! With such Tract writers, the man who believes the creeds produced by men certainly uninspired, and frequently, no doubt, unregenerated, is all right, sound in the faith—evangelical—not to be held under suspicion at all; but the man who, when asked what he believes, says, "I believe the New Testament," or "the New Testament is my creed," is to be suspected of being a compound of Christianity and Atheism! He is to be regarded as neither a Christian nor an Atheist, but a medley of both—as having designs upon churches and societies and faiths, which he has not honesty enough openly to avow! Can any one tell why the honesty of a person is to be challenged, if, when asked what he believes, or what his creed is, he answers, the New Testament, or the revelation from God to man; but not to be challenged, if, when asked what his creed is, he replies, the Westminster, the Augsburg or Philadelphia Confession? How does it prove that a man has designs upon churches, societies and faiths, for him to declare that the New Testament is his creed? How all this can be is somewhat of a mystery to us over here in the New World, however clear it may be to learned doctors of divinity in the old country.

There must be, in the estimation of the author of the Tract in review, some wonderful mystical grace, or saving efficacy, in modern human creeds, written by uninspired, and, no doubt, in some instances, unregenerated men! The man who swears by one of these human creeds, declares his allegiance to one of them and his belief in it, is all right. No danger of him having any designs upon churches, societies or faiths. His fealty to a human creed, though written by an uninspired, and, may be, an unregenerate man, and having no more authority from God than the Koran or the Book of Mormon, is a perfect guaranty that he is sound in the faith—all right. But for the man to say the New Testament is his creed, or that he believes the revelation from God to man, lays him open to suspicions of bad designs and dishonesty! No matter if during the first three hundred years of the existence of the church, and during the period of its greatest glory and prosperity, it had no creed but the law of God, men now who stand upon the same ground, take the same law of God for their creed—their rule of faith—are to be held under suspicion of designs upon churches, societies and faiths, and not sufficiently honest to declare their purposes!
What wonderful virtue there must be contained in human creeds. And what an amount of spiritual enjoyment we are ignorantly cutting ourselves off from in rejecting all human authorities in religion, and receiving nothing that is not from God!

What an evidence this of our Atheism!

The writer of the Tract before us, does not perceive that he is about half converted on the creed question. He does not perceive that he is backing down. He is not willing to stand up to the former ground and maintain, as the creed-men in former times did, that he who does not believe the creed "cannot be saved." He does not perceive how beautifully he is backing down, in condemning, as he does, the "creed that enters presumptuously into the most inscrutable mysteries of the faith." He, like many other men have done, begins to see some of the absurdities of the creed-men; but supposes this to be merely the abuse of a good thing, and not the proper use, and has set about the work of modifying creeds, or trying to avoid the abuse, and yet avail himself of the use of creeds. But he does not perceive the fact that there is no stopping place between the Athanasian and no human creed at all. He does not perceive the fact, that the evil is not in the abuse of the creed principle, but in the use of it. The principle itself is wrong: A creed is not condemned merely because it contains errors, but because it is a creed, or rather, because it is a human creed and not a divine creed. The law of God is adopted, not because it is not a creed, or does not contain a creed; but because it does contain one, and a divine creed at that. Nay, more, it is the only divine, complete and perfect creed ever adopted by man. "Whosoever would be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold" this creed; which faith if he do not keep pure and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish eternally—"the faith once delivered to the saints," the creed of all creeds.

The writer says, "Why, this very renunciation of creeds may become a creed as condemnatory and as exclusive as the Athanasian creed." True, if this were elevated to such a prominence as to make it the central idea for a church, and unite men upon it, there is no question but it would be a creed, and no better than most of the other creeds. But the anti-human-creed-men are not making the renunciation of all human creeds the basis of union, the foundation of confederation, or the central idea at all. They are not united upon a negative, a renunciation or repudiation. They are united upon faith, the faith once delivered to the saints: that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. Their bond of union is not a negative, a declaration of what they do not believe, or what they repudiate; but an affirmative proposition; what they do believe. They disavow, repudiate, or disbelieve many things, and their faith does not consist in what they do not believe, but in what they do believe. They do not believe in human creeds, or creeds written by uninspired men, but this disbelief in human creeds is not their belief, bond of union, or ground of confederation. This belief is in the Messiah, that he is the Christ the Son of the living God. This belief has no Socinianism in it, no Calvinism, Arminianism, Unitarianism, Trinitarianism, Universalism, or any other humanism, but is simply "the faith of Christ," "the faith once delivered to the saints"—which above all and first of all, a man must believe, or he cannot be saved. This is the foundation, the rock on which the Lord has built his church. Other churches, of course, are built upon other foundations, have other centers, or "faiths," Socinianism, Arminianism, Calvinism, &c.

The statement that "Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God," being the foundation, or major proposition, embraces all the minor propositions, all the details, or, in one sentence, all the revelation to man, in it. When it is granted that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God—that he is the express image of the invisible God and the brightness of his glory—that he was before all things, and that by him all things consist—that it was by him and for him the worlds were made—that in him dwells the fullness of the Godhead,
quadratily Review.

or divinity, bodily—that he knew all things, and that all authority in heaven and on earth is given to him, all that he endorsed, or sanctioned, is divine. Every prophet quoted by him, or in any way referred to, as a sacred writer, is thus endorsed and sanctioned. In this way, his numerous quotations from the Old Testament, some times styling it the word of God, or the language of the Spirit, endorses it as divine. In the same way, as the apostles were sent by him and authorized, they had his endorsement. It may, therefore, be justly said, that he extends one hand back and endorses all the prophets, and the other hand forward and endorses all the apostles. In this way, all of both Old Testament and New, centers in him, and the belief that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, embraces it all—the entire revelation from God to man. Thus God has embodied his entire will to man, condensed and embraced it in the person of the Christ, so that in confessing him, a man confesses all, and in rejecting him, a man rejects all. Does Mr. Chew want more than this? Does he say, this is not sufficient? Who shall dare to add anything to it, on the presumptuous ground that it is not sufficient?

Our worthy Tract proceeds: “In the face of all opponents, moreover, would we avow the essentialness of believer’s baptism. ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,’ are the chosen words of the Blessed One—words we can never maim or alter without loss. But who has told us that this is all that needs to be confessed and done to obtain recognition among the saints of God?” No one, we presume, has so told us. That Jesus is the Christ the Son of God is the foundation of all true doctrine, as he admits; and that it is true, that he is the foundation of the church and the embodiment of the faith, he cannot deny; and that this, or its equivalent, was what was confessed, in the time of the apostles—nothing more and nothing less, cannot be gainsaided. If Mr. Chew thinks the apostles required anything more to be confessed, he has the New Testament, containing a history of their practice; let him produce the instance where they required anything more, and tell us what it was. But we have a system of induction in this country, by which we test all questions of this sort. We do not think that we find all the Lord required in any one isolated passage of scripture. When we start to ascertain what a man must confess, we examine all the cases of conversion in the New Testament, ascertain what the foundation of the church was, what the apostles preached, what the people believed and what they confessed. Then we know we have the whole of the preaching, the faith and the confession. We cannot be mistaken in this. When we desire to know what we must do to be saved, we do not quote the words, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” and assume that “that is all.” While it is true, that neither of the items contained in that can be omitted, it is equally true, that there are other items that cannot be dispensed with.

We in this case also pursue the inductive plan, by examining all the cases of conversion in the New Testament, and every item we find existing in any one case, we take it, exists in every other case, whether it is mentioned or not. For instance, we find believing and baptism mentioned in the commission together; from this we assume that faith and baptism, as items in the plan, or in the process, exist in every case; but we do not assume that they are all. We read in another place in the commission, of repentance and remission of sins; from this we are satisfied that repentance and remission of sins, as items in the plan, existed in every case. We read in other places of the presence of the grace of God, the blood of Christ, the Spirit of God, the confession and calling on the name of the Lord, from which we learn that these were also present in every case. When these items are all summed up, we have the grace of God, furnishing us the entire system, the belief of the gospel, without which the grace of God would not save us; leading us to repentance, without which we would perish; the confession with the mouth, unto salvation; the immersion into
the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, calling on the name of the Lord, the remission of sins—washed away in the blood of the Lamb, and the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The confession of Christ embraces all Christianity in him, and then, nothing short of obedience to all he has required is satisfactory. We are not of those who stop at one, two or three items, saying “that is all.” The requirement is, to commence with the first thing required and continue till the last item and the last day in our lives, to the best of our ability, in doing the will of God.

We come now to notice the long hackneyed case of Eld. B. W. Stone. We never deemed that there was any capital for creed advocates in this, when properly considered. We dispose of this case as follows:

1. The fact must be admitted, that Eld. Stone, great and good a man as he was, at one period in his life, held some speculations and spent much time in discussing them, such as were not only useless, but injurious and utterly untenable.

2. It is, in the second place a fact, the denial of which we challenge, that the worst speculations he ever held or advocated, he held, without any disguise, while he was a member in the Presbyterian church and enjoying all the benefits of the Confession of Faith. The worst errors he ever held he imbibed in the Presbyterian church, held them without disguise, and was ordained by them while they knew, and he honestly and openly avowed his dissent from them.

3. The quotation made in the foregoing document, which we would by no means endorse, and which the brotherhood, in this country, would not anywhere indorse, was written before his union with the Disciples.

4. When the union took place between Bro. Stone and the brethren identified with him and Bro. Campbell and the brethren identified with him, it was on the ground that all speculative questions should be laid aside, and that the preachers, on both sides, should confine themselves to the language of scripture. This the venerable Stone did, as a true and faithful man of God, till the day of his death, without creating the least disturbance on account of any of his previous peculiarities.

5. Not only so, but he did, in his writings, repeatedly, and we heard him do the same in his preaching, again and again, declare his unshaken belief in the divinity of Christ—that he was an object of worship—that even the angels worshipped him—that all authority was given to him—that in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

6. Whatever there was peculiar, speculative or unsound in the early views and teaching of Eld. Stone, and that is where the unsoundness existed so far as it existed at all, was more chargeable to the Confession of Faith—to Presbyterianism than any other cause, and it should be held responsible for it.

7. It is manifest that after he threw off the Confession, the Presbyterian yoke, and took our glorious Lord as his only guide, he had much fewer speculations and became much sounder. His case furnishes one of the strongest arguments against creeds.

The next case brought to show that the confession, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, on which all the first Christians were received, and for which thousands of them died, is not sufficient; that we must have some modern creed added to it, is that of the notorious Schismatic, Dr. John Thomas, who, many years ago, was for a short time identified with us, but was soon rejected for his unscriptural teaching. We are no more responsible for John Thomas than we are for Joe Smith, the Mormon prophet.

Then follows, gathered from Dr. N. L. Rice, as he is styled now, and since the debate with Mr. Campbell made him Doctor of Divinity, the case of Bro. Raines, than whom, we doubt whether there is any place a sounder man, who was received on the faith that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, while he was still a Universalist. If there was anything wrong in this, it was not the confession, or any insufficiency in it, but in the act of the brethren who received him. There is no Universalism in the con-
fession that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and receiving a man on that is receiving him not on any Universalism, or as a Universalist, any more than receiving him on the Confession of Faith would be receiving him on his Universalism, or as a Universalist. There is nothing in the Confession of Faith, any more than there is in the confession that Jesus is the Christ, to hinder a Universalist from entering the Presbyterian church, as members are generally received in that church, nor is there in any other church, using a human creed; for the new converts do not know what is in the creed, when they are received, and what is vastly worse, many of them do not as long as they live, know what is in their creed or the Bible either. To the credit of Bro. Raines, let it be recorded that when he became acquainted with his new confession, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, he soon saw that there was no Universalism in it, and he has from that time to the present been an uncompromising opponent of it.

But now, let our learned Tract writer tell why these cases are introduced! What is his object? Is not that object to show that the confession on which the eunuch was received—that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God—is not sufficient? and that by adding some modern human creed, written by uninspired men, to the original confession, which has the authority of the Lord, it can be made sufficient? Is not his object to prove that the heaven authorized statement, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God—the statement upon which all were received in the time of the apostles, and for many hundreds of years before the modern, absurd, contradictory and preposterous creeds existed, is insufficient, and that the addition of these poor, erring and bungling human expedients can supply the deficiency? Does not his argument go to show, so far as it shows anything, that the statement that the Lord has authorized and upon which he received all the thousands in the time of the apostles, will not do—that it has been tried and proved to be a failure; and that modern creeds, existing almost without number, and no two of them agreeing, will do—have remedied the failure? Or, to come to the point; is his argument to show that the wisdom of God in preparing and presenting a confession has failed, and that the wisdom of man—uninspired man—has come to the rescue and supplied the defect?

"What is your creed, sir?" The Lord's creed, in its most condensed form—its most abbreviated and epitomized form, a presented to one who applies for admission, as in the case of the eunuch, is that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," but, in detail, fully unfolded and developed to mankind, it is found in the "all things that Jesus commanded the apostles to teach." Those who receive this and practice it, are Christians—disciples of Christ, no more, no less, and will be saved independent of all the additions to the only divine authority in religion—the revelation of Jesus Christ, through prophets and apostles—as found upon the sacred pages of scripture.

"Without doubt," says our learned writer, "the use of scripture language has been too much departed from." This implies that the use of scripture language should be departed from some, but not "too much!" Will he inform us how much, precisely, we ought to depart from the language of scripture? "Ah, there's the rub!" Will some of you gentlemen, who are for departing from the use of scripture language, tell us how far we should depart, and not be too much? And will you tell us which one of the numerous creeds in existence we must adopt when you convince us that we must depart from the use of the language of the word of God, but not too much?

Let no day pass without a review of God's carriage towards you, and of yours towards him; of mercies and afflictions—of duties and your frame of heart in them—of your sins and inclinations to sin. And let God have the glory of what is good.
LETTER TO A. CAMPBELL.

"COMMUNION WITH THE SECTS."

Beloved and Reverend Brother: It was my intention to have addressed you this month upon Missions. But as communications from esteemed brethren who are readers of your Harbinger urge me to notice certain remarks which have appeared therein, and which we reprint. I am constrained to ask your attention to another topic.

You will remember that in 1859 Brother G. Y. Tickel forwarded a resolution unanimously adopted by our Annual Meeting, recently held, which resolution set forth that—"Reports having been circulated in this country, that some of the Churches of Disciples in America admit unbaptized persons to the Lord's Table, it is requested that enquiry be made by the Chairman of this meeting of Bro. A. Campbell, and that the reply be published in the British Millennial Harbinger." You will also recollect that your reply contained the following:—"I can say, so far as my knowledge extends, we have no such custom. In all my travels abroad I have not witnessed such an occurrence. That unbaptized persons may have sat down to the Lord's Table amongst our brethren without invitation, is not wholly impossible; but I know of no church that has formally invited them to participate with it on such occasions." It however now appears that what in 1859 you could speak of as not wholly improbable, is now certain and extensive, and defended where we should least have thought of looking for its defence—in your own Harbinger—by your Co-Editors.

It may be well to say, that upon this matter I speak the mind of the churches which in this kingdom have declared for the faith and order of the primitive age. I do not know that one of these churches, even if our Colonies be included, would, knowingly, admit an unbaptized person to the Lord's Table. At our last Annual Meeting, owing to the presence of a preaching brother from your side of the Atlantic, the brethren assembled gave another unanimous repudiation of that practice which according to Bro. Errett, prevails in two-thirds of the churches in the United States. We take this stand in obedience to the Lord. Had He left the matter to our discretion we would say to every believer, Come! And could we do as some churches with you are doing in this and one or two other points, where we now have hundreds we should have thousands. We too should find it agreeable to the flesh to take down the barrier. To be thought charitable by pious sectarianists is, to say the least, pleasant, and to refuse fellowship to some who are truly devout and who are near and dear to us, as to take up a cross we would gladly be saved from. Prove to us, dear brother, that we may do this, and you will indeed have our thanks, and joyfully will our communion be extended.

I ask not now, what the position of many of the churches with you really is—we are bound to accept the letters in your Harbinger as completely answering that question—but I ask, By what authority they do this thing? and I solicit a "Thus saith the Lord," or an Apostolic example in favor of this practice, or an admission that they have abandoned the platform upon which this great Protestant Reformation was inaugurated.

It is said that the practice is not to invite, but only to suffer the unbaptized to break the bread, &c. But communion with that class is either right or wrong. If right, then it should be sought; if right, publish the invitation far and wide! If wrong, then to talk about putting the responsibility upon the shoulders of those who avail themselves of the door we have opened, is but self-deception. We have no right to suffer wrong-doing when it is in our power to prevent it. But perhaps it cannot longer be said that the unbaptized are not invited. It may be that an invitation does not immediately precede the breaking of the bread, but when your leading periodical publishes that you "spread the table in the name of the Lord," you do, to all intents and purposes, invite every pious Romanist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist within reach of your houses of worship, and consequently the papers in the Harbinger are appropriately headed "Communion with the Sects."

But let us give some little attention to Brethern Hawley, Errett, Richardson, and Pendleton.

Bro. H. says:—"May I not express a wish that you, Bro. P. will favor your readers with an article upon the propriety and correctness of cultivating friendly and confidential relations with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ?" Quite unnecessary for Bro. P. to do anything of the sort, for no sane Christian can for one moment doubt
the propriety of cultivating such relations.

You, dear Bro. Campbell, were so doing, when you penned that kindly address to friendly aliens which all readers of the "Christian System" will remember. But to do thus, and to spread for them the elements of an ordinance instituted for subjects of a kingdom to which they, however friendly, are aliens, is to do two widely different things.

Next Brother H. cites, "Prove all things," and adds, "pardon me if I enquire if you ever knew any evil consequences to flow from allowing Pseudobaptists to worship with us." We might at once answer, Certainly we have. But we object to testing the question in this manner—The proof must come from the inspired word and not from our very limited experience.

Bro. Errett says:—"In primitive times there is no doubt that all who came to the Lord's Table, as well as all who participated in prayer, singing, &c. were immersed believers." Very good! Do we propose to follow or to abandon the primitive practice? As they did, let us do. But Bro. E. adds; "The corruptions of Popery, out of which the church has not yet half recovered, have made the people of God erring, scattered, and divided people." Our plea "is a plea for the reunion of the scattered people or God. It does not recognize sects, on human bases, as divine—but it recognizes a people of God among those sects, and seeks to call them out." Will our good brother tell us something about God's people—who and what they are? Of course Bro. E. would not knowingly receive to the Lord's Table those whom there is no authority for so designating. Who, then, under this dispensation, are God's people?

They are new creatures in Christ Jesus. Bro. E. in a paper upon "Regeneration and Remission of Sins" (reprinted in the last number of the B. M. H.) puts it thus; He has "new desires and affections"—he sustains "new relationships"—this series of changes is internal, the change of state or relationship accompanied by the birth of water—baptism.

1. Faith, or a new mind—
2. Repentance, or a new will—
3. Baptism, or a new state—

constitute a new creature, internally and externally—in principle, in aim, in position.

Again, he says of those who by baptism have realized a change of state, that they have "entered into the kingdom of God, where God is their Father, Jesus their King," &c. It will be remembered too, that the Lord has left it upon record, that unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom. It therefore now remains for Bro. E. to give up his plea for communion with unbaptized persons, or to withdraw his paper upon "Regeneration and Remission of Sins," for if baptism changes the believer's relation, state, or position in regard to the kingdom and its King, it must do so in regard to the ordinances instituted for the subjects of that kingdom, of which the Lord's Table is one. You, dear Bro. Campbell, have said in your address to friendly aliens; "Every kingdom has one uniform law or institution for naturalizing aliens, and that institution, of whatever sort it be, is obligatory by the authority of government, upon every one who would become a citizen." In the kingdom of God's dear Son that institution is baptism, and those who have not submitted to it—however friendly, however much we love them, however we may feel assured that the Lord will appropriate to them a resting place in that realm into which sorrow shall never enter—are aliens, and aliens are not members of the one body, and have no right to ordinances which are given only to those who become subjects in the kingdom of God's dear Son.

Bro. E. writes—"We are compelled to recognize as Christians many who have been in error on baptism, but who in the spirit of obedience are Christians indeed (Rom. ii. 28, 29.) I confess, for my own part, did I understand the position of the brethren to deny this, I would recoil from my position among them with utter disgust. We willingly recognize as Christians many who have been "in error on baptism." If they are right now we raise no question about the past. We also recognize as in the kingdom many who are still in error upon baptism. All baptized believers who walk in love we regard as Christian brethren, though many of them hold to much error in regard to the design of baptism. Many of this class stand "among the sects," and the voice of God cries, "Come out of her, my people. But what Bro. E. has to do is to show that God has authorised the church to regard as his people persons of whom it cannot be said, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put him on." Let Bro. E. sit down at the Lord's Table with one of his unbaptized people of God—we will suppose that after this his unbaptized brother in Christ requests to be baptized, and that they both
go down into the water. With what baptism will he baptize him? Not with that which is "for the remission of sin," for surely he would not have welcomed to the Lord’s Table, as one of God’s people, an unpardoned man? Will he baptize him into Christ? Certainly not. He already recognizes in him one of God’s people, and as the Lord’s people are all in him, a baptism of which they are subject cannot be into him.

Can he baptize him into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? Impossible! For he is already a Christian, and every Christian stands in that relation to the ever glorious name into which baptism is designed to introduce him. With Paul we hold one baptism—it is for those who are sinners and aliens, that therein they may be pardoned and translated into the kingdom. For Christians—for God’s people—no baptism has yet been instituted.

Dr. R. Richardson comes next. He starts by telling us that the reception or non-reception of unbaptized believers to the Lord’s Table is an "untaught question," and that "it is one which therefore we can not scripturally either discuss or decide." But I submit that, who are to approach the table is as clearly taught as the time for spreading the table. We know the one as we know the other. We know when, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the table was spread, and we know who, under the same guidance, were received at that table. But the Doctor urges that those who reject the unbaptized "presume to decide two questions, 1st. That no unbaptized persons are Christians. 2nd, That all baptized persons are Christians." "Neither of which propositions," he says, "can be proved." Here are at least two errors. The refusal to receive the unbaptized does not decide the second proposition, and has no bearing upon it. And the intimation that there are unbaptized persons who are Christians we shall hold as untrue, until Dr. R. finds time to point to an apostolic precedent, or for giving the name of Christ to one who has not been baptized into that name. Then Bro. R. actually quotes Scripture in favor of his position! But he quotes it in scrap-doctor fashion, and as did one who sought to lure the Redeemer from the path in which the Father had called him to walk: Paul told a company of baptized believers to discern in the bread and wine the body and blood of the Lord, and, lest they should by not discerning, eat and drink unworthily, he called upon them to examine themselves. But he had no reference to unbaptized persons, none to baptism, and nothing whatever to do with the question before us. When the Doctor, content with one text, could find nothing better to his purpose than—"Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat"—certainly his case is a bad one.

Bro. Pendleton brings up the rear. He "considers it next to impossible to influence any one for good while we treat him with distance and distrust." But who proposes to treat unbaptized believers thus? Can we not give them a place in our hearts? Can we not manifest confidence, and yet say—the Lord’s Table is in his kingdom—unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter that kingdom—we doubt not your faith, repentance, and devoutness—we love you much, but you must enter the kingdom before you can approach the ordinances instituted for citizens? To talk, then, about treating men with distance and distrust, is to leave the question to indulge in a side-play upon the feelings.

Bro. P. continues: "To plead for union and at the same time exclude the really pious from the communion of the body and blood of the Saviour, is, in the very nature of things, to destroy the practical power of our plea." That depends upon whether the said communion was instituted for all the "really pious." If so, then we should not only not exclude, but we should affectionately invite. If on the other hand it was instituted for those who are in Christ, and believers are baptized into him, then we do not destroy the power of the plea—"for the Lord’s Table is in his kingdom—"for God’s people,"—and its strength is divine. Properly expressed, from our stand-point, Bro. Pendleton’s proposition appears thus: To plead for the union of all who are in Christ, and at the same time exclude the really pious, who are not yet in him, from an ordinance instituted for those who are, is, in the very nature of things, to destroy the practical power of our plea. Thus fairly presented it refutes itself.

But our good brother is a bold man—he appeals to the Acts of Apostles. "Cornelius," he tells us, "was acceptable to God, and honored by special evidence of the Savior’s confidence and respect in order to lead him to a fuller knowledge and reception of the new revelation concerning his kingdom. He was treated as a member while yet ignorant of its regulations." If it be so, the question is settled, and that too by the Scriptures, and of course Dr. Richardson is wrong, and it is not an "untaught question." He, evi-
dently, was not aware that Cornelius was treated as a member of the kingdom before he had entered it. It is also new to us—we must wait for proof, and in the meantime hold the assertion as an offspring of that dogmatism which carries its foregone conclusion to the Bible. Your own words, dear Brother Campbell, in this very case, are—"One thing is obvious, that under the reign of heaven it behoved so good a man as Cornelius to hear words by which he might be saved, and put on Christ by an immersion into his death, that he might enter the kingdom and enjoy the remission of sins, and the hope of an inheritance among all the sanctified. Certainly it is both expedient and necessary, that you also go and do likewise." That is, that pious unbaptized believers must of necessity do as did Cornelius, in order to be treated as members of the kingdom—which treatment, Bro. P. tells us that Cornelius received before he entered.

Bro. P. asks—"Can we deny that God has recognized, and is still recognizing, the truly pious and full of faith and good work in the many divisions of professed Christians as really and truly his people?" Suppose we cannot deny, what then? What God recognizes we know not otherwise than by His word, and that does not teach us that He recognizes the people in question. Then, again, He who reads the heart, and who will receive into the everlasting kingdom whomsoever He will, leaves us only to deal with faith confessed, repentance declared, baptism submitted to, and subsequent right walking. Such only does He authorise us to receive to the Royal Feast. But why does Bro. P. throw from his own shoulders the burden of proof? To him it belongs—that he has cast it off is evidence of weakness? We affirm that under this dispensation those who are immersed into Christ are God's people. He admits this, but adds certain others. We demand proof. Will Brother Pendleton supply it?

I will only add that, if your Harbinger is now to advocate that the unbaptized are Christians—that God's people are some in the kingdom and some out—that whether in or out the table of the kingdom is spread for them; if those who cannot admit this without proof are to be charged with exclusivism and Pharisaism, that then it is desirable that over your own signature the affirmation be made, and that you review your published papers upon baptism in its relation to the remission of sins and translation into the kingdom, show the possibility of holding to the views therein expressed, and also the assumption presented in your pages by the respected brethren above alluded to.

I know of no one in this country who can harmonise them. We feel that we must hold to the first and reject the latter.

Wishing for the above a place in your Harbinger, and with much esteem and Christian affection, I remain, dear Brother Campbell, yours in the one hope,

David King.

Birmingham, England, Jan., 1862.

REMARKS.

We copy the foregoing from the British Millennial Harbinger, for February. Our readers will remember that we published in full the articles of the brethren here commented upon, some weeks ago and recorded a few words of objection. We regretted exceedingly the appearance of these articles, and very reluctantly entered our demur. No articles published among us for several years have met with such a general dissent from all quarters. These articles, so far as we have had an expression, and we have had a very extended one, are very generally regarded in about the same light as set forth by Bro. King, in the foregoing—as a shrinking from our principles, yielding to popular feeling and a pseudo philosophy; a mistaken, sophistical and sickly charity.

We perceive that our good Bro. King has been misled by these articles, and that he has been induced to think that a state of things has obtained in this country, among the brethren, that is not general and will not be maintained anywhere when the subject comes to be considered. There will be found, when the matter is considered, no difference between the brethren on this side and the other side of the Atlantic, on the subject in question.

I. In the first place, the heading of the articles in question was startling—"Communion with the Sects." This heading implies more than the brethren attempted to defend. "Communion with the Sects," would really require the persons thus comming to sit down with the party in their assembly, at their communion and commune with them. But for this the brethren
did not contend, nor did they appear to have this in their minds.

II. They only appeared to think of individuals, from among the sects, sitting down in the house of the Lord, at the Lord's table, and communing with the disciples.

III. These individuals, when they come to describe them, they make out not to be sectarian, but unimmersed Christians among the sects! These, they maintain, may sit down with the disciples and commune with them. This is about as near as we can come at their position.

In a matter of this kind, there need be no feeling, no excitement, no hard words. Let the matter be calmly investigated and the brethren will all come to the same point—to the same mind and the same judgment. It will, however, require some patience and forbearance. Still, the matter is one of too much importance to be shoved over, set aside, or ignored. We, therefore, add the following considerations:

1. If Bro. Pendleton put the heading to the articles, as editors do some times, when articles come without any heading, then the other brethren are in no way responsible for that part of the work. But with his carefully trained, discriminating and scrutinizing mind, we can scarcely see how he ever came to select a heading so poorly indicative of what was to follow. But if the heading was from Bro. Hawley, the difficulty is no less, for then it was before all the others, and we can not see how they failed to see that it indicated much more than they intended. No matter where this heading came from, we are to regard it merely as an oversight—a slip of the pen—as none of the brethren, in their articles, introduce advocate or attempt to defend what it clearly indicates.

II. If any thing is clearly ascertained, agreed upon and settled, among the brethren, in all sections of this country, it is that none were recognized as Christians, in the time of the apostles, who had not believed the gospel, amended their lives, confessed Christ and been immersed "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

III. That none but those considered of the same description were in the primitive church, or the kingdom of Christ.

IV. That none but those in the church, or kingdom of Christ, ever participated in the Lord's Supper, or the commemoration of the Savior's sufferings for our sins.

V. The primitive practice, the disciples, everywhere in this and every other country, claim, is their practice.

The conclusion is easy, viz.: That none but immersed persons should commune. The question meets us square in the face, shall we depart from the practice of the primitive church, after, as a distinct body, having for thirty-five years been praying for its universal prevalence, advocated and defended it in our preaching and in all the publications of the brotherhood? If we shall, where shall we begin? Shall we begin by giving the worship of the house of God to those not in the house—not in Christ, according to the gospel—and who refuse to enter into the kingdom and can not be induced to understand, or if they understand, to submit to the clearest and most oft repeated commandment of God in the New Testament? It will not be difficult for the brethren, in this country, to decide this matter. They will generally conclude that it would be preferable, if we are to depart from the primitive practice, to take the popular sectarian plan for it, and try to make it appear that there are many good Christians, saints and holy men, as good as any in the world, who have never been "immersed into Christ," and thus "put him on." But the brethren have no idea, in this country, of backing down from apostolic practice and what they have practiced themselves, but will stand by the long cherished principles, for which they have made much sacrifice; labored long and hard to propagate, advocate and perpetuate. They will have no objection to admitting all the good qualities, the pious deeds and evidences of devotion found among sectarian of all grades, from Romanists to Mormons,
and treating them with all due courtesy and kindness, as well as to use every means in their power to turn them to Christ; but they will not admit that any man is in the kingdom who has not been "born of water and of the Spirit"—that any man is in Christ who has not been "baptized into Christ;" nor will they admit that any were in the primitive church, or are in the church of Christ now, who have not been immersed. Equally certain is it, that only those in the church—in Christ—in his body—in the time of the apostles, came to the Lord's table, or should do so now.

That individuals have invited unimmersed persons to commune, or opened their way so to do, and even desired it, in some instances, in this country, we think probable, though, in our extended travels and experience, we do not now think of an instance of the kind; but we do not recollect of any one, coming out in our publications, and undertaking to advocate such a thing till the articles in question made their appearance. And we doubt not the brethren will modify and explain their positions till the amount will be, that if an unimmersed person, from some of the sectarian parties, should, on his own responsibility, sit down with us and commune, no harm would be done and it would not be necessary to object or exclude them; that they might sing with us and join us in the prayers, and we should not demur; and it would have a good influence on them and be likely to gain them. Still, we do not see even the propriety in all this. The worship belongs to those in Christ, in the kingdom; the prayers, the praise, the communion; and the people of the world, or those who have been immersed but erroneously made a profession are not to be converted, won to Christ, or made Christians, by participating in acts of Christian worship and devotion. Those acts are for those in the kingdom— in Christ—and not means for converting sinners, or setting those right who are sincere, trying to serve the Lord, but have never entered the kingdom according to the law of Christ. The divinely appointed means of initiation into the kingdom are found in a department for that purpose, and the acts of worship are distinct from these means and found in another department. The steps to be taken to enter the kingdom are not the same as the acts of worship after we are in the kingdom, and should be kept distinct from them. The man who has never taken the steps necessary to become a Christian, or gone through the divine process appointed by the Lord for that purpose, can not become a Christian by engaging in acts of Christian worship, or in any other way, according to the gospel, than by taking the steps required in the gospel to become a Christian. All this the brethren who have written the objectionable articles believe as firmly as we. Why then, attempt to justify the communion of sectarians with Christians? Simply, we presume, as an expedient, to show good will to them, courtesy and kindness, that they may be induced to hear, associate with us, become convinced and ultimately set right. But we can not resort to any expedients most manifestly at variance with primitive practice. We have no confidence in any such expedients. What the first Christians did, we may do. What they did not, we may not do. The more closely we adhere to the primitive practice and the more faithfully we maintain our integrity to the Lord and what was the clearly ascertained practice of the first church, the more power and influence we shall have to save all classes.

It is and can be no ground of offense to those who have not taken the steps required in the New Testament to become Christians, to be considered out of the kingdom and treated accordingly. But for us to teach, as we have done, and as the scriptures do, that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God;" that "as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ," and then endorsing persons as Christians, by opening the door to them to participate in acts of worship and devotion, which belong exclusively to those in Christ, is inconsistent, and calculated to quiet their con-
sciences, lull them to sleep and pacify them in security, under the impression that all is safe without doing what the Lord manifestly requires at their hands. In this way, we may weaken the influence the Lord has given us to save men. If we yield one point, and admit that men may be Christians without it, we may yield another and another, till the modern unbelieving theory, that "whatever a man thinks right, that is right to him," shall be adopted. Let there be no shrinking from the principles and practice of the primitive church, but let us, in all faithfulness and integrity, maintain them, as the Lord gave them, to the last and least item; and when the chief Shepherd shall appear we can, with Paul, say, "I have kept the faith;" and if any man shall please, on this account, to "recoil from his position among us with utter disgust," let the consequences be upon his own head, and not upon the brethren whom he thus threatens. There are true men who love the hallowed principles of the gospel and the primitive practice of the disciples of Jesus, who will maintain them, as the Lord gave them to us, advocate, propagate and perpetuate them till the last invitation shall be given to dying and perishing man, till the last trumpet shall sound and the Lord shall come in power and great glory. Shall we stand with this number, be true and faithful with them, that we may be accepted of him in that day? The Lord help us so to do.

Books.—Young persons learn a great deal by being in the presence of books.—A love of knowledge comes with reading, and that, in a young mind, is almost a warrant against the inferior excitement of passion and vice. Books are windows through which the soul looks out, and a house without books is like a room without windows. It is a pleasure to have books; and a library growing larger every year is an honorable part of a young man's or a young woman's history.


BY ELDER JAMES CHALLEN.

This subject, like many others found in the scriptures, has been the occasion of much controversy. We shall not enter at length on the discussion of it, nor consider at large the conflicting opinions entertained in regard to it; but will nevertheless be compelled to look at some of the more popular views developed by the several writers with reference to it.

The very title, "Man in the image of God," is an august and sublime one, and indicates the noble origin of our race, our high calling and destiny. Of no other beings is it said that they were made in the image of God.

Whatever may be the rank of those intelligences which people other worlds, and doubtless they are both elevated in their nature, glorious in their offices and countless in their numbers, yet of none of them is it affirmed, that they were made after any model, much less after One so perfect and divine as "the only wise God."

The first notice we have of the origin of our race in the Book of Genesis, furnishes us with this noble and unique conception. By some, the account given in the first chapters of the Book of Creation, of the fall of man, his expulsion from Paradise, and the incidents connected with this fatal catastrophe, are looked upon as myths or fables, containing certain great moral truths, but not as the facts of history. This, we never can believe. They exhibit all the marks of simple narrative, severe and truthful, in all their details. There can be no dispute in regard to the chief actors in the living drama—the Creator, the man, and the woman.

In regard to the tempter, who is called the serpent, it has been deemed almost a work of love to thrust him out of existence, altogether—to reduce him to a Jewish fable or a heathen myth; or by the pointed needles of criticism, "to prick every bubble" of his "frivolous fame," "and resolve it back to the air it came from." Even
Coleridge calls the personal Devil "a mere fiction, or at least an allegory, supported by a few popular phrases and figures of speech, used incidentally or ornamentally by the evangelists." This seems to us strange; and yet Coleridge is often quoted as a most profound theologian. He was rather a true poet and philosopher. He gave himself to literature instead of religion. He became "an inhabitant of the Hill of Parnassus, rather than as a dissenting minister, to remain a shepherd on the delectable mountains."

Of this Evil One, several names are given in the scriptures: "The Old Serpent;" "The Deceiver;" "The Murderer;" "The Accuser;" "The Tempter, Satan, the Devil;" "The Serpent, who through his subtlety deceived Eve."

The account given us of man's origin and apostacy; the Tempter who seduced him, and the trial and judgment that ensued; are all matters of fact, and must be so regarded, or the redemption by the Messiah, and all that constitutes Christianity as a divine system, is but a fable and a dream! The latter is founded upon the former, and grows legitimately out of it. Had there been no fall, no temptation, no guilt, no ruin, there would have been no promise of relief—no personal Redeemer—no salvation by his death—no hope of immortality by his resurrection.

So far, then, we deemed it necessary to premise, before we entered upon the chief subject of this essay: Man, the Image of God.

That he was created in God's image is distinctly affirmed in various portions of the Divine Oracles, as will be seen in the following statements: "Let us make man in our own image;" "In the image of God created he him, male and female created he them." Gen. i. 26, 27.

It is thus declared in these passages of scripture four times, in the short space of two verses, that man was created in the image of God.

But even after man had fallen, it is reaffirmed by Moses, that "in the image of God created he man." Gen. ix. 6. And this image, as still remaining, however defaced, is the reason he assigns why "he who sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." This shows the deep reverence with which we should regard man, even in his low—his lowest and most degraded state. He still bears in his person, the lineaments of his Creator—the likeness of his God and Father. The Miltonic type of Adam, was truly sublime, combining the heroic ideal of the highest Grecian art, with something beyond that, which, alone, his mighty genius could supply:

"Truth, wisdom, sanctitude, severe and pure."

His poetical delineations of Adam, are suggestive of all the constituent elements of his character and nature, viz: authority, dignity and grace; his divine manliness.

Though the great poet has lavished all his skill and power on his favorite Eve, it must be confessed that he has made her, a being too ethereal for flesh and blood; too nymph-like for a dweller in earth's lowly shrine; hardly a suitable companion for man! She seems, in his ideal, too little allied to flesh and blood to awaken our truest sympathies, and to unite her fortunes with her Lord on earth. The scriptural conception is ampler, nobler far, because it is the divine. She was the help-mate of her noble lord, and the predestined mother of the race; and therefore is she seen in the true sublime of her own native womanhood. She is both wife and mother. Poetry is unable to add anything to this—

"To find man's veritable stature out, Erect, sublime; the measure of a man, And that's the measure of an angel, says The Apostle."

It was no vulgar temptation to which Eve was subjected; "Ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil." The good, they knew—they had it in profusion. Evil, they knew not, as yet. The very word was strucken from the mint below. It came from the tempter's own hand. Bitterly did Eve and her fallen Lord pay the price of this ambitious knowledge! It has become the base coin of all our wretchedness here on the
earth. It will not be received as the value of a single gift or blessing of all that God has to bestow upon his creature man. And yet this knowledge of good and evil, is all the knowledge, aside from revelation, that the world can give us. How little of the good, in comparison with the evil, have we accumulated for six thousand years!

But notwithstanding the apostacy of our race, the divine image is seen, in some measure, in all men. Sin has not wholly defaced or obliterated it. Its traces, now and then, are distinctly seen everywhere. But chiefly in infancy and childhood, the divine photograph appears. They have not as yet been "drawn away and enticed by sin."

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy."

The touches of a divine pencil, dipped in celestial colors, may be clearly traced in it; and therefore, in the "renewal" of man in the image of God, the child has become the earthly model. "Except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." In a still higher sense than Wordsworth conceived, thus,

"The child is father of the man."

In order to understand more fully this subject, we will examine a few leading opinions entertained upon it.

There is first, the poetical idea, which has formed the basis of many a song and beautiful stanza, that the "image" is wholly or chiefly in the outer man. This is the *esthetic* form of the question—the *beau ideal* of all that is graceful and imposing in the face and form of humanity. With head erect and radiant with beauty; and with body and limbs stately and kingly. This is the stereotyped ideal of all the romance writers of the past and the present. It is eminently sensuous, animal, earthly, and cannot be confided in as the true conception of the image. Relative, comparative, counter-part truth, should not be mistaken for absolute truth. The law had in it "the form of knowledge and of the truth," but not the reality. It was the outer semblance of the inner truth, found alone in the gospel.

Though in accommodation to human weakness, God is represented in scripture as having the body and the attributes of man, we are not to degrade the Creator into the likeness of the creature—especially in relation to "the house we live in."

Whatever resemblance, in some respects, may be between the "thing formed and he who formed it," we should ever remember that God is Spirit. This is his essential nature. Not a Spirit, but "Spirit." Just as our Savior said of his Father: "God alone is Good." Not simply a good being, nor yet the good being, but wholly, truly, eternally "Good!"

All relative and comparative ideas concerning the essential nature of the only wise God, seem tame, in view of these positive affirmations, as thus expressed by him who alone "knew the Father." The same form of expression, is found in the writings of the beloved John: "God is love;" not simply a being who has loved us and loves all his works; but, his essential nature is "Love."

In the same sense "God is Spirit." In this absolute sense, we suppose that God has no likeness. It was after the prophet Isaiah had asked the questions: "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him?" that he adds: "To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?" It is also expressly forbidden in the scriptures for any one to personify God, or to make any supposed similitude of him. He dwelleth not in temples made with hands. Idols, of wood and stone, the work of man's hands, are but the embodiment of some ideal God, within the mind of the infatuated devotee; and in the sight of him who is "SPIRIT," an abomination. We can form some idea of everything that is material and sensuous. Our imaginations, though not creative, have a wonderful power in combining all the elements of thought we may have, and throwing them into every possible shape. They are kaleidoscopic, and every turn of the instrument, changes the relations of all the objects within, and places them in new and strange and ever varied positions; but the imagination, no
more than the kaleidoscope, can create the materials which revolve therein.

That the body of man is beautiful, no one can deny. The casket that enshrines the spirit is exceedingly fine, both in the materials of which it is formed, and the skill displayed in its organization.

"What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! In form and moving, how express and admirable! In action, how like an angel! In apprehension, how like a God! The beauty of the world: the paragon of animals." But notwithstanding this array of excellence in the person of man, we should be careful not to entertain gross ideas of God, growing out of any supposed sensuous resemblance between him and his Maker, as if he had bodily organs and parts, and the essential characteristics of a human being.

The body of man, however beautiful and perfect, is simply but a tabernacle, which enshrounds his spirit; and that which it contains, being the inhabitant, alone possesses whatever marks and traces of a divine image is inherited by man. The jewel, is always of more value than the casket which contains it; the man, of greater value than the house in which he lives; the spirit, than the tent in which it has taken up its temporary abode.

All gross and materialistic ideas of the spirit of man, issues from the same fount which produced the idolatries of heathen worship. They changed "the glory of the immortal God, into the likeness of mortal man, of fowls, of four-footed beasts, and of reptiles;" So materialism has changed the glory of the spirit of man—God's likeness, into organized matter, nerves and tissues, the cerebrum and cerebellum of the crown-head! And as fowls, and four-footed beasts and reptiles, have all these in common with man, it has reduced man to a level with them. He has the wisdom of the serpent, the courage of the lion, the fierceness of the vulture. He is a superior order of animals to any one of the species, but combines not in himself the sum total of the entire genus

How men degrade themselves, when they forsake their true mercies and belie their own nature! What fools they become, when they adopt sense instead of faith as their safest guide, and rely upon reason rather than revelation, on those subjects which lie beyond our earthly horizon!

If man is only an animal, simply flesh and blood—mere organized matter—in what is he greater than the race of animated creation? Can he worm himself into the earth as a serpent? Has he the sting of the adder? Has he the industry and foresight of the ant? Can he build such houses as the bee, and fill them with such sweets? Can he soar with the lark, and singing as he soars, fill

"All the earth and air,
With his voice as loud
As, when night is bare,
From one lonely cloud
The moon rains out her beams, and heaven is overflowed."

Has he the cunning and the handicraft of the beaver? Can he spin such silken threads and weave such gossamer veils as the spider? Does he understand geometry as the wasp, or can he throw such a circle as warms the breast of the wren? Has he the eye of the eagle, the meekness of the dove, or can he snuff up the battle from afar, as the wild horse of the desert? Has he the tread of the elephant, the endurance of the camel, the patience of the ox? Can he draw out leviathan with an hook? or his tongue with a cord? Can he put an hook into his nose? or bore his jaw through with a thorn? Will he make many supplications to thee? Will he speak soft words to thee? Lay thine hand upon him, remember the battle, do no more."

The Apollo Belvidere, as a work of art, is unsurpassed. No human form on earth possesses all the points of beauty and perfection it displays, because it has in it combined the chief excellences of all. But it is unconscious marble. The differential quality between it and the most imperfect specimen of humanity, is life, intelligence; and this gives more dignity, grace and value to a man, than all the Apollos that all the
quarries could furnish in time or eternity. And so in our comparison with man, and the whole animated world. Whatever attributes and qualities the inferior tribes, in some respects, may have over our race; they have not reason, conscience, the faculty divine.

"Dear heaven, how silly are the things that live in thickets, and eat berries."

_Davenport, Iowa._

**ROMANISM--A FRAGMENT.**

BY F. W. EMMONS.

But Romanism under all governments, in all countries, in all ages, has been the heaven of proscription. It has filled the heavens with darkness. It has placed a man, the Pope, on the throne of Immanuel. It has set up angels, and men, and women, as mediators and intercessors, and has withheld from the common people the word of life.

Shall we point you to its rise, in the first and purest ages of the church of Christ? In the days of Paul, he said: "The mystery of iniquity doth now already work." Shall we speak of its progress, till from the general falling away from Christ and from holiness, that "man of sin and son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," was fully revealed? When the Pope was declared Universal Bishop, when the saints were given unto his hand? Shall we point you to what Romanism did from the fifth to the tenth, from the tenth to the sixteenth, and from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century? Shall we speak of the dark ages, and what made them dark? Of the proscriptions and persecutions, the deaths, the rivers of blood which have been poured out; of the inquisition, of all its horrors; of St. Bartholomew's day, and many other days of blood? Yes; we will point you to them. We point you to them as the Pope of Rome and Romanism, and as the legitimate fruits of their power. They took away liberty, civil and religious—whole ly took them away, and annihilated them—in the old world; and this they are beginning to do here in the new. We point you to the history of Romanism and of the Christian church, as it may be found in books upon your shelves, and accessible to all—to standard, stereotyped works, for what Romanism has been, and for what it has done in the old world, and we will soon tell you something of what it has done and is doing here.

But first let me show that our other affirmations of Romanism are true; that it is the friend of tyranny and oppression and moral darkness, the foe of Christ; that it is anti-Christ.

Shall I proceed now to prove all this, or these things, or shall we consider them as truisms, and by the references given and the remarks we have made, as already proved?

If it be proved that Romanism is the enemy of civil and religious liberty—has ever been so in the old world, it is a truism; and proved, per consequence, that it is and ever has been the friend of tyranny and oppression and moral darkness.

But is it the foe of Christ? Is it anti-Christ?

Most certainly it is the foe of Christ, if it assumes Christ's throne; and if it be the foe of Christ, it is anti-Christ, for anti means against. But in pretending to be the "Vicar of Christ upon earth," in opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God or is worshipped, the Pope of Rome not only fully revealed himself to be the foe of, and anti-Christ, but the Man of sin, and the Son of perdition. The Pope, as the head; the Roman Catholic Church, as the body; and Romanism, as the spirit and principles by which all the members are actuated, are inseparable. We therefore speak of them all together.

That this "Man of sin" is the "Woman" also, who sits upon "the scarlet colored beast;" or, if the man be the Pope, the head, the woman is the church, the body,
the great "harlot," which is described by St. John as drunken with the blood of the saints, and the mother of all abominations, is equally obvious. What have we, therefore, to prove?

It seems as though all that we have said, without saying more under this head, were altogether a work of supererogation. And yet it may not be so; and yet it may not be out of place, nor uncalled for, to quote and apply here two other characteristics of this Man of sin. "Forbidding to marry," says Paul, and commanding "to abstain from meats, which God hath given to be received with thanksgiving by them that know and obey the truth." The Romish clergy are forbidden to marry; and the Romish Church eats no flesh, except fish on certain days. "And I saw," says John, "a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her formation. And upon her forehead a name written, 'Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the earth.' And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration." The explanation which follows, makes it perfectly plain that the subject of this vision is the Roman Catholic Church. In this all expositors of prophecy and commentators of note, except Romanists themselves, agree.

With these verifications of our definition of Romanism, the few and general references which have been given to its past history in the old world, we come now with it to the new. Let us look at it and contemplate it within our own borders, at home. Romanism, we have said, is in this country what it has been in every other. Its spirit, its aims are the same here and now, that they have been elsewhere and formerly. All that is wanting is the opportunity and the power, and these are fast increasing, and the Pope of Rome will make our President, our governors, and fill all the subordinate offices of State.

We have spoken of Romanism, as yet, only as opposed to civil and religious liberty, as prescriptive and persecuting in its spirit, as corrupt in its principles; and, in this aspect, have specified but a few particulars. Time would fail us, now, to speak of their "transubstantiation," their "con- fessionals," their "purgatory," their "code of morals," and much else that might be named. But permit the relation of an incident or two, of which the writer was an eye and ear witness.

In the winter of 1837, while attending a public debate on the Roman Catholic Religion, at Cincinnati, Ohio, which then and there occurred between Alexander Campbell and Bishop John B. Purcell; while the former was reading from a little book published by Smith, of New York, formerly a Romish priest, containing extracts from the works of St. Ligori, my own mind, and that too of all who heard, I presume, was particularly arrested by one passage, which contained a license for the lewdness of priests. It spoke of their keeping bad women, and of their being "fined" for it. It was no sooner read and briefly commented upon by Mr. Campbell, and he had taken his seat, than the bishop arose in great wrath. He appealed to heaven, in the most solemn manner, and called on all to witness, while he declared that no such passage was to be found in the works of Ligori; that he had these works, and had read them all, and this, which Mr. C. had now read, was "a base fabrication of the apostate Smith!" The next day, or a day or two afterwards, at Mr. Campbell's request, I wrote to Mr. Smith for an attested copy of the original Latin of the passage in question, and before I left Cincinnati was favored with the sight of it. That it was in the works of St. Ligori, and correctly copied and published by Smith, in the letter which he returned was attested by Duncan Dunbar, pastor of the McDougal st. Baptist Church; Jno.
Kennaday, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Spencer H. Cone, pastor of the Oliver St. Baptist Church; Sam'l. F. B. Morse, professor, etc., in the university of the city of New York; Wm. Green, Jr., deacon in the 6th Free Cong. Church, New York, and C. G. Finney, pastor of the church in the Broadway Tabernacle. Here, then, I saw both lewdness and lying—the one sanctioned by the precept, the other by the example of two high dignitaries of the Roman Church.

Subsequently, during a visit in the city of New York, I was particularly interested with the relation which an old gentleman by the name of Wilcox gave in, at a conference meeting, of his conversion, some forty years before, from Romanism. He was then upwards of seventy years of age.

"Till I was thirty-three years old," said he, "I knew nothing about any other religion than that of Rome. I prayed, as I was taught, to the virgin Mary, and confessed my sins to the priest. About this time, I became concerned for the salvation of my soul; felt myself to be a sinner; and prayed much to the virgin and others, using the Romish prayer book to get relief; but found it not. A protestant minister then visited the house where I was, to see a person who was sick; and he was asked to see and converse with me. He knocked at my door, and I being then in the act of praying to the virgin, got up from my knees and let him in. I had the prayer book in my hand. He asked me what book it was, and that I would let him see it. I declined an answer; but when he repeated his request, and promised to give the book back to me, I let him take it. He told me that it was wrong to pray to the virgin, and to any being but God. I was shocked with his teachings; but he continued to explain and reason with me, and before he went away he said: 'Now let us kneel down together and pray to God.' We knelt down; and O, such a prayer as he made I never heard before. The spirit which he exhibited and the kindness of his manner, affected me much. The next day I called upon my priest, and told him about it. And what do you think the priest answered? Oh, my friends," continued the old man, "he was mad—the color came to his face, and he said, 'Damn him; why did you not kick him out—out of the room?' I replied that I had no occasion to treat him thus. The priest repeated his oath, and cursed him and cursed me; and I went away, and I never confessed to a priest again; but I prayed and confessed to God, and I found mercy and forgiveness through the blood of the Lamb."

---

EXCOMMUNICATION.

BY ELDER A RAINES.

To the intelligent disciple of Jesus, there is something awful in the word excommunication. The great mass of professors seem to have scarcely any conception of the solemnity and fearfulness of that act by which a member of Christ's church is cut off from the body of Christ by the authority of Christ, and consigned to the world lying in wickedness, as his only appropriate place.

This incompetency to appreciate the awfulness of excommunication, is an evil, which, together with innumerable other evils, has been entailed upon us by the apostacy. In the mists and smoke of this defection from original christian principles, the stupendous weight of christian obligation has, in a great measure, been concealed. Surrounded as we are with a multitude of voluntary associations, denominated evangelical; and having been educated amid the roar and confusion of the heterogeneous principles, and defences of principles, out of which these associations, unknown in the Bible have grown; and by which each is supported to the disparagement and at the expense of all the others, it would have been strange if the minds of men had not partaken of the general dimness and confusion.

The unavoidable effect upon the minds of many persons, produced by these principles and sects, is, a callousness to the obligations of the christian profession. Not one of
these sects, receives members upon the good confession, as did the apostles and primitive churches; and, even if they did, still, the very existence of a plurality of belligerent sects, each dubbed by the others, churches of Christ, would be calculated to lessen, in the minds of their members, the terrors of exclusion. Hence, it has been no uncommon occurrence for members to run out of one church into another, when under censure, and, sometimes, immediately, or shortly after excommunication from one of our congregations, for acts of great disorder—perhaps, high-handed knavery or meanness, we have known them as if they could change their principles with the same facility with which they change their clothes, to be in a few days members with some of the sects, sailing under flying colors, looking daggers, and all sorts of impudence at those who had but executed the law of Christ in excluding them; and pouring scalding torrents of putrid vituperation on the heads of their quondam brethren, who had perhaps treated them with a hundred times more lenity than they deserved—and who, being countenanced and encouraged by their new associates, never once dreamed of the scathing vengeance that darted upon them from the throne of Him, whose laws they had despised, and whose authority they had trampled upon. Add to all this the fact, that the sectarian condition of Christendom necessarily engenders in the bosom of each sect a desire for numbers, even at the expense of principle, and we need not think it strange if the arm of Discipline should be paralyzed, and excommunication become a thing of mockery; a mere straw, or bubble to be tossed on the billows of the raging and unsanctified passions, of unsanctified, turbulent and self-willed pretenders of godliness!

According to the order and laws of the primitive church, these evils could not exist. These demand the unity of the church, and speak in thunder-tones against all divisions and factions. Had, therefore, the voice of God been permitted to rule among those who professed to be followers of Jesus, the church would have remained one; in which case, in every instance of exclusion, the excluded party would have been driven from the Eden of all church relationship and privilege, into the wide perishing world; and, not having any other church into which, as a city of refuge, he might run—not having any other altar than the Lord's, upon which he might lay hold, his circumstances of obvious and unmitigable rebellion against God, would, far more probably than under present circumstances, have caused overwhelming convictions to rush upon him, and brought him again to humility, penitence, repentance, and the church.

Under the evil circumstances which surround us, we cannot do better, in so far as the present question is concerned, than to point out these evils on the one hand, and the obligations of the good confession on the other:—holding up, at the same time, according to our best ability, the enormity and danger of a person's suffering himself to be cut off, by the execution of the laws of the King of Saints, from that institution which is the pillar and support of the truth.

We say, then, that as the confession or profession of Christianity involves a solemn vow or covenant to believe all that God says, and to do all that he commands, according to the utmost of the ability with which he endows us, therefore, this vow is disregarded by us—this covenant is broken on our part, whenever we suffer the laws of Christ to cut us off from his church: and we stand uncovered in the full blaze of all eyes in heaven and on earth, as having broken covenant with God and the church—as having perjured ourselves, in the very worst sense of the word perjured! How great the enormity! How Heaven-daring this sin! Viewed in this light, we shudder as we contemplate it! We start horror-stricken, as from the serpent's venomous fang!—as from a bottomless vortex! Yes, if the laws of Christ cut us off, we have lied to the Holy Spirit! and as we wend our way from the church into the world, we are deserters—from the army of God to that of
Satan—from the banner gemmed with Bethlehem’s effulgent star, to that of the Devil, crimsoned with the blood of our fathers and mothers—clotted with the gore of all past generations of our race! And if our exclusion should be made the subject of our sport and laughter, we are sporting with our own deceivings, on the slippery brow of a precipice, beneath which fiery billows roll; and our laughter is but the laughter of a moral maniac!

We know that the above paragraph may seem severe: but whether or not it is severe, is not the question—Is it true! We have thought much on the subject of excommunication, and have viewed it from many points, and contemplated it in many aspects; but conscientiously, we cannot, with the solemn obligations of the good confession before us, soften, in the least, our decision. Did we not, when we made that confession, solemnly covenant to hearken to Jesus Christ—to be his disciples—to honor him, by engaging and continuing in his service, and to be faithful, the Lord being our helper, until death? If we did not promise so much as this, then we say that the confession is a solemn nothing, and of no more value than a blasted nut-shell. But we have proved, in our essay on the good confession, that we did thus promise: we are, consequently, compelled, by the obvious and uncontrollable truth of the case, to hold fast our decision, as one of the terrible verities of our holy religion, and to defend it, though the whole world were to rise up against it. And we say farther, that if all professors viewed this subject as we do, it would be a thousand times better, both for the church and for the world: for how, in that case, could a believer in the truth of Christianity, suffer himself to be cut off from the body of Christ, by the law of Christ, and still retain his moral powers in a healthy state, so as to be acutely sensitive under conviction on account of sin, nothing short of the deepest mental agony would be the consequence. How degraded would a man feel himself to be! How false-hearted! False to his God, to his Saviour, to his brethren, to himself!

In the present state of society, however, we cannot reasonably expect this subject to be generally appreciated. The customs of the world, or at least many of them, are highly detrimental to fidelity in both church and state; and operate as preventives to those compunctious throbings of conscience which ought to result, in every instance, from an infraction of the principles of our
christian profession. It is indeed most al-
arming and lamentable, that a very large proportion of mankind, even in this nominally christian country, seem to be gov-
erned but little by the obligation of their covenants made with their fellow men, and break them habitually, with very little ap-
parent contrition. We need wonder, then, to see these same persons throw aside their Christian profession as if it were a very light thing; and, instead of repenting in sack-
cloth and ashes, rather glorying in their re-
bellion, and hardening their necks against all the remonstrances of their brethren, and against all the motives of the Christian re-
ligion?

Under these circumstances, it is precisely what we ought to expect; especially, when, perhaps, not one in a thousand of them ever understood the solemn sanctions, the infinitely weighty obligation of the good confession. The ease and impunity with which many respectable persons break their own solemn covenants, and still retain their respectability, might be illustrated by a reference to the frequency with which the temperance pledge has been broken within these last few years, by persons who had pawned their honor that they would not drink any thing as a bever-
age that could intoxicate. They are now found in the use of intoxicating drinks! Have they forfeited their honor? Not in the estimation of the great majority! They are very honorable men, forsooth! and, per-
haps, rather boast that they had the spirit, the gentility, the independence, to violate a solemn covenant. Infinitely more alarming is the condition of the man who breaks his baptismal pledge, the good confession—for this is a pledge given not to manonly, but to God! and not that we will abstain from the use of ardent spirit merely, but from all sin, the Lord being our helper.

But this is not all: the excommunicated are excluded from the privileges of the congrega-
tion. They can no longer partake of the Lord's supper. They are cut off from pastoral oversight and admonition. The prayers of the congregation are no longer for them, only as the saints pray for the world: indeed, these excluded ones, having deserted to the camp of Satan, have placed themselves at a greater distance from the prayers of the congregation, than are those of the world, who have never made a profession. They go out from under the watch-care of the brethren. They are in one sentence, cut off from a proprietorship in all the ordinances of the house of God; and therefore from all the benefits resulting from a proprietorship in those ordinances. They are cast cut of the ark of safety—and prostrate in their sins and blood. Feeble, and without the help of those means of grace, by the use of which “the righteous scarcely are saved,” where shall these ungodly and sinful men appear? If while enjoying access to all the ordinances of the house of God, they permitted Satan, like a strong man armed, to take pos-
session of the whole citadel of their soul, is it not alarmingly probable, that now, since he has obtained possession, he will keep it, and that their last state, like the man out of whom the unclean spirit was cast, and who was afterwards possessed by the seven spir-
its, more wicked than the first, will be inac-
culably their worst state?

But dark as this case has already been made to appear, the half has not yet been told us. What an evil influence does the bad life of the excommunicated shed on the world and on the church? Often they be-
come the bitterest enemies of the church; and misrepresent and slander it in a most wicked and cruel manner. This, more or less, prevents the salvation of others. But even should they remain the nominal friends of the church, still their bad conduct, and their fall, will discourage others, and pre-
vent them from making the requisite efforts for salvation. And it should also be remem-
bered, that the excommunicated almost al-
ways have their friends, sometimes relatives, who become offended at their exclusion, and behave in so unchristian a manner as to make it necessary to exclude them also. Much bitterness and heart-burning is the result:—sometimes schisms and factions, confusion and every evil work; a long train of evils, the effects of which will be commensurate with eternity, and all these having their origin in the sins of one man, who so persisted in sin as to render his exclusion necessary. Of what responsibilities has God connected with a profession of the Christian religion! How fearful the condition of every man, who, having made the good confession, tramples under his feet its solemn obligations! Such men, through obstinacy, or the love of self, may resist the motive of the gospel while on earth, and may even proudly or stubbornly die without a renunciation of their sins; but when the great day of reckoning shall come, they will find, when it will be too late, that they had been engaged in a most disastrous enterprise. While here, they may be angry with, and abuse the church; but if the law of Christ has cut them off, the sentence of the church has been ratified in heaven; so that their wrath and abuse is not so much directed against the church, as against the head of the church—the one Lawgiver, who is able to save and destroy.

'The sentence of excommunication,' says James, 'should never be proceeded to by the church, but with the greatest caution and seriousness. It should be accompanied with sorrowful and humble confession of the delinquent's sin, and earnest prayer that it may have a good effect on his mind, and the minds of others. It should be done in the name of the Lord Jesus, and not as an act of the church's own authority. It should have an immediate reference to the ends of church fellowship, and the benefit of the offender. It should be unattended by any emotions of wrath, malice, party-spirit, or personal resentment. In short from the beginning to the end of the fearful proceeding, there should be a manifestation of all that deliberation, discretion, seriousness, grief, and awe, which this solemn act of excision seems naturally to demand. There appears in this act a reference to the future judgment of Christ. In one sense, the church now judges for Christ in matters of his kingdom; and we to them who dare to pronounce this sentence, without being persuaded on good grounds, that it is the sentence of Christ himself. It is the echo of his awful voice, saying even now to the offender, 'Depart from my house;' and unless the offender repent, in anticipation of his sentence, saying at the last day, 'Depart from my heaven.'

'It is a saying, no more trite than true, that "prevention is better than cure." To this we shall add, "prevention is better than excommunication." The scripture rule is, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye who are spiritual, restore such one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."'

'We often lament the defectiveness of our congregations in point of discipline. And we are bound to admit that many of them are deplorably defective. To us however, it appears, that this defectiveness does not so much consist in the not bringing erring individuals before the congregation, as in the want of private admonition and exhortation. We are commanded to "exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day, lest any be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." This mutual exhortation is made the duty, not of the preachers and teachers only, but of the whole brotherhood; and would, in innumerable instances, were it performed according to the scriptures, prevent the necessity of public trials, or even trials before the eldership; and if so, it would in very many instances prevent excommunication.

'Now, it is a known fact, that mutual or private admonition and exhortation is but little practiced in many of our congregations. In all such cases the number of apostasies must be many; and, consequently, instances of exclusion must be numerous. In many instances, if a brother errs, instead of meekly admonishing him, we become shy of him, and distant, and perhaps
aid in publishing his fault, and in some instances, if his case is not very promptly brought up, animadvert with great severity on the tardiness of our Muzzled (1st Tim. v. 18,) lay Bishops, whom we have put into office, it would seem, among other purposes, to keep the disagreeable work of exhortation and admonition off our own hands: or that, having many servants, we may be a kind of spiritual quality? Thus, an ordinance of Christianity is permitted to lie prostrate among us; and a most important ordinance too; intended as a preventive against the hardening effects of sin. It would be marvelous, indeed, if the leaving this wheel out of the machinery of our discipline, should not be attended with very deplorable consequences.

We mention mutual and private exhortation as one of the means by which excommunication might be, in many instances, prevented; it is, however, but one of the means. The whole influence of the preachers and teachers, and the efficacy of all the ordinances of Christianity, as well as the exhortations of the brotherhood, should be brought to bear against the deleterious power of sin; and the efforts to be made should be in the ratio of the object to be had in view, the saving of souls from death, and covering a multitude of sins. In many cases much forbearance should be used.

Men, in their best estate, are encompassed with many imperfections and frailties; and hence, for many of their derelictions, should be more pitied than blamed. The government of the church, when administered according to the law of Christ, is a government of grace. The rod of iron is rarely to be used. We may place the standard of Christian duty as high as we please; but let us take care how we unchristianize those who come short of it. Scandalous offenders must be excluded, (1st Cor. v. 11,) but the babe in Christ, (1st Cor. iii. 1-3,) though under the influence of an often preponderating carnality, is to be fed with the sincere milk of the word, that he may grow thereby. Exclusion, in every instance, should be the last resort,—every means having been previously expended, by which the offender might be restored.

We have sometimes thought that some of our congregations are more influenced by a fear of the opinions of the world, in reference to the offending members, than by the law of Christ. Hence, in such cases, we have often heard, among them, this exclamation, “What will the world say?” Now, although we are not for wholly disregarding the opinions of the world, still, we can not consent to make them our CHURCH DISCIPLINE. We have, in the scriptures, a perfect law of liberty; and it is our duty to govern our congregations by this, let the world’s opinions be what they may; and, consequently, instead of suffering ourselves to be unduly influenced by the opinions of the world, and, as the result, prematurely cutting off a brother, we should cast about in our minds for means of restoration. These being brought to bear fully, from time to time upon his mind, if he is not restored, the great probability is that he is not a Christian. He “loves not the Lord Jesus Christ,” and “is anathema maranatha.” He has become a lifeless branch, and needs to be pruned off, to be gathered in a bundle, with other lifeless branches like himself, to be burned, in the coming day of dreadful retribution.

“It is a question worthy of consideration,” says James, a Baptist, “how church members should conduct themselves toward those who are separated from their communion. We are not left without instructions on this head. ‘If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.’ 2d Thes. iii. 14, 15. ‘I have written unto you, not to keep company, if any that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one no not to eat.’ 1st Cor. v. 11. Two things are here evident.

1. We are commanded to withdraw from voluntary association with such individuals.
We are to shun their company. We are not even to sit down with them to an ordinary meal, etc., and this is to be done, to testify our abhorrence of the sin, and that the offender himself may be ashamed, and feel the awful situation in which his transgression has placed him.

2. But it is equally evident from the apostolic injunction, that excommunicated persons are not to be utterly forsaken and abandoned. 'Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.' Pains should be taken to bring them to repentance. They should not be given up to their sins, and given over, to become more and more vile. The pastors and members should seek opportunities to admonish and warn them, "peradventure God may give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." Upon their penitence and reformation, they should again be received into communion with compassion and love, joy and gratitude.

The reader will perceive that it is the opinion of James that the apostle prohibits Christians from partaking of an ordinary meal with an excommunicated person. And Dr. A. Clarke is of the same opinion. His words are, "Not even to eat with such; have no communion with such a one, in things either sacred or civil. You may transact your worldly concerns with a person that knows not God, and makes no profession of Christianity, whatever his moral character may be; but ye must not even thus far acknowledge a man professing Christianity who is scandalous in his conduct. Let him have this extra mark of your abhorrence of all sin; and let the world see that the church of God does not tolerate iniquity." Barnes’ words are, "to have no intercourse or fellowship with him of any kind; not to do any thing that would seem to acknowledge him as a brother; with such an one not even to eat at the same table. A similar course is enjoined by John. 2d John x. 11. This refers to the intercourse of common life, and not particularly to the communion." To these we might add a long list of the learned, who testify that Paul prohibits the partaking with an excommunicated person in a common meal. Now, may we not ask, why "note" persons in this way, why mark them as with a brand of infamy? Is it not because, having violated their profession, or confession, they are to be viewed as traitors? It is some where related of the traitor Arnold, that on visiting England, he was introduced to a noble lord; and extending his hand, he doubted not that his lordship would grasp and shake it with great cordiality. How must Arnold have been cut to the heart, under a sense of meanness, when instead of the anticipated cordiality, he perceived himself to be looked upon by his lordship with withering scorn! "What!" said his lordship, "the traitor Arnold! I will never give my hand to a traitor!"

But is a man who is excluded from the church of Christ, by the law of Christ, a traitor? Christians are soldiers—constitute the army of the faith—Jesus is the captain of salvation—the kingdom of Satan constitutes an opposing army—follows it not, then, that those who go from the army of the faith are traitors? Certainly they are deserters. And if, after desertion, they, in any way, aid and abet the enemies of the church, they are traitors. They have sworn allegiance to the government of the prince Messiah, and in violation of this oath gone over to the armies of Satan. These being the facts of the case, what are they but traitors? And is not this the grand reason why the apostle commands that with such the Christian shall not eat? These questions demand our most pious consideration.

It should not be forgotten, however, that though we may "mark" or "note" persons who become scandalous offenders against Christ and the church, yet we are to do this benevolently. We are not to depart from the law: "Do good unto all men as ye have opportunity." Our refusing intercourse with offenders, is not to be the effect of malice or spite, but from a sense of duty, and to show our abhorrence of sin; especially the sin of trampling upon the blood-sealed confession; the sin of viola-
ting our baptismal vow. Nor should we forget that, if the learned are right in the interpretation of the words, "with such an one no not to eat," those professors who admit the excluded to all the common courtesies of life, violate a law of Christ. Can it be that these words relate to the Lord's supper? The word "eat" appears too common to designate a participation of the Supper. What say you brethren?

To conclude. "Let us prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." Let us, as far as possible, restore the whole law of Christ—the whole Christian institution, cost us what it may.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION. No. IV.

THE MINISTRY AND PREACHING.—No. 2.

In a previous article, under the above caption, a brief description of learned, doctrinal and partisan preachers, sworn to defend certain dogmas and parties, was given. In the present papers a description of another class will be attempted, viz.: The learned, scientific, philosophical, moral and political lecturer. That it is proper for men to deliver learned, scientific, philosophical, moral and political lectures, at proper times and in appropriate places, no one of intelligence has the least doubt. The ground of complaint is not that lectures of this description are delivered, for the entertainment and improvement of public assemblies. On the contrary lectures on literature, astronomy, or geology are perfectly right. But the ground of complaint is, that the house of the Lord has been turned into the lecture room, the church into a popular assembly of the world, the professor of the gospel into a popular lecturer, and in the place of the preaching of the gospel—preaching "Christ—as we have it in scripture, we have the worldly lecture and entertainment. The ground of complaint is, that men claiming to be ministers of the gospel, preachers of Christ and of the New Testament, pervert their calling, turn themselves and their calling into anything that the popular breeze may bring along, preach anything and everything, but the gospel.

The class of men here alluded to are highly cultivated, most polished and accomplished gentlemen. They are well posted in all that pertains to their day and generation, outside of the Bible. They understand and observe the etiquette of society in which they move, and attend most punctiliously to the little civilities, courtesies and amenities of life. They are graceful, easy in their manners, polite and fashionable men. They are well versed in the political career of their country, the newspaper literature, both political and the unpolitical secular, but not so conversant with religious literature, especially the Bible. They attend to the novel, even down to the latest, the softest and most sickening love tale. Indeed, they are frequently found to be authors of some of the most choice of these. In one word, they are well informed in all the literature of their time and country, except that in which the pure gospel of the grace of God is set forth. That is outside of their study. They also have acquired the attractive art of assuming the grave, solid and august air and tone, and the lightest, emptiest and most supercilious. In one word, they have acquired the bare art of first class theatrical stage performers. No matter what the theme they can speak upon it and act it out. They know how to acquire applause and gratify the multitude, and their trade is to do it.

These men give themselves no trouble about what is popularly styled "doctrine," nor do they annoy their auditors with anything of that sort. When the tough questions that have puzzled the minds of thousands of profound men come into their minds, they dash through at a single bound, simply pronouncing the doctrine so or not so. This not only ends all controversy, but all occasion for any. It is entirely satisfactory
to the speaker, and it is a matter of no consequence whether the hearer believes it or not. This class of preachers should not be styled Trinitarians, or Unitarians, Calvinists or Arminians, Restorationists or Universalists, Mahomedans or Mormons. They are neither Jews nor Pagans. Among the numerous names now current, there is not probably a single one appropriate to them. Individuals of the class we are introducing have been found nominally identified with different ecclesiastical bodies; but really they belonged to nothing and were nothing but brilliant, shrewd and flourishing men of the world; and could probably be as appropriately styled Nothingarians, as anything that can be manufactured conveniently in our language. They are nothing religiously. They are simply moral, literary and political lecturers. The mistake is in styling them "ministers of the gospel." This is the last title applicable to them. Jesus is not "the way, the truth and the life" to them, nor in their preaching. He is no grand center in their minds. He figures much less in their exhibitions than Byron or Shakespeare. They do not preach to save men, but to entertain, amuse and captivate the affluent, popular and fashionable church-goers, who prefer anything in the bounds of the universe to the pure gospel of the grace of God.

The preachers here described, precisely suit one class, and a large one at that, for they can preach all day, amuse, entertain and delight the audience without the least interruption of their consciences, in reference to their deliberate, premeditated and persistent disobedience and utter indifference to the commandments of God. The people hear them and go away with the same light and giddy hearts as when they came. The idea of repentance never enters into their minds. If they hear anything said about sin it is in reference to the sin of Adam, the Antediluvians, Sodomites, Egyptians or Jews, or the sin of some other state or country, or the sins of some other people than those immediately addressed; or if any allusion is made to their sins, it is in some comical style, that sums all classes up together and makes them all sinners about alike, and all needing the divine clemency, though all have much good in them and in the end causing no one to tremble as Felix, or to come to repentance. Their places of public exhibition are as much places of fashionable amusement and entertainment as the theater, only the surroundings are not so grossly corrupt.

Which one of this class of men has ever entered upon the grave work of an expositor of scripture? Which one of them has ever attempted to set forth the different dispensations of religion, as found in the history of God's dealings with mankind, showing where one ended and another commenced, what part was applicable to us and what not applicable, and assigning all the numerous reasons? Which one of them has ever shown himself to be a teacher of the Bible in any good sense? Theodore Clapp was a man of decided learning, ability and had an immense power over men. He had a splendid understanding of human nature and knew how to move men. He could have turned thousands to righteousness. But where are those turned to the Lord by him? He had the learning and mind necessary to an accurate understanding of the scriptures and a sound interpretation of the Bible; but what light did he ever shed upon that holy Book? Instead of his shedding light on the Bible, he diverted attention from it. Theodore Parker was also a man of decided learning, natural ability, and he had a superior understanding of human nature; but what has he left the world in the shape of light upon the Bible? Surely nothing deserving the name. In the place of light, he threw darkness over it, to the extent of his power, he filled the public mind with doubts, difficulties and uncertainties. He commented, carped and animadverted upon the faults, flaws and imperfections in the characters of the great and good men of the Bible, and appeared to make these an excuse for the irreligious and impious in his own time. It was wonderful, as well as painful to any pious man, to hear
him attacking the characters of such men as David, Abraham, Noah, etc., and to see with what avidity the most profane, debauched and dissipated of every sort, would listen to his descriptions. When he died, his sun set behind a thick, dark and gloomy cloud, leaving no good work behind, nor one bright prospect in the vast and boundless future lying before him.

Henry Ward Beecher may have more faith than either of the men we have alluded to had, but if he has, the evidence of it is hard to discover. He has the learning, native ability and understanding necessary to have made an impression upon his generation such as would have appeared to the end of time. But what has he ever done to bring the religion of Christ to bear upon his race? What has he ever done to apply the law of the Lord to our world and enforce it upon mankind? With him the Bible is a very good old book, from which to select an isolated extract, as a text, for a popular lecture, whether in any degree of the same nature with the text or not. But as a book of authority, containing a divine system, to be enjoined upon the world—a revelation from God—he knows it not. He preaches as a philosopher, knowing from reason, the light of nature and human intuition, what is right. As to preaching Christ; setting him forth as the Savior of the world—"the way, the truth and the life," the "chief among all the thousands, and altogether lovely"—"the head over all to the church," and enforcing obedience to his law, as the only means of recovery for a fallen, sinful and ruined race, he is about the last man who would have anything to do with it. The pure gospel of the Son of God, as it came from the heaven-inspired lips of the apostles of the Lamb, is no theme for him, nor his admirers. It is too remote from this world, too spiritual and heavenly a theme. The political evolutions of the world, the institutions, organizations and arrangements of the world, and his themes.

As to the numerous hosts more of this sort, with all their varieties and degrees, from Henry Ward Beecher, now the most popular, attractive and powerful of his class in America, down to Ames, of "Broad Gauge" memory, Bloomington, Ill., it is useless now to particularize, either as they were at the commencement of the Reformation, or as they are now. Enough has been said to introduce them. These men go not to the commission for their themes, nor to the preaching of the apostles. They find their gospel in the surroundings, in the newspapers, the court house, on the streets, any place, every place, anything and everything that can be paraded, dished up and presented in a pleasing form, so as to entertain and amuse the audience. At one time, the preacher darts his arrows down, in vengeance and awful fury upon the politicians; yet in such a way as to show that he means nothing only to evidence his independence. Then he makes an awful attack upon all the tribes of rumsellers and suckers in the land; yet in such a way as to show that he cares nothing about them, their practices or business; but is simply evincing to all that he is a great man and fears nothing. Next he makes a terrible dash at the aristocracy, and all grades of monopolists, with awful indignation on the side of the face toward the poor; but a wink on the other side, showing that it all means nothing, or at least, that it has no reference to any one present, only to show that the preacher can say what he pleases. Thus the audience is carried from topic to topic, in a pleasing manner, and all are impressed with the greatness of the preacher and his wonderful independence.

Some prodigy of the class under review, preaches a masterly discourse on profane swearing, proving clearly that it is a sin; and another favors the people with an equally masterly effort on licentiousness, and so they go the round of the popular vices. Then follows a flaming sermon on dishonesty in business transactions, and this is followed by a sermon on "Sabbath breaking," and the people speak of the high moral tone of these preachers. The people feel, after hearing these great men, upon
these mighty themes, that they are truly great men, that their themes were great themes, and the vices pointed out were great vices—that the speaker was interesting—did great credit to himself; and they would like to hear him again, but no body repents. Nobody turns to the Lord.

All this is done in the name of the Lord, and a vast amount more not here described, that can, at best, be called nothing but a desecration of the profession of the ministry, the professed house of God and the preaching of the gospel. And is there, or was there no need of reformation here? What regard have these men for the apostolic charge, to "preach the word"—to "preach Christ"—to "know nothing but Christ and him crucified"—to "glory in nothing save in the cross of Christ"—to commit the things heard of the apostles to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also? What becomes of the holy and apostolic requirement to preach no other gospel, to add nothing to it and take nothing from it? These men have shown that they will not be limited down to the apostolic character, manner of preaching, nor themes. And shall any man conclude that these men needed no reformation, or that they now need no reformation? Shall any conclude that piety, purity of heart and devotion to God, can be maintained while the stupendous themes of a once crucified and buried, but now risen and highly exalted Savior, the resurrection of all men from the dead, the judgment of the world by him whom God has constituted Lord of all and the final glorification of the saints, and the eternal perdition of the finally impenitent set aside? No; he who sets aside these grand, sublime and transcendentally glorious themes in the house of the Lord and in the profession of preaching, shows that the love of God is not in him and that he has no confidence in the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus, to arrest the attention of mankind. He thus degrades the Lord and his holy cause, and prostitutes his position as a professed preacher of Christ to the world.

Let no young preacher who ever intends to honor the name of his holy and immaculate Master and his cause, ever follow so unworthy an example as that given by the class of men we have described; but let young preachers read the discourses of Paul, consider his history and take his example, and the blessing of the Lord will attend them. In one word, let young preachers who desire the blessing of the Lord, consult his preaching, his example, with the preaching and example of all the apostles and that of the first evangelists; and put their everlasting trust in the Lord, and not one in a hundred will fail of success. Adopt their manner, example and every thing as far as possible, as it is the only infallible rule for the preacher of Christ.

---

**THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS.**

**NUMBER ONE.**

**BY ELDER JACOB CREATH, OF PAULYRA, MO.**

1. These words spake Jesus and lifted up his eyes to heaven and said: My Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee. (2.) As Thou hast given Him authority over all flesh, that He might give life eternal to as many as Thou hast given him. (3.) And this is life eternal that they might know thee, that thou art the only true God, and whom thou hast sent Jesus Christ. (4.) I have glorified thee on the earth; the work which thou gavest me to do I have finished. (5.) And now, my Father, glorify thou me, with that glory which I had with thee before the world was—The intercessory prayer of our Savior, Jesus Christ. The seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel. Murdock's Syriac Translation.

The glorification of the Son of God. The first six verses of this beautiful, sublime, and comprehensive prayer, are for the glorification of the Son of God. Christ having finished his public ministry, and having given the apostles all the instructions he judged necessary, he closed the whole with a solemn prayer to God, with uplifted eyes, that he might be reinstated in his original glory. Philip Melancthon, the companion and friend of Luther, said "there never was heard in heaven or earth, a voice more excellent, more holy, more fruitful, more pathetic, than what we have in this
prayer. Indeed, it is a specimen of that gracious intercession which the Redeemer ever lives to make for us above. There was a superstitious custom among some Christians in ancient times which Chrysostom severely reproved, of wearing this or some other portion of John's Gospel about their necks as an amulet or preservative from evil; we, however, may make a more rational or effectual use of it by storing it in our memories and practising it in our living. Much notice is usually taken of the dying words of a great and good man, and especially of a dear friend. These are the words of a dying Savior, the friend of sinners: whose expressions of affection towards the apostles seemed to become stronger and stronger as he drew nearer the close of life. It is supposed these words were spoken or this prayer offered in the stillness of the night when, as the poet says, an infidel half believes. It is the longest prayer recorded in the New Testament. It may be slowly repeated in three minutes. It is a model prayer for simplicity, its devotion, its comprehensiveness and its brevity. It is the most tender and sublime composition ever spoken or written. He is the most compassionate and tender of friends. It is very touching to have a friend pray for us.

My Father, the Hour is Come. What hour is this? The hour in which the long series of prophecies, visions, types and figures, was accomplished. This was the center in which they all met, the point toward which they had been verging for so many generations. The law and the prophets were now standing at the foot of the cross doing homage. Moses and Aaron were now bearing the Ark. David and Elijah were presenting the oracle of Testimony. In this hour all rites, ceremonies, types, and symbols, receive their consummation. The hour in which he was to undergo his immersion in sufferings. The hour in which the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, and rocks were to be sundered. The hour in which the sun was to draw a veil over his face, and refuse to look upon the horrid scene of his bitter sufferings. The hour in which he was to clothe himself with zeal as a cloak to tread the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. There hangs all human hope.

That veil supports the falling universe. Aftersitting under the cold, dark clouds of death, he arose in the morning of his resurrection, brilliant, magnificent and glorious, no more to bleed, no more to die. He was dead; he is alive he lives forevermore. Various are the methods by which men have sought to obtain eternal life, but the method of obtaining it may be found in the third verse of this prayer, as distinguished from Judaism, Idolatry, philosophy, Mahometanism, and Deism. This is eternal life, to know this the only true God, and Jesus thy apostle. The Gentiles worship many gods, but Christians worship one living and true God, through the one only Mediator, Jesus Christ. The Jew, the Musselman, the Deist, and others pretend to worship God without a Mediator. The Christian comes to God through the death, the resurrection and intercession of Jesus Christ. The knowledge of God, our Father, is to be obtained principally from the Jewish oracles. The knowledge of Jesus Christ, our Lord, is to be obtained chiefly from the New Testament Scriptures. To know Jesus Christ is to believe in him as the Messiah, the Saviour, the Son of God; it is to love him, obey him, worship him, adore and praise him as the Chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely. It is to commit our all to him. They that know thy name will put their trust in thee. It is to honor the Son by honoring his work, his mission, his death, his mediation, his ordinances, and his word. The word glorify holds a most conspicuous place in this part or first division of this prayer. Baysle and sons say the Greek word doxazon in the New Testament, signifies to adore, to invest with dignity or majesty. Rom. i. 21. To invest with dignity or majesty. 2 Cor. iii. 19. Hebrews v. 5. To cause a manifestation of dignity, excellence, or majesty. John xii. 28 xiii. 32. To glorify by an admission to a state of bliss, to beatify. Rom. viii. 30. Dr. MacKnight
in his note on Rom. i, 21, says to glorify one is to think of him frequently with esteem, and to pay him that outward respect both in speech and action which is due to the worthiness of his character. To glorify God, therefore, is first to think highly of him, to speak of him with reverence, to worship him publicly as the Maker and Governor of the universe, of which worship a principal part is to give him thanks as the author of all the good things mankind enjoy.

To glorify, means in various parts of the New Testament, to render illustrious, eminent to exalt, to dignify. John xi. 4. Lazarus' sickness was to glorify God. John xii. 23-28. The resurrection and exaltation of Christ, are there spoken of, also John xiii. 31-32. John xiv. 1-3. Christ there speaks of Peter's death, by which he would glorify God. God heard and answered this part of our Savior's prayer and glorified him by sustaining him in life and in death; by raising him from the dead by his ascension, by his enthronization and exaltation at his right hand, by giving into his hands all authority in heaven and on earth; by commanding all the angelic hosts to do him homage by sending down the Holy Spirit upon the apostles to enable them to preach the gospel infallibly and effectually, by his return to earth to raise the dead and to introduce the spiritual seed into the heavenly country, and to judge the living and the dead at the last day. The first part of the prayer has been answered in the glorification of the Son of God before men and angels. Who so illustrious is he? Who has conquered so many hearts as he? Who has employed so many tongues as he to celebrate his praises?

These words spake Jesus, and then closed the whole discourse with a solemn prayer to God in which he asked that he might be reinstated in that original glory which he enjoyed with God before the world was made. The words here referred to are the words of his consolatory discourse in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of John's gospel, and also a part of the thirteenth chapter, and is one of the longest discourses our Savior ever delivered. This is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. The knowledge of God is absolutely necessary to man's well-being in this world, and to his eternal happiness, and without which unspeakable misery will be his portion in the other world. These things are plain from our Saviour's words in the third verse, and from the words of Paul in 2 Thes. i. 7, 8. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Again, Jeremiah ix. 23, 24. Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, but let him glory that he understands and knows me. God frequently upbraids his ancient people for the want of this knowledge; Is. i. 3. The ox knows his owner, but Israel doth not know, my people do not consider, they have no understanding.—Again, by Hosea, he says: my people are destroyed for the lack of knowledge. This knowledge is to be obtained principally from two books: the book of God's word, and the book of God's creatures. These two books are physicians of the mind. Thou hast known the Holy Scriptures from a child which are able to make thee wise to salvation. All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God. II Tim. iii. 16.

The law or word of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. Psalm 19. The law of thy mouth is better to me than thousands of gold and silver. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter than honey, yea, than the droppings of the honey combs. The merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. It is more precious than rubies, and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared to it. Psalms 19-119-72-103. Psalm iii. 14, 15. How sweet are thy words to my taste, yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth. God's words are ancient, authoritative, necessary, perfect, pure, inspired, infallible, plain, clear, efficacious, and useful. What profitable los-
sons may be learned from the consideration of angels, demons, and men of all colors, languages and nations? What by the heavens, earth, air, water, fire? What by frost, snow, heat, drought, moisture, night and day? What by seedtime, harvest, summer, winter? This is a book of many volumes a whole library. Some of them teach us the power, wisdom, goodness and providence of God. Others humility, patience, obedience, diligence, sobriety, love and gratitude. The divine writers made much better and greater use of the book of God’s creatures than the moderns do. See Moses, the Prophet, David, and our Savior, the birds, lilies and foxes. They made better use of the Bible than the moderns do. These hints may suffice. It may be asked, why did our Savior first pray for himself? I answer, because he is the Foundation of the superstructure of human redemption—he is the foundation of the most ancient, deeplaid, capacious, august, sublime, and important temple ever erected. The government is on his shoulders. The two ends of the arch stand on him.—This was predicted anciently. Psalm 118, 22-23. The stone which the builders refused is become the head one of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing and is marvelous in our eyes. This passage is quoted some five or six times in the New Testament, and is applied to our Savior. Math. xxi. 42 to 46. Mark xii. 10. Luke xx. 17. Acts iv. 11. Ephes. ii. 20. First Peter ii. 4. Neither is there salvation in any other, says Peter. Paul says other foundation can no man lay for union and salvation. Paul calls him the aneogonaos, the bottom corner stone, uniting and holding together the two sides of this grand temple of human redemption, composed of Jews and Gentiles. The sum and substance of the New Testament, applications and expositions, is that Jesus Christ is the stone here mentioned; that he was rejected and set at naught by the chief priests and Pharisees, the then builders of the church; but that being chosen of God, and precious to him, this most valuable stone, thus despised and rejected of men, thus thrown among the rubbish and buried in it, was at length from such a state exalted to be the chief stone in the building, the main support in the edifice, and a center of union for Jew and Gentile, the two parts of which this temple consisted; that this was the work of God and the admiration of men. And what can be more truly marvellous than that a person put to death as a malefactor, and laid in the grave, should from thence rise immortal and become the head of an immortal society: should ascend into heaven, be invested with power, and crowned with glory; and should prepare a way for the sons of Adam to follow him into those mansions of eternal bliss. The day in which Christ arose from the dead may be called the day which Jehovah has made. There is another prediction which we will cite as referring to this foundation for the union of Christians. Isaiah xxviii. 16. Therefore thus says the Lord God, behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation. Old Zion, in Jerusalem, was a type of the Christian church—the stone laid was Jesus Christ, by the twelve apostles on the day of Pentecost, in the city of Jerusalem, and the apostles themselves were laid on this sure foundation, then a hundred and twenty Jewish stones or believers, then three thousand, and then five thousand, then great multitudes, and then the Samaritans, Ethiopians and Gentiles. Christ said he would build his congregation on this foundation, that he was the Son of the living God, the souls of men are built on him by faith in him and obedience to all his commands and precepts. All the apostolic congregations were built upon Jesus Christ by faith and baptism, such as the mother and model congregation in Jerusalem, in Rome, in Corinth, in Ephesus, in Collosse, in Phillippi, and throughout the Roman Empire. I refer to the Acts of the Apostles, and to the epistles to prove that all the primitive church and Christians were built on this foundation by faith and baptism, and were intelligent, united and happy, and thus this part of the prayer was fully answered; Jesus Christ was glorified by their union on himself.
The first division that we read of at Corinth was not about doctrines or orthodoxy, but it was on account of undue attachment to leaders—Paul, Apollos, and Cephas as it is now. Now men say they are of Luther's party, Calvin's, and Wesley's and so on through the whole list. Christ is not glorified in this way, but dishonored, and great injury is done to his cause. As God has glorified his son in the eyes of men and angels, let us glorify him by building all our hopes of pardon, peace, acceptance and everlasting life on his gospel, his life, his resurrection and intercession at God's right hand; by our union with and love of each other, and by our devotion to every part of his will, and thus men will see our love of each other, and our good action, and will glorify our Father in heaven.

TO BE CONTINUED.

OPINIONISM.
BY ELDER A. RAINES.

"Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye; but not to doubtful disputations." Rom. xiv. 1.

This is a highly important portion of holy writ; but, as it is given in the common translation, its meaning is almost wholly lost. We shall, in the first place, seek a correct translation of the passage, and then, secondly, show its bearing, or application.

Brother Campbell's note on this passage, is worth the attention of our readers. Family Testament, 66 p.: "Him that is weak in the faith, receive you, but not in order to the strifes of disputations." McKnight. "Receive unto fellowship him who is weak in the faith, without regard to differences of opinion." Thomson. "Him that is weak in the faith receive with kindness; not so as to increase his scrupulous surprisings." Stuart. "Without regard to any difference of opinion." Anonymous translation. Literally it reads, "Receive him who is weak in the faith, without any regard to nice distinc-

tions of reasoning among yourselves." Dialogismos means more than reasoning; for logismos, without the dia, signifies reasoning. Hence the word dialogue means not merely to discourse, but a discourse between two.

Diakrisis literally denotes discrimination, distinguishing, or adjudication. Such being the literal import of the terms, the context shows in what sense they are to be received in this passage. "For one believeth this—another that," shows that these private thoughts, opinions, or persuasions, ought not to interrupt communion. Hence, the strong in the faith are commanded to receive the weak, without regard or affection for these differences of conclusions, reasonings, or opinions.

Let the reader mark the difference between "weak in faith" and "weak in the faith." It is not uncommon to find persons strong in faith, and weak in the faith; and weak in faith, though strong in the faith. Many a Christian reposes strong faith in the promises of God, who is, nevertheless, weak in the faith; or whose knowledge of Christian liberty is so limited as to render him as squeamish in conscience as a dyspeptic in ailments. Some, also, have very enlarged views of the Christian system, who are yet weak in faith as it respects confidence in all God's promises.

Dr. A. Clarke's note on this passage is as follows: "These words have been variously translated and understood. Dr. Whitby thinks the sense of them to be this, 'not discriminating them by their inward thoughts.' Do not reject any from your Christian communion, because of their particular sentiments on things which are in themselves indifferent. Do not curiously inquire into their religious scruples, nor condemn them on that account. Entertain a brother of this kind rather with what may profit his soul, than with curious disquisitions on speculative points of doctrine. A good lesson," says the doctor, and so say we, "for modern Christians in general."

Having now given, not only the critique of A. Campbell on this passage, but also
the renderings of several other learned men, which substantially accord with Mr. Campbell's view, we shall, in conclusion of this part of our essay, permit Mr. Hodge, a dyed-in-the-wool old school Presbyterian, of Princeton College, to give us his view of this passage. "The former of the two important words of this clause means: the faculty of discrimination, 1st. Cor. xii. 10, the act of discerning, Heb. v. 14, and then adjudication, judgment. It may also signify doubt, or inward conflict: see the use of the verb in chapter iv. 20. It is taken in this sense in our version, not to the doubtfulsness of disputes, that is, not for the purpose of doubtful disputations. The word rendered disputations, means also thoughts, opinions. The clause may therefore mean, not to the judging of (his) opinions, that is, not for the purpose of judging his opinions; do not act the part of a judge over him. This sense seems preferable on account of the context, as Paul enforces this direction by showing them that they had no right to sit in judgment on their brethren in such matters."

That contentsions about certain matters of opinion are prohibited in this passage, is evident; and that these Christians were commanded to receive or fellowship one with another, notwithstanding their differences of opinion, is also equally evident. The grand question, therefore, comes up—To what extent may opinions be tolerated? We answer, that the principle established by Paul, in this passage, requires of all Christian congregations, that they receive, and fellowship, and love, all persons who act in the departments of piety and morality in subordination to the Christian institution, whose opinions are not plainly subversive of the faith of the gospel. We say, plainly subversive, because if we refuse to receive a person, or, after we receive him, exclude him from the congregation on account of his opinions, whose opinions are not plainly subversive of the faith, we exclude him by virtue of our opinions, and not by the law of Christ; and, therefore, make our opinions paramount to the law, and subversive of it; and, consequently, become, ourselves, the proper subjects of censure!

Taking it for granted, then, that it is established, that all persons are to be received and retained, whose deportment is Christian, irrespective of their opinions, whose opinions do not subvert the faith, the next step which perhaps we ought to take, in this investigation, is, to ascertain, whether persons whose opinions subvert the faith, are to be excluded from the fellowship of Christians. The proof of this point is just as obvious and conclusive as is the proof, in the scriptures, that drunkards, and revilers, and extortioners, and misers, are to be excommunicated. To this effect, is Paul to Timothy, "Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith, have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymenius and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme. 1st Tim. i. 19, 20. And again, "But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is Hymenius and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." 2d Tim. ii. 16-18.

From the passages just quoted, it appears that Alexander, Hymenius and Philetus, had been teaching that the resurrection had past. This, if they were honest, was their opinion. But it was an opinion that put itself in positive and obvious conflict with the word or testimony of God, which every where declared the general resurrection to be future. It was therefore subversive of the faith. The teaching of this doctrine overthrew the faith of some—of all who believed the resurrection to be past. Their faith was shipwrecked. The effects of the doctrine are assimilated to those of a canker. This opinion, therefore, was a most pernicious and intolerable opinion; so much so, that the advocates of it deserved the severest censure, and even exclusion from the church. Thus, our principle is established
—that opinions and opinionists that plainly oppose any fundamental testimony of Christianity, are to be repudiated by all the orderly subjects of Messiah's kingdom. We say it is established, because, as the law of Christ required the exclusion from his church of those who taught that the resurrection was past, and, as the apostle represents the faith of those who believed this doctrine as shipwrecked or overthrown, it follows of necessity that the same reason must obtain in every similar case, that is, in every case in which our opinions certainly conflict with the obvious testimonies of God's word.

We are not ignorant of the fact, that we have now placed ourself in the midst of whizzing and buzzing difficulties, more numerous than the hairs of our head. But if we are in the midst of difficulties, it must be obvious to all the intelligent, that Christianity itself is also equally involved. We have proved, that to a certain extent, opinions which conflict with one another, are to be tolerated; and we have also proved that opinions, which conflict with, or subvert the faith of the gospel, are not to be tolerated. These positions, or conclusions, therefore, are not opinions, but facts; and if facts, be the difficulties which surround us what they may, these facts are not to be departed from, but adhered to, as solemn, as essential verities of our holy religion. Is it not probable, therefore, that the difficulties of our subject are more imaginary than real—that they are perversities which have grown out of, and inseparably attach themselves to sectarianism, rather than Christianity?

One difficulty, which it has been our lot frequently to encounter, is in the question, "Where does faith end, and where do opinions begin?" We answer, where testimony ends and inference begins. This difficulty, however, might be further urged, by the question, "Where does testimony end and inference begin?" We answer, that frequently it may be difficult and even impossible to ascertain precisely the terminating point of testimony. Grant this, then, and what follows? It is equally difficult for a Christian to ascertain his practical duty in the whole of its minute details. "It is required of every servant according to his ability." This is as true in faith as it is in practice. Where, then, testimony on any point, is to any extent obscure, so that its meaning is uncertain, we are just so far beyond the line of faith, and within the territory of opinions; and all that is necessary, in all such cases, is that we use our best efforts, in order to know the whole truth, and forbear one another in love, to the whole extent of our differences in opinion, in subordination to that law which stands at the head of this article.

If illustrations were necessary, in order to convey fully our meaning, we have them in abundance. Take one from that fundamental of sectarian orthodoxy denominated the trinity. Now that there is a Father, and a Son, and a Holy Spirit, and that these three are, in some sense, one, is a truth of unquestionable scripture testimony. It is as clear as a sun-beam. But how these three can be one, and this one three, seems to be a puzzle that has confounded the minds of all who have attempted to penetrate its mysteries. Hence, we have extant, no less than nine or ten systems of Trinitarianism, and perhaps as many systems of Unitarianism! Now, the question is, can anyone of these systematizers say, that his system is certainly divine? If he can not, in truth, say this, then his system is more or less false; and if a system of opinions may be, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, more or less false; and if so, then those who hold it as fundamental, certainly make opinions—the mere inferences and deductions of erring men, fundamental. They make their fallible deductions, and in many cases their blind errors, paramount to the law of God. It is thus that popery was born; and in this atmosphere, composed of the principles of opinionism, it, and every other sectarianism in christendom, lives, and moves, and has its being.

Take another point for the sake of illus-
A man says that Christ is the Son of Joseph. Is this man to be received into the church of Christ?—or if received, is he, after his opinions have come to light, to be retained in the congregation? We answer, emphatically in the negative. And why shall he not be retained? Because he as plainly subverts the faith, as did those who said "the resurrection is already past;" for, it is no more clearly revealed in the scriptures that the general resurrection is future, than it is that God is the Father of Jesus, through the power of his Spirit, by Mary.

It should not be forgotten, in this investigation, that those who term themselves evangelical, and who profess to hold all the fundamentals of Christianity, need as much forbearance as we do, or the most of those whom they denominate heretics. What do you of the orthodox doctrine that God died? Do they not believe and sing that "God the mighty Maker died, for man the creature's sin?" Can any man find, within all the ranks of heresy, or even in the golden bible of the Mormons, a more dark, impossible, and fundamental error than this! It is an infinite falsehood! and it conflicts directly with the faith of the Christian on this point, which is that "God only hath immortality," and that "He is without variableness or the shadow of a change;" consequently, that he never died! Was the universe three days and three nights without a God? The supposition is monstrous!! Add to this, another orthodox fundamental, "that Jesus is the eternal Son of God!" Eternal Son! This as directly conflicts with the testimony of God, as does the saying that he is, the son of Joseph. The word Son necessarily implies the antecedent existence of one who becomes the Father. To speak, therefore, of eternal Son an infinite absurdity, a palpable contradiction in terms and in fact, and a subverting of the testimony (Luke i. 35.) which declares that he was the Son of God by Mary. Ye orthodox, who live in glass houses, why so imprudent as to throw stones? Why speak ye of the errors of those whom ye denominate Arians, with so much contempt and superciliousness, since it must be apparent to all the intelligent and impartial, that whatever may be the errors of those termed Arians, they hold no errors so palpably and enormously absurd as are those to which we have just adverted.

The fact that the Christian religion has been founded on facts, testimony, and faith, and not on inferences, or matters of opinion, is, to our mind, one of the conclusive evidences of its divine origin. Religions of human origin have universally been religions of opinion; and, consequently, more calculated to divide, than to unite the human family. If, then, the Christian religion had been of human origin, it too would have been a religion of opinions. But, as it is a religion of facts or faith, the overwhelming probability, from this source alone, is, that it is divine. Its body is revealed truth; its soul is love divine. Its spirit enchains all holy angelic intelligences, in one body, to one center, God in Christ; and binds, as by a mighty centripetal force, all men, who drink into its intelligence, to the same grand point of attraction. Opinionism scatters the wheat, as chaff is scattered by the whirlwind. In the scheme of opinionism we see the wisdom of men, which is foolishness: in the facts of the gospel, the wisdom and power of God.

For various reasons, a few only of which we shall name at present, it is impossible that men entertain the same opinions upon any subject. The minds of men are not organized alike; and, therefore, can not think alike. Besides, men are to be regarded under a great diversity of circumstances. Some minds are more highly cultivated than others. There is, perhaps, as great a diversity in the influences, considered in all their modifications, by which a diversity of opinions obtains, as in the original organization of human minds. Hence, we see men differing on every subject—agriculture, horticulture, law, medicine, government. If a newly invented plough is presented to two farmers, in order that they
may decide on its merits, ten to one if they
do not differ. And so it is to the end of
the chapter. And this is a wise arrange-
ment of God. Our Creator delights in har-
monious variety. Look at the whole mate-
rial universe! We perceive no two things
that are precisely alike. Just so it is in
the world of mind. There is an extensive
mental, as physical variety. Were it not
so, the world of mind would stagnate. Men
would all follow the same vocation. There
could be no mental collisions, by which our
intellect is constantly being whetted to a
keen edge, and brightened. And we would
lose much in the want of the exercise of
Christian forbearance, in so far as a diversi-
ty of opinions is concerned. But into the
midst of all this variety, physical and men-
tal, God has handed down a religion of well
defined facts and testimonies, in the unity
of the faith and spirit of which, his rational
offspring may be united in the enjoymen-
t of all opinions which are not plainly subver-
sive of the faith. How admirable is this
scheme! How God-like! How worthy of
all acceptation!

We shall conclude this number, by
warning our own brethren against opinion-
ism. If we mistake not, some of them
much need, not only to be warned, but to
acquaint themselves thoroughly with the
law of Christ, as respects faith and opin-
ion; for, if we are right in what we have
written on this subject, the man among us,
who sows discord among brethren, by the
propagation of any opinion whatever, is a
sectarian; and is, perhaps, more inexces-
sibly so, than are others; having had a better
opportunity to learn his duty.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION—
NO. V.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING—NO. III.

Having in preceding articles noticed the
learned, doctrinal and partisan preachers,
and the learned, moral and political lec-
turers, it is appropriate to proceed to the
old-fashioned called and sent preachers.
This class outnumbered the other classes
put together, thirty years ago; and, while
it was vastly less accomplished, it was more
pious and decidedly better than either of
the other classes. They, as a class, were
sincere men. They believed they were spe-
cially called and sent, to use their own lan-
guage, "by the Holy Ghost," and that any
man who dared to question their "divine
call to the ministry," as they expressed it,
was nothing short of an infidel. They nev-
er stopped to look into the Bible to see
whether there was anything about men be-
ing "called by the Holy Ghost to preach
the gospel," or to enquire how, or by whom,
even the apostles were called, or qualified.
They assumed that they had "a divine call,"
and not only claimed to be called as was
Aaron, but thought the claim proved be-
yond all contradiction, when they would
quote the words, "How can he preach ex-
cept he be sent?" Their call consisted
mainly in an intense "desire to save souls,
" as they expressed it. Some, however,
claimed to have heard a voice, speaking
audibly and calling them. Others had a
very remarkable and impressive dream,
which they interpreted to be a call to preach.
The larger portion of them, however, were
simply impressed by their great love to the
Savior and their fellow-men, with an ardent
desire to do good, in saving souls. Still,
you were all called, they believed, and ap-
p lied to themselves the language, "Wo is
me if I preach not the gospel."

About the most shrewd thing these men
were in the habit of doing, when their di-
vine call was questioned by other preachers,
was to retort, that it was not strange they did not believe in the call to the ministry, for the Lord evidently had not called them, and they supposed somebody else was called, and they had gone. These men as sincerely believed themselves called, as was Aaron, as were the apostles and inspired, as they believed the Bible. They frequently would, when introducing their discourses, tell their hearers that they did not know what they would say, but what the Spirit gave them, they would give it to the people. They would quote and apply to themselves the injunction of the Savior to the apostles, not to meditate beforehand what they would say, and appropriate to themselves the promise, "The Holy Spirit shall speak in you." They would frequently receive calls to go to distant states or countries, and in compliance with these calls, start on long, tedious and difficult journeys, without means and under the most unfavorable circumstances, and frequently failed to reach the place to which they believed the Lord had called them. Many were the difficulties they encountered, the disappointments to which they were subjected and the adversities they endured. Nothing short of the solemn delusion that they were specially called and sent to preach the gospel, could have impelled them on in their work. Many absurdities, inconsistencies and things for which they could not account, would come upon their minds. Still, no one of their number, and no company of them had light enough to discover where the difficulty was, or how to relieve themselves. Some of the difficulties that would come into the minds of the more thinking and reflective were the following:

1. If they were called and sent, as the apostles were, why did they not all preach the same thing as the apostles did? Why were they not all in fellowship with each other as the apostles were? If they were inspired, and spoke as the Holy Spirit gave them utterance, why did they not all speak the same thing? Why were they, as they were known to be, frequently found opposing each other, and preaching things directly adverse to each other? One party could not call in question the divine call of another party, for their calls all stood upon the same basis, and were sustained by the same evidence—the testimony of the preacher's own tongue. He said he was called. One man could say he was called as loud as another. No one claimed more loudly or boldly to be called, than Jo. Smith, the founder of Mormonism.

2. They could not well see, if the Lord had called them, why there were so many not qualified, utterly ignorant, and stupid men, wholly incompetent and incapable to do the work to which they professed to be called. Still, they had their apologies for even this. Sometimes they would quote in extenuation of this difficulty, that the Lord had chosen the weak things of this world to confound the mighty. This appeared to suit well enough, so far as the weak things of this world were concerned, but the trouble was, they did not confound the mighty. Sometimes they would tell some poor man who believed as seriously as any of them that he was called, but who had not the first qualification, and who literally could not have preached if the fate of the world depended on it, that "somebody else was called and he had gone." Still, there stood the difficulty; he had as loud a call as any man, and, indeed, louder, for there was some truth in the rather rough saying, "the greater the fool the louder the call." Not only did this class have as loud a call to preach as any, but precisely the same evidence of it—their own testimony—they said they were called.

3. In some churches, they had and still have some kind of tribunal, to judge of the divine call, and see if they "have gifts as well as grace," as it is expressed in one little book, and if, on investigation, it is found that the Lord has made a mistake and given grace where there are no gifts, the mistake is corrected, and the person is decided not called!

4. Another serious difficulty these specially called and sent men encountered, was that they frequently found men, not
not called, but making no pretense to

to a call, who would utterly confound, confuse
and put them to flight. This might be re-
garded as a matter of but little importance,
if these preachers had not professed to be
inspired; speaking as the Holy Spirit gave
them utterance; having the Holy Spirit to
guide them into all truth; but under
these pretensions, it represented not merely
the man as defeated, but the Holy Spirit,
who was speaking in him!

5. These men found infidels, who had
read a few books written by unbelievers,
and who soon found that they could make
no defense of the Bible, or any offset to
their infidel objections to the truth of the
Bible. This satisfied infidels that their
pretensions were without foundation, and
emboldened them in their unbelief, their
objections to the Bible and hardness of
heart. It led them to conclude that the
professions of the apostles were of the
same kind or no better, and no pen can re-
count the evil that was occurring and the
rapidly spreading infidelity in all quarters
of the land.

6. Another difficulty these men encoun-
tered, was that in spite of all their profes-
sions to speak whatever the Spirit gave
them, and their pretensions not to meditate
beforehand what they would say, they would
find themselves and each other meditating,
studying and preparing their sermons. It was
difficult for them to reconcile their pretension,
that they did not study what they would say,
with what they knew to be fact—that they
did, despite all their pretensions to the con-
trary, meditate beforehand what they should
say. This was the hardest part for their
brethren and the people, who heard them
preach the same sermons, almost word for
word, and knew most positively that they
did study some beforehand, though not half
enough to preach well, to get along with,
when they would hear them claiming to
speak as the Spirit gave them utterance.
Still, they had their method of managing
troubles of this sort, and when men of sense
would tell them that they could not understand
them, they would reply, "The natural man
receive not the things of the Spirit, neith-
er indeed can he know them, for they are
spiritually discerned." And, again, "We
have the Spirit of Christ, and the spirit
searcheth all things, yea the deep things of
God." If this would not silence the ob-
jector, they would quote to him, "The
wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou
heardest the sound thereof, but canst not tell
whence it cometh nor whither it goeth, so
is every one that is born of the Spirit."
In this way, they generally sent their an-
tagonists away either under the impression
that they had no right to attempt to know
anything on such subjects, or that the whole
claim for religion is an imposition.

Many of the class of men here treated of
were very illiterate, possessing scarcely any
knowledge of the history of the Bible, the
church or the world, and of the most ordi-
nary natural ability and understanding.
They did not understand their own tongue
or any other, human nature, or the customs
of their own country or time, or any other.
Yet these men had a fast hold upon the
hearts of the masses of the people, espe-
cially in the country, and it was difficult to
supersede them with anything better. They
had indoctrinated the whole land in the be-
lief of their divine call to the ministry, and
a large proportion of them were known to
be honest men, of good character, and they
were supposed to possess an immense
amount of spiritual light. The man that
dared to question their claims, their pre-
tensions and assumptions, was regarded as
a dangerous man, not only unsettling the
faith of the people in their ministry, their
own profession, but unsettling their confi-
dence in the salvation of their friends who
were dead, and, as they confidently be-
lieved, gone to heaven. This roused every
prejudice, every fear, and stopped thousands
of ears to such an extent that they would
listen to no man or even regard any one as
better than an infidel, who would dare to
say aught against the unreasonable and un-
warrantable pretensions of these men.
Still, the work had to be done, unpleasant
as it was, or the cause must continue to suf-
The first thing, or among the first, was to strip these sincere but misguided men of their absurd and mischievous assumptions, in commencing the great work of reformation. This was done, and is still done, where men making the same pretensions are found, by urging such considerations as the following:

1. These men were not called as the apostles were. The Lord appeared to the apostles in person, and called them with his own voice, saying, "Come, follow thou me." The Lord has not appeared to any man, or set of men, in his own person, and called them in the same way—with his own voice.

2. There are no men in our day qualified as the apostles were. The Lord took the twelve apostles under his special charge and personal instruction for about three years and a half, during his lifetime. He then went to heaven, was crowned—crowned Lord of all and King of kings; and, in miraculous and visible form, openly and publicly, according to his promise, sent the Holy Spirit upon them, to inspire them, endow them with power from on high and guide them into all truth. They were thus enabled to speak in tongues they had never learned, guided and miraculously enabled to stand before governors, kings and the other mighty ones of earth. They were humble men, illiterate and weak before they were inspired, but lacked no wisdom, learning or power, from that time forward. Our modern called and sent men have never been in company with the apostles, had the three and a half years instruction in the same way, been endowed with any supernatural power or wisdom; nor have they ever yet been enabled to speak in foreign languages, and the most of them, not even in their mother tongue anything like accurately.

3. There are no men in our time who have been sent in the same manner as the apostles were. The Lord appeared to them in person, and gave them their commission—commanded them to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"—to "Go and disciple all nations."

4. Most important of all, the Lord gave the apostles miraculous power by which they could prove that the Lord had sent them. They could open the eyes of the blind, give hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, and health to the sick. They would raise men from the dead, smite men with blindness and death, or drink deadly poison without harm. These indisputable attestations of their apostleship are all wanting on the part of our modern called and sent men. They have not a single mark of apostleship, but are lacking in every particular.

If then, our modern called and sent men, were not called in the same way the apostles were, qualified in the same way, sent in the same way, and carried not the same evidence of their divine call, it is evident that they possess no such call and are nothing but uninspired men. When they are brought down to this—to mere uninspired men—so that there is nothing but men to look at, to think of and talk about, there is but little left, for they are but ordinary men—not superior in any sense.

We have to turn our attention in some other direction, if we would find authorized preachers, than to those professing to be apostles, successors of the apostles, or men called and sent as they were. We have none of this description now, and all claiming it are deluded, or aiming to delude others.

But there is an authorized ministry in our time, divinely authorized, called and sent, not as the apostles were, nor are they apostles, nor inspired, nor workers of miracles, but humble, honest and faithful preachers of the things they have learned of the apostles. They are resurrecting the old gospel preached by the apostles, preaching it and enforcing it on the world. By the blessing of the Lord, they will restore it in all its fullness, and the people will rejoice in it as in days of old. This class, if the Lord will, shall be set out in our next, and their authority given for preaching.
The darkest hour in the night of Europe is an era respecting which historians are not even yet agreed. It has been regarded by many as being in the tenth century. One or two other writers consider the seventh or eighth century to be the lowest in point of depression, or the nadir of the human mind; and they suppose that its movement in advance began with Charlemagne, while England can never forget her own Alfred the Great. A few moderns, too fastidious, or by no means so affected by the gloom and barbarity of the middle ages, profess to be tender of allowance as to the extent of this darkness, and would fondly persuade us to adopt a more cheerful retrospect. But speaking, generally, with reference to the people at large, the entire period, from the fifth or sixth to the fourteenth century, presents, at the best, but a tedious and dreary interval in the history of the human mind. Individual scholars, indeed, like stars which shed their light on the surrounding gloom, there were ever; and wherever there existed any marked regard for sacred writ, in the vernacular tongue, there the life-spark of Christianity was preserved. The Albigenses, the Waldenses, and other parties, might be adduced in proof; the persecution and dispersion of whom, had considerable influence in diffusing the light which its enemies labored to extinguish.

It was not, however, till after a long and profound sleep throughout the dreams and visions of the middle ages, that the human mind was at last effectually roused to action; and in none of the countries throughout Europe more decidedly than in Italy and England. But still, for some great moral purpose, worthy of infinite wisdom, and to be afterwards disclosed, that mind, throughout all these western kingdoms, was first to be permitted to discover what was the utmost vigor of its native strength.

First came the age of the chisel, and the painter's pencil, and the pen, not to say of the music of the human voice. Those stupendous fabrics, which began to be erected from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, in which the massive dullness of the Lombards, was giving way to the influence of the Saracens of Spain, still stand out in proof, that many hands were already busy, under the guidance of some presiding ingenious mind. Literature and the fine arts, more especially classical learning, painting, and sculpture, were then to enjoy that triumph, the spoils of which now adorn the walls of every palace, as well as the cabinets and libraries, the galleries and public rooms of every city in Europe. This triumph, too, must take place in Italy, or in the very seat of that extraordinary power which had ruled for ages, with unmeasured sway, over all the West; for, throughout the long preceding night, it could never be said that Rome herself had been either asleep or inactive. The Eternal City, as it was styled, the Lady of Kingdoms, like the Assyrian of old, having "found out as a nest the riches of the people; as one gathereth eggs that are left, so had she gathered all the earth;" and, generally speaking, it was only here and there that some solitary individual "moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped."

There was, however, one singular peculiarity belonging to this power. Ruling over the mind, its vigor seemed to increase with its remoteness from the seat of government, and the thunders of the Vatican, unlike those of nature, often struck terror in proportion to the distance at which they were heard. This much at least is certain, that though Great Britain and Ireland formed the utmost confines of that power on the west, there was no country between these islands and Italy where the Roman Pontiff felt such confidence of his strength, nor one which was more harassed and oppressed by his pecuniary exactions. The Western states of Europe, even the most
remote, had, indeed, all couched down un-
der their burdens, and that for ages, before
the full claims of the Rota, or pontifical
conclave, were admitted upon Italian ground.
Nor is this mystery inexplicable. Kings,
however despotic, had by degrees been
moulded to subjection; but the stern Re-
publies of Italy, composed of a metal least
of all malleable, long remained hard, un-
bending, and most vexatious neighbors. To
say nothing of Florence, Pisa, or Genoa, it
is well known that even in the diocese of
Italy, properly so called, the Milanese had
resisted the claims of the Pontiff down to
the eleventh century; and during the twelfth,
the country was covered with cities still
fighting for liberty; but that, so very near
to Rome, there should have been such a
power or form of government as that of
Venice, at once arrests attention as by far
the most extraordinary point in European
history. As this remarkable state, less
than two hundred and fifty miles distant
from Rome itself, “arose before the old em-
pire of Rome was swept away, endured
through the barbarism of the northern
irruptions, as well as through all the dark-
ness ensuing, and was only extinguished by
Napoleon within our own times, its history
forms a connecting chain, if not the only
one that can now be traced, between the
Europe of the Romans, of the middle ages,
and of modern history.” With its internal
feuds we do not interfere; but no survey,
however brief, can be complete where Ve-
nice is overlooked.

An insignificant band of fugitives, in the
fifth century, took possession of the rocks
and little islands on the North-West shores
of the Adriatic sea. Cut off from all pos-
sessions on the mainland, not possessing
one foot of land there for eight hundred
years, but surrounded by their own marsh-
es, they were at first ruled by magistrates
sent down from Padua. This people, re-
solved to provide for their own security,
form a government for themselves! “De-
testation of the despotic authority or gov-
ernment of one man, and an inflexible de-
termination to remain a separate and dis-
tinct people, were the two principles by
which the Venetians were guided, and upon
which they continued to act with the stead-
iness and success of a natural principle.”

At the close of the seventh century, indeed,
they elected a chief magistrate, (the Doge,
Dux, or Duke,) whose office was to contin-
ue for life, and the people to choose his
successor; but his powers, though vast,
were rendered next to nominal by those of
the Council and the other magistrates.
Without his Council the Doge durst not
open an official letter, and much less do any
thing official. Yet here, and at a moment
when every prince in Europe was a vassal
to the Emperor, either of the East or West,
the Venetians, unsubdued, were rising to
greater opulence and strength. Though
Pepin fought against them with all his
strength, they conquered, and put an end to
all claims on their allegiance; Charlemagne
had no choice left except to declare them
independent.

At a much later period when we turn to
Rome under successive Pontiffs, and their
insatiable thirst for power; while the Doge
of Venice convoked the people, whether
from the different islands or the districts of
the capital, for the purpose of choosing
their own pastors and bishops; not one of
whom, by fixed and original laws, could hold
any civil office, whether of honor or emolu-
ment; to him belonged the power of in-
stalling these Bishops, as well as of award-
ing all ecclesiastical punishments. The as-
sertion of such rights, of course, could not
be easily maintained, and more especially in
the neighborhood of a power which had
determined to overshadow all the earth:
but as the beginning of the thirteenth cen-
tury may be truly regarded as the twilight
of a better day, Venice, amidst her own
rocks in the sea, will serve as a contrast to
the entire surface of Europe, and prove the
extent to which she had still secured her in-
dependence.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

In our own country, at the commence-
ment of this century, poor King John was
actually promising to make his kingdom tributary to the Pontiff, with a proffer of not less than a thousand merks, or a sum equal to £20,000 now, over and above the old tribute: and although the Barons soon after wrested Magna Charta from him, to show how low the kingdom had sunk, we find the Pontiff, at this same John's request, annulling the proceedings. The great charters, it is true, were confirmed by his successor, Henry III.; but the power of Rome was growing every day during his fifty six years reign. It was then that the Pontiff was exclaiming—"Truly, England is our garden of delight! It is an unexhausted well! and where so much abounds, much may be acquired." No wonder that he thus exulted, when his income from England was three times as much as that of the king on the throne. But above all, in proof of the Pontiff's power towards the West, this was the era of that detestable persecution of the Albigenses, pursued with such hideous cruelty. The execrable measure, in which plunder was the grand object, was counselled, planned, and commanded by Rome. Now, if we seek for any relieving contrast throughout the entire century, it is to Italy itself that we must turn our eye. Even in the neighboring Republic of Florence, it is true, amidst the surrounding gloom, Dante had begun to sing, in his own style, about paradise and the infernal regions, not forgetting to intermingle certain severe allusions with his poem; and besides this, there was his treatise "Monarchia," distinctly hostile to the claims of Rome: but for the bolder contrast to the sentiments of all Europe, we must look to Venice. It is admitted that in the commenceinent of this century the Venetians had chosen to apply to Rome for an indulgence, but this was merely to facilitate a treaty with the Caliphs of Egypt. Eager to retain their commerce with the East Indies, they wished to open a communication between the Nile and the Red Sea; and had they succeeded, perhaps the trade might never have passed from their hands. Still, this application betrayed no disposition to bow allegiance. On the contrary, this ancient Republic had reigned, for more than two centuries, as Lords-paramount of the Adriatic: and although that gulf washed the shores of various States, those of the Roman Church among the number, not one of them dared to navigate it, or even fish in its waters, without a license from Venice, for which they paid a heavy tribute. When one sovereign Pontiff presumed to inquire, by what right they pretended to domineer there, the brief reply given was—"That sea is ours." But the sea would not suffice any longer as the bounds of their sovereignty; and, therefore, about the middle of this century, they began to acquire land. Arvi in Romagna was taken under their special protection, much in the same style as the provinces of India have since been taken under that of Britain. This place belonged to the Church, and that in the opinion of the Emperor; but even he said not a word. It so happened, too, that the Venetians did not approve of any ecclesiastic engaging in war, and if he did, at their hands he must abide the consequences. The Captains-General of the Pontiff's troops, were dignitaries of his Church. Such a prisoner being taken, with his crosier, scepter, and sword; the Venetians condemned him to ride, sitting backwards, on a mule, and proceeded by the common crier, proclaiming—"Behold the wicked priest, who displeased God in his life, and was taken in iniquity." Such a proceeding, in the year 1274, had no parallel in any other part of Europe. It was little more than seven years after this when the Pontiff, Martin IV., having, in his customary style, given the sovereignty of Naples to Charles of Anjou, and proclaimed a crusade against the lawful heir, chose also to excommunicate the Venetians because they would not unite in the outrage. But was the result similar to that which ensued, in all other nations? On the contrary, for three long years, no priests officiated, no prayers were offered in their churches, and without yielding, they allowed the Pontiff to die! His successor, Hono-
In the course of the fourteenth century, whether we look to Germany, to Italy,
our own country, the events are equally inter- esting and full of promise. Within the first of these, the influence of that singular confederation, called the "Hanse Towns," had begun to be felt. The league, by this time, included more than sixty cities. These had commerce for their common object or bond of union; but they were the germs of future freedom, and ultimately contributed, in no inferior degree, to the protection of individual rights. Thus early was Divine Providence in operation with a view to a better day. At the same time, nothing can be more natural than that an Italian author should claim for his country the precedence of all other nations, whether as the science of government, or the revival of learning. He is well entitled to speak out; and on account of the result, he ought to be first heard, not only in this, but more especially in the next, or the fifteenth century. "The science of governing men for their advantage," says one of the ablest native authorities, "of developing their individual faculties, intellectual and moral, for their greater happiness—that political philosophy, began in Europe only with the Italian Republics of the middle ages, and from thence diffused itself over other nations." Again, "The Italians, in the fourteenth century, discovered, as it were anew the ancient world; they felt an affinity of thoughts, hopes, and tastes, with the best Latin writers, which inspired them with the highest admiration. Petrarch, and particularly Boccaccio, passed from this study to that of Grecian antiquity; and on the solicitation of the latter, the Republic of Florence, in 1360, founded a chair of Grecian literature, the first in the West. A passion for erudition spread from one end of Italy to the other, with an ardor proportionable to the dark ignorance of the preceding centuries. It was imagined that all knowledge consisted in knowing and imitating the ancient masters. The highest glory was attached to classical learning; and Petrarch and Boccaccio attained a degree of celebrity, credit and power, unequalled by any other men in the middle ages—not by reason of those merits which we feel at the present day, but as the pontiffs and interpreters of antiquity."

"We owe to the learned of the fourteenth century, and to their school, a deep sentiment of gratitude. They discovered and rendered intelligible to us all the chefs d'œuvre of antiquity. Fragments only of classic works remained, scattered throughout Europe, and on the point of being lost. These learned men of Italy collected, collated, and explained them; without their antiquarian zeal, all the experience of past ages, all the models of taste, all the great works of genius; would never have reached us, and probably, without such guides, we should never have attained the point on which we now stand."

In thus writing, the author, of course, had in his eye, not only the close of the fourteenth, but the greater part of the fifteenth century, when Italy, in truth, became the garden of literature and the arts, the wonder and delightful resort of the learned throughout Europe. As a fact, it is of importance, not only to concede, but observe this, and let the precedence be fully understood as holding a place in the course of events about to transpire. The learning and refinement of Italy, about to assume that position in history which the wisdom of Greece had done in the days of old, must enjoy her long reign of a hundred and fifty years without any superior. Now that the human mind is waking up, let the Italian "imagine that all knowledge consisted in knowing and imitating the ancient masters," and "let the highest glory be attached to classical learning;" let the "chief works of antiquity be rendered intelligible," and the men of Italy "collect, collate, and explain them." In short; as Greece is coming to the assistance of Rome, and the great masters' must first rise to show the extent of their powers; since the former, at the commencement of the Christian era, had stood in a peculiar relation to the surrounding nations—so, let Italy now stand in the same relation to Europe. Distinguished for
classical learning, and first in the arts, if not the sciences, she claims to be the well-spring of all the lost civilized nations in the West. Minute criticism may here be dispensed with, nor does any admirer of the Sacred Volume need to object to the fullest concession. Let Dante and Petrarch for the moment, and Boccaccio and Poggio Bracciolini lead the way.

In all this, however, it must now be granted in return, there was literally nothing of Divine light, properly so called—no reverent, distinct approach to the Sacred Volume; and this becomes the more observable, as the only country in Europe to which we can look for this, was that which, of all others, was held in greatest contempt by Italy; to say nothing of its being at once the most distant from Rome, if not also the most oppressed by that power. This was no other than our native land. Bracciolini, the last of these Italian scholars, had actually visited it, and viewed this country with chagrin, if not disdain, when compared with the enthusiastic love of classical literature which polished and adorned his country.

Yes, so far as the revival of learning was concerned, it is worthy of particular notice that, in England, it was associated, even from this early period, with a special leaning towards the Oracles of God, and that on the part of several eminent men, all alike well known, not only at home, but as distant as Italy. Of these, in proof, we cannot omit to notice four—Robert Grosssteste, Richard Aungerville, Richard Fitzralph, and, above all, our own WICKLIFFE. The first of these, indeed, Grossteste, died as early as the year 1253, and, three years before that event, made no scruple, when preaching at Lyon before Innocent IV., to arraign his clergy, in the boldest terms, for their ignorance, and arrogance, and flagitious conduct. Now this was above an hundred years before the erection of Boccaccio's chair for Greek in Florence; and yet certainly Grossteste was not unacquainted with either Greek or Hebrew. He had translated Dionysius the Areopa-

gite and Damascenus into Latin—had facilitated the knowledge of Greek by a translation of Suidas's Lexicon—had promoted John of Basingstoke because he was a Greek scholar, and possessed of Greek manuscripts, which he is said to have brought from Athens. Nicholas, surnamed Graecus, resided with Grossteste, to help him in translating from the Greek; nor should it be forgotten that, however humble might be the claims of this eminent man to the character of a Grecian; all this happened above a century before that Boccaccio himself had positively asserted of the Italian scholars, that they did not know so much as the Greek alphabet. Nor was Grossteste unacquainted with Hebrew, though we cannot assert, with Wharton, that he was profoundly skilled in it. The number of Jews then in England, as well as of Hebrew manuscripts, fully accounts for what might seem incredible to those who have not looked into the times. At this early period, however, the chief eminence of Grossteste arose from his being a decided friend to vernacular translations of the scriptures. "It is the will of God," said he, "that the Holy Scriptures should be translated by many translators, and that there should be different translations in the Church, so that what is obscurely expressed by one, may be more perspicuously rendered by another." Was there any other country in Europe where as much had been expressed by any man, before the middle of the fourteenth century? If not, then let Grossteste or Greathead be allowed to have sounded, if not the first, one of the earliest feeble notes of preparation; though more than a hundred years must pass away before the subject be taken up in good earnest, and though England, confessedly, will first sink into greater barbarism.

Richard of Bury, (son of Sir Richard Aungerville) the Chancellor of England and Bishop of Durham, who died before the middle of the fourteenth century, was a man more to the Italian taste, so far as a passion for literature was concerned. If we allow him to express his own feelings, he
was "carried away and even beside himself with immoderate love of books, and desire of reading;" though there was one fault, too much akin to the rest of his order, a desire to monopolize every book to themselves. This man employed collectors not only in England, but in France, Italy, and Germany. Perfectly familiar with French from his residence in that country, at one period he regarded Paris, on account of its literature, as the "paradise of the world;" at another, he laments over its decline. But he visited Italy also, and there met with Petrarch. The celebrated Italian, indeed, mentions Aungerville in one of his epistles—Virum ardentis ingenii.

But there was yet another Richard, well known to the last, of a superior character, and far more diffusive spirit. This was Fitzralph, an Irishman, too, and the energetic precursor of Wickliffe, in opposition to the Friars. Born, it has been said, at Dundalk, and, at all events, certainly there interred, though he had died at Avignon, Fitzralph, then Primate of Ireland, after preaching indefatigably in that country and in London, had gone to face Innocent VI. himself on the subject of those exactions and abuses which had become past all endurance. If Aungerville was bent upon collecting and engrossing all books; still farther to the west than even the "Thule" of the Ancients, at the utmost verge of the Pontiff's authority, even in Ireland itself, there was then a thirst after knowledge which could not be satisfied. Fitzralph complained aloud, and told Innocent that no book could stir, whether in divinity, law, or physic, but these Friars were able and ready to buy it up,"—"that he himself had sent four of his secular chaplains from Armagh to Oxford, who sent him word again that they could neither find the Bible, nor any other good profitable book in divinity, meet for their study, and therefore were minded to return home to their own country."

As for the Primate himself, by his own account, "the Lord had taught him, and brought him out of the profound vanities of Aristotle's philosophy, to the scriptures of God." — "To thee be praise," says he, at the commencement of his life, written by himself, once in the possession of Foxe, and which he meant to have printed,—"To thee be praise, to thee be glory, to thee be thanksgiving, O Jesus most holy, Jesus most powerful, Jesus most amiable—who hast said, I am the way, the truth, and the life,—a way without deviation, truth without a cloud, and life without end. For thou the way hast shewn me, thou the truth hast taught me, and thou the life hast promised me. A way thou wast to me, in exile, the truth thou wast to me, in counsel, and life thou wilt be to me, in reward."

Could the assertion which has been oft repeated, only be confirmed, that Fitzralph translated the New Testament into the Irish language, or that such a translation existed in his time, it would form one of the most curious facts in the history of modern literature; pointing out Ireland as that country in Europe which had been the first pitied, as it has been the last. But, at all events, in the very same year, or 1360, in which Fitzralph expired at Avignon, John Wickliffe, at the age of thirty-six, was al- lured from his hitherto retired life; and when he came to write his "Trialogie," he speaks of Fitzralph as having preceded him, in terms of high commendation.

We have now, however, arrived at a point in history fraught with the deepest interest, and bearing so directly on the subject of the following pages, that it becomes necessary to pause a few moments, and look round. Let Grecian literature, by all means, revive in Italy, for this will be drawn upon, as soon as the proper time arrives; but, in the meanwhile, something else must be accomplished and very far to the West. The event which took place was not only a marked and powerful one, in relation to England, but it formed the first of a series in Europe, although more than an entire century passed away before the precedent was followed by other countries. We refer to the translation of the entire Sacred Volume into the language spoken by the people. Fragments there had been in
several languages, but the present work being complete from Genesis to Revelation, intelligible to the common people of that day, and intended for their express perusal, may be regarded as the first positive instance of its kind in modern Europe. It is, at least, the only one in the fourteenth century upon which we can now lay our hand, no continental nation having anything similar to produce.

FAREWELL.

BY W. T. MOORE.

Like a funeral dirge on the ocean's surge,
I heard its music float,
Through the waving trees on the gentle breeze,
With melancholy note:
As it moved along with its mournful song,
I felt its sad'ning spell,
And my heart grew cold for the tale it told
Did seem to say—farewell!

Then I walked along through the happy throng,
And heard each joyful tale,
As it fell from the tongue of the old and young,
And died on evening's gale,
But a voice of woe, was now whispered low,
Which caused each heart to swell,
As it passed on by with its mournful cry,
And sadly said—farewell!

As I stood on deck of the sinking wreck,
Where waves beat mountain high;
As I heard the wail of the stormy gale,
Which then was passing by:
A sorrowing tone, like a parting groan,
Rose on the air—then fell,
As the ship went down, with the crew to drown,
I heard it say—farewell!

I stood by the bed of the early dead,
And saw the mother there,
And I saw her start, as she raised her heart
To God in solemn prayer:
And I heard her cries, as she turned her eyes,
While down a tear drop fell,
And a sigh was breathed, from the sad bereaved,
Which gently said—farewell!

And I saw the wife, in the prime of life,
Bend o'er her husband's bed,
And the tear drops start as her bleeding heart
Received the news—he's dead!

And as she rose, from her sad'ning woes,
With feelings none can tell,
She then wept aloud, while she humbly bowed,
And faintly sighed—farewell!

Again as I stood, with the great and good,
Where joy and love were crowned,
With the evening song, while its notes prolong
The heart strain's dying sound:
A sorrowful word from their lips was heard,
As trembling down it fell,
And it told the heart, that all must part—
That all must say—farewell!

Now my spirit yearned, and my eyes were turned,
They saw that holy book,
On whose pages bright, a glorious light,
Is seen by all who look:
And I saw in this bright home of bliss,
Where we shall ever dwell,
Where we all shall meet, and each other greet,
And say no more—farewell!

THE CHILD'S WISH.

O, mother dear, the angels near,
Are waiting—their forms I see—
I shall soon be gone, ere the morning's dawn,
I know they will call for me
And when I go, you will lay me low,
In the orchard very near;
Let them take me not, to that far-off spot,
To the churchyard, mother dear.

There are I know, all green and low,
Fresh graves where my playmates lie;
That flowers too, with their wealth of dew,
There look to the midnight sky.

That headstones white, in the pale moonlight,
Gleam fair as the fallen snow,
That over each grave, the green trees wave,
When the soft south breezes blow.

Through the happy days, that the summer stays,
I know, it is bright and fair,
But when frost benumbs, or the cold snow comes,
Dear mother, its lonely there.

So when I go, you will lay me low,
In the orchard very near;
Then if frost benumbs, or the cold snow comes,
It matters not; mother dear.

FANNIE FAITHFUL.
A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION—
NO. VI.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING—NO. IV.

In a previous article it has been shown, that no men, in our time, or any time this side of the apostolic, were called, qualified and sent as the apostles were; or that, in the same sense, there have been and are now no apostles, or successors of apostles. The question then, naturally comes up, where is the authority for men preaching at all in our day, if we have no apostles or successors of apostles, in the original sense? This must be answered fully and fairly, or no preacher now has any authority for his profession or calling. If men can not now show their right to preach and their authority for it, without being specially called, qualified and sent, as the original apostles were, they may give up all idea of preaching, for they can never show that they have any claim in that category. Where, then, shall we turn our attention? We had as well inquire if there were not hosts of preachers in the time of the apostles, not called, qualified, or sent; not witnesses or ambassadors, in the same sense as the apostles were, endorsed by them and recognized as faithful ministers of the word. Who has not read of Timothy, Titus, Mark, Luke, Barnabas, Silas, Apollos, Philip, &c.? These men never claimed to be apostles, called, qualified and sent, as the apostles were, or that they were witnesses, ambassadors, or inspired men. They never claimed to speak with apostolic authority. The distinction between these two classes of men is as clear as that between any two classes in the world. The apostles were extraordinary ministers; the other class were ordinary. The apostles were chosen in Christ as the special instruments through whom the gospel was to be revealed to the world; the others were simply to preach the gospel, as previously revealed by the apostles. They were not called in the same way as the apostles, qualified in the same way, not sent in the same way, not under the same instructions, not witnesses, or ambassadors, nor were they sent to do the same work as the apostles. The following are a few of the clear marks of distinction that may be observed between them and the apostles:

I. Jesus appeared to the apostles personally, and called them with his own voice, saying, “Come, follow thou me. To the others he did not appear personally and call them with his own voice, but, after they became Christians, were brought to know the love of Christ, and to see the ruin to which our race is exposed, had their hearts moved with the benevolent desire to save man, and were found to have ability, they were called by a deep sense of the importance of preaching the gospel as the means to save men, by the apostles and the churches. This is the call to preach now, the divine call and the only divine call to preach the gospel—the ability to preach, a sense of the importance of preaching to save mankind, the authority of the apostles and of the church of the living God.

II. The Lord qualified the apostles by miracle—by direct inspiration, so that it was not the men who spoke, but the Holy Spirit in them. In this way he did not qualify any other class of men; the others had to learn of the apostles, and preached what they heard and learned of them.

III. The Lord sent the apostles as he never did any others. He appeared to them personally, after he rose from the dead, and sent them with his own voice, saying, “Go, into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” This he never did in the case of the ordinary ministers, or any other class of men.

IV. Jesus commanded the apostles not to study what they should say, at the same time assuring them that the Holy Spirit should speak in them—that he should bring all things to their remembrance. The apostle Paul commanded preachers of the other class, or such men as Timothy, Titus, &c.,
ordinary ministers, to study, to give themselves to reading, to meditation, to give themselves wholly to the work, that their profiting might appear to all.

V. The apostles could confer supernatural gifts upon others, by the imposition of their hands, and did so in many instances. The other class, or ordinary ministers never conferred any supernatural gifts by the imposition of their hands, or in any other way, nor had they the power so to do. Hence, when the apostles were gone, and those upon whom they had laid their hands were dead, miracles ceased; and all from that time to the present who have professed to do miracles, were either miserably deluded themselves, or mere pretenders.

VI. The apostles were not only witnesses, but the specially chosen witnesses of Jesus, qualified to be such by being with him as most intimate associates for about three and a half years previous to his death, and then, seeing him and being with him repeatedly during a space of forty days, after he rose from the dead, hearing him, eating and drinking with him, handling him and finally seeing him ascend up into heaven. In this way these men were qualified to be and actually were chosen in such a sense as no other men ever have been, are now, or ever shall be.

VII. The apostles were Christ's special ambassadors—ministers extraordinary—directly called, miraculously empowered and specially sent into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature—or, as one of them expressed it, "to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ." We have no special ambassadors now, no ministers extraordinary, directly called, miraculously empowered and specially sent. We have only now, the ordinary ministry. The reason of this is obvious; the extraordinary work is done. The revelation from God to man is made and confirmed—it is complete. The making of this revelation and confirming it, or bringing it into the world, was an extraordinary work and required an extraordinary ministry. But now, since the revelation is made, the gospel revealed and committed to the sacred pages of the New Testament, the ordinary ministry is not only authorized, but required to transmit it from generation to generation till time shall be no more. Hence Paul says to Timothy, "The things which thou hast heard of me, before many witnesses, commit to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."

VIII. The apostles spoke by authority and when their divine ambassadorship was confirmed, as it was wherever they went, what they said was divinely authorized and received implicitly. The ordinary ministers did not speak by divine authority, only when they spoke precisely what they had received from the apostles, and then the authority was not in them, but in the apostles. It was received not because they spoke it, but because it came from the apostles. What the ordinary ministers said, was not received implicitly. To be believed, they had to "speak as the oracles of God." "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." "They who hear us," (the apostles) says John, "are of God; they who hear not us (the apostles) are not of God." What the apostles uttered, surrounded, as they were, by divine attestations of their ambassadorship, or ambassadorship, was received as the divinely accredited oracles of God. When the ordinary ministers spoke, what they uttered was received, if it was what had been uttered by the apostles. If it was not what had come from the apostles, they did not receive it or regard it of any authority. Nothing only what the apostles had said could be received, no matter from whom it came. "Though we," says Paul, "or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel to you than that which you have received, let him be accursed." See Gal. i. 8, 9. That which the apostles preached was au-
authority; or, as Paul expressed it, "that which we have preached unto you," and if any man, or an angel from heaven, preached anything else, it was not only unworthy of credit, but the terrible anathema of heaven rested upon him who did it.

Thus it is clearly perceived that there was in the time of the apostles another and distinct class of preachers from the apostles, not called, qualified, sent, as the apostles were; not apostles, ambassadors or witnesses, not to make revelations, or to reveal the gospel, but preach the gospel already revealed, advocate, defend and perpetuate it from generation to generation. This class of preachers we have yet and must have till the end of time. It is not their province to reveal anything new, but to preach, propagate and perpetuate to the end of time, that gospel which has already been revealed, or, as Paul has expressed it, "made known among all nations for the obedience of faith," and that too, "according to the commandment of the everlasting God." The work now, of the ordinary ministry, or the evangelists, is to preach the gospel, enforce it upon the mind of the present generation, and through preaching, bring it to bear upon the world—the power of God to salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek—the preaching of the cross to them who are saved, the wisdom of God and the power of God. Without this ministry the church could not exist, the work could not progress. They are the ordinary instruments for doing the ordinary work, and without them, the ordinary work could not go on. The apostles were extraordinary ministers, to do extraordinary work, and when the extraordinary work, of introducing the new order and confirming it, was accomplished, the extraordinary ministry ceased.

The following are some of the evils resulting from the modern mistaken notion of men professing to be called, qualified and sent as the apostles were, or in other words, claiming that they were apostles:

1. An utter neglect of the ordinary means to qualify men for preaching the gospel, already revealed. Those men who thought they were inspired and claimed to speak as the spirit gave them utterance, utterly neglected books, reading, meditation and education. Their boast and glory were that they did not depend upon books, upon study or meditation, but upon the direct power and influence of the Holy Spirit. They were careful, which, by the way, was unnecessary entirely among people of intelligence, to inform their audiences that they had no "college larnin." The result was, that the land was filled with a class of men, professing to be inspired, specially called and sent, against whom it was regarded as almost blasphemy to raise the slightest objection, and to call in question their claim to a divine call, was almost an infallible evidence of a man's infidelity. Yet ninety-nine out of every hundred of these men did not know their mother tongue or any other.

To talk to one of these men of reading to prepare him for preaching, was all nonsense to him. All knowledge, such as may be obtained from books, was foolishness to him, and nothing would do to preach, unless it was a direct emanation of the Holy Spirit. Certain it was that the Holy Spirit did not teach them anything; and, as they would learn nothing from the communications of the Holy Spirit found in the Bible, they had scarcely an idea of the Holy Spirit in their minds, or any other ideas, and they were certainly, as a class, the most stupid, bungling and uninteresting, as well as unprofitable men that ever attempted to impart public edification.

II. A most shameful and preposterous set of pretensions. The preacher would pretend that he had not studied his discourse, in order that he might maintain his claim to be specially called and sent, and yet, bungling as his discourse was, many as were his perversions and misapplications of scripture, it was manifest to an observing person, that he had studied his sermon, thus showing that his pretense was false. When the preacher was about to commence his discourse, he would be careful to inform his audience that he did not know what he
should say, but whatever the Holy Spirit
should give him, he would give his audience.
Yet, he would frequently pray the Lord to
forgive what had been said amiss and bless
what had been said according to his will,
and even ask the people to excuse his blun-
ders.

III. The claim to a Divine call opened
the way for the preaching of the most pre-
posterous, most silly, and sometimes ridicu-
lous nonsense ever uttered in public assem-
blies. This would not have been so utterly
absurd, had it not been for the claim that
all their silly nonsense emanated from the
Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation.
Had the people been taught to regard the
whole as of men, very weak and ignorant
men at that, the harm done would have been
trifling; but to ascribe the whole to the
Holy Spirit, was ruinous in its effects.
Many sensible people looked upon these
men as an exponent of the Bible and Bible
men, and seeing the utter want of consis-
tency, propriety, and even common sense,
declared it not only to be human, but the
weakest, most silly and stupid of all human
emanations, and were thus driven into the
coldest and most gloomy unbelief.

IV. These pretended called and sent
preachers were wholly inefficient. They
could operate upon no class of society only
the ignorant and gullible, and then, simply
by excitement, noise and fanaticism; and
when their proselytes were made, they were
no more enlightened than before. They
had felt an impression and thought it was
religion, but, at times, doubted it. Their
preachers would describe their own feelings
to them, and if, on hearing the description,
they could conclude that they had felt as
the preacher said he had; it was taken as a
strong evidence. A strong impression or
feeling was the evidence of the preacher's
conversion and of his Divine call. Their
evidence of a call and of conversion was
one that an external world could not see,
that their brethren could not see, and one
that could be claimed as stoutly by a Mor-
monite as anybody else—their feelings.
They said they felt a call, or felt that they
were pardoned, but this feeling evidence
was entirely invisible to all mankind except
the person claiming it. To him, the im-
pression was not visible either, though many
thought it a great light like that which
shone round about Saul of Tarsus, though
no one could see or hear anything.

V. This professed call led to an almost
utter abandonment of the Bible, and listen-
ting to these men as apostles. To make a
necessity for such a ministry as they claim-
ed to be, they taught the people that the
Bible was a sealed book, a hidden mystery,
and that no one, unless specially called and
sent to expound the mysteries of the gospel,
could unfold it to mankind. With this
view, it was useless to read the Bible or try
to derive any benefit from it. The apostles,
though inspired and possessing the Holy
Spirit to guide them into all truth, had giv-
en us nothing but a mystery, a sealed book
and powerless gospel, that could do nothing
till a called and sent preacher was given to
expound it, or unfold the mystery. When
these called and sent men came, one of
them expounded it to mean Calvinism,
another to mean Arminianism, one to mean
Unitarianism and another Trinitarianism,
one to mean Methodism, another Presbyte-
rianism, one Lutheranism, another Episco-
palianism. It is now manifest to a thinking
man, that to follow these men, regard their
teaching and confide in them to point out
the way to heaven, was almost as unsafe as
to have no guide at all.

By listening to this class of men, the
ears of the people were completely turned
away from the truth and turned to fables.
Never did any pretense more fully and ut-
terly subvert the gospel of Christ, under-
mine it and defeat its holy purpose in its
mission to save man. Never was there a
class of men that needed reforming more
than these. Nor was there ever a class that
were more difficult to reach. It is true,
many of them were sincere men and aimed
to do good, but their mistaken claim, with
their continued impression, that they were
inspired and spoke as the Spirit gave them ut-
erance, turned them constantly from the
only thing worth preaching—the gospel, the power of God to salvation to every one that believes. Taking this delusion all in all, it was the most mischievous, ruinous and even destructive one that gained credence in the beginning of the present century. Under its influence, every error was propagated that the human imagination could conceive, every form of perversion of scripture imaginable and every species of nonsense that could be invented, not only in the name of the Lord, but under a professed sanction of the Holy Spirit. Yet, no matter how silly, how absurd, or contradictory to the clearest teaching of apostles and prophets, any man who dared question the pretensions of these men, was branded as unregenerated, an infidel or an Atheist, and his mouth stopped by quoting, “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither indeed can he know them for they are spiritually discerned”—“the wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, and canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth, so is everyone that is born of the Spirit”—these things are “hid from the wise and prudent and revealed to babes”—they are to “the Greek foolishness”—&c., &c. In our next we will give a few specimens of their preaching.

WHICH GOSPEL IS BEST?

Mrs. Burr, the beautiful Esther Edwards, thus writes to her father, just after the death of her husband President Burr, and from the bedside of the sick, perhaps dying son: “Oh, how good is God. He not only kept me from complaining, but comforted me. I saw the fulness there was in Christ for little infants, and his willingness to accept such as were offered to him in faith.—‘Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not,’ were most comforting words: God also showed me, in such a lively manner, the fulness there was in himself of all spiritual blessings that I said, ‘Al-
A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

NUMBER SEVEN.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING.—NO. V.

Forty years ago, the preaching was almost invariably textural, or, as they expressed it, "preaching from a text." No man was considered a divine, who could not preach a long sermon from a short text, or a great sermon from a small text. The preacher aimed to astonish the people, that so much could be said from such a small text. In some places, and among some people this custom has not changed materially yet. In many popular circles the short text is still adopted, and the sermon is made correspondingly short. Indeed, among the fashionables, the following are the chief and most desirable qualities:

1. A short text, and nothing in it.
2. A short sermon, composed of smooth and pretty words.
3. Smoothly and gracefully delivered.
4. Not to come nearer our time than the Ante-diluvians, Egyptians, Sodomites, or ancient Jews.
5. Not to question any practice, unless it be Pagan, Infidel, Mormon or Romish.
6. Not to say anything that will in any way disturb the conscience.
7. Scarcely a seasoning of gospel in it.

It is perfectly astonishing what insignificantly little, senseless, empty and insipid ditties, are now being listened to, and even roundly paid for, called, "sermons," or "preaching the gospel," among the elite in fashionable circles. We heard of one man, a short time since, in the Capital of a popular State, in the presence of the "first class," who took for his text the words, "And there was no room in the inn." After pausing for a few moments, at the same time extending over his audience a wise and knowing look, in a deep and impressive tone, he repeated the words, "And there was no room in the inn." The wonder was, what kind of wisdom a man could be endowed with, to bring a gospel sermon out of such a text! We did not learn what the sermon was, preached from this marvelous text; but, as the preacher was "a workman that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing" his text, a learned and popular divine, he probably divided his text into some three heads, upon which he discoursed softly, smoothly, and even gracefully, for at least twenty minutes, without a single collision with any man's doctrines, views or sins. This pious, learned and profound expounder of the mysteries of the gospel, receives probably from $1,500 to $2,000 a year. He most probably does not preach more than one sermon for each Lord's day; for it would hardly be expected that two such efforts, as to bring a gospel sermon out of the words, "And there was no room in the inn," would be made by the same man on the same day. He would certainly need
a week of relaxation for recruiting his exhausted energies. Allowing him then, to receive the moderate support of $2,000 per annum, and to preach once each Lord's day, or, "holy Sabbath," as he calls it, it cost the church only about $42 to have expended on them the words, "And there was no room in the inn." Yet, we doubt not, this man and others of his class talk of the arduous and exhausting labors of their profession and their scanty subsistence!

Another man, a textuary too, hard by the capital of his nation, and in the hearing of distinguished personages, took for his text, "hind's feet," and not being a good scholar, though a masterly divine, mistook "hind's feet," for hen's feet, and, being a doctrinal preacher, as well as specially called and sent, soon clearly deduced and demonstrated the glorious doctrine of the adorable and ever blessed Trinity from the three toes of the hen's feet. This was, no doubt, considered deep and profound preaching, as no one not well skilled in the deepest and greatest mysteries, could have perceived this almost unfathomable mystical significance of the hen's feet. What this wonderful effort cost the church, we have no certain means of ascertaining, but not less probably than in the case of the exposition given above.

Another of the same class of expositors, of whom we read an account in the Christian Baptist some twenty-six years ago, had his pious, holy and most righteous indignation stirred within him, as his soul was vexed from day to day, with the sinful and profane knots of ribband on the ladies' bonnets, and, being a faithful divine, determined not to look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, he resolved to preach a sermon against this great sin. He too, was among the great ones of the nation. Having searched the Bible from side to side for a text, he hit on the following, as exactly in point: "Let him that is on the house-top not come down." To rid the subject of all incumbrance and every thing not relating to the matter in hand, he took for his text the following four words: "Top not come down."

Being a proficient in his work, he soon transformed the negative "not," into the theological noun, "knot." As near as we remember, the plan of his discourse was as follows: 1. To explain the nature and sinfulness of the "top knot." 2. To expatiate on the reasonableness of the injunction, "Come down." 3. To denounce the eternal perdition of the disobedient.

Another case is recorded in the same work, of a man who took for his text the words of the wicked servant, who said, "Thou art an austere man." Not being a good speller, though a profound preacher, he mistook the word, "austere," for oyster, and, unfortunately, founded his whole sermon on the word oyster. The plan of the sermon, as near as we now remember, was: 1. To show the resemblance between oysters and sinners. 2. To point out the analogy between his Savior and the oyster catcher.

Another great man preached a great sermon on the words: "Adam, where art thou?" He too, was one of your methodical and learned divines. He planned his discourse as follows: 1. To show that Adam was some place. 2. That he was where he ought not to be. 3. That if he did not take heed to his ways, he would find himself where he would not want to be. No doubt he sustained all these marvelous positions to the fullest satisfaction of his audience.

We allude to these as mere specimens, not from the more ignorant, but from among those who claimed to be the "first class," and set themselves up as the chief ones of the nation, and while these may be more manifestly ridiculous than common, they are not really more incompatible with the whole spirit and intent of what Jesus meant by the requirement, to preach the gospel. Not one of these preachers out of one hundred, claiming to be specially called and sent, could tell what the gospel was, and not one of their hearers out of a thousand could tell what the faith of the church was,
or even knew, or, in other words, what they themselves believed. The truth is, a large number of them did not believe anything, or in other words, were not believers at all. They knew their party by name, and went for it and their preacher without knowing what the faith was.

Any one can preach from a text, or on a text, with or without grace, or even common sense. Not only so, but by textuary preaching, any theory, speculation or dogma in creation, can be proved, or if not proved, the adherents of the party can be made to believe it to be proved. In this way, thousands have been made to believe the most silly delusions, idle dreams and mischievous fictions ever invented. In numerous instances, they had as well never have had a Bible, so far as any adequate understanding of it was concerned. Many maintained, that what appeared to be the meaning of scripture, on the face of it, was not at all the real sense, but merely the sense that the carnal mind received—that the real sense lies deeper down—that the natural understanding can not comprehend spiritual things—that they are only to be understood by the spiritual understanding—that spiritual things can not be heard with the natural, or ordinary ear, but with an inward, or spiritual ear, and in this way, the only ears with which man can hear, and the only understanding with which he can understand, and through which the Lord from the beginning has operated upon man to turn him to God, have been rendered ineffectual and wholly inaccessible, by the very men professedly sent to enlighten the world. Men of sense have listened to discourses which they knew had no sense in them, on the face of them, but thought there was probably a deep mystical sense—a spiritual sense—that the natural man could not discern. Others again, and not a few of them, came to the conclusion, seeing the utter lack of sense, or adaptation in the whole affair, that the whole concern, Bible and all, was a stupendous farce, imposed upon mankind by cunning and designing men at first, and followed up by honest, sincere and well-meaning, but ignorant and superstitious men. In this way, thousands of men, who would have been an ornament to the church, have been ruined by the men laboring to save the world.

If these professedly specially called and sent men had made it a matter of settled study, how to defeat the preaching of the gospel, render ineffectual and entirely counteract any good influence it could have on the world, they could not have hit upon a better plan to accomplish their object, than the one adopted by them. On their plan of preaching, if they had expounded every text correctly, and if the hearers had understood every exposition given and remembered it, in a whole lifetime, they would not have heard even a hundredth part of the New Testament expounded. Then, when it is remembered that in nine tenths of the cases, the expositions were most absurd, ridiculous and false, the chances of knowing the truth become exceedingly few. Still, farther, as if to render the preaching of the gospel more ineffectual, the preachers had their pulpits perched up from six to ten feet high, and when one would enter and lift his eyes to the preacher, closely ensconced in his “sacred desk,” as he peeped over the top of his castle, it would put one in mind of nothing more readily than a swallow, peeping from her nest, highly elevated in a chimney. The entire arrangement appeared to be calculated, if not so intended, to make the impression that preachers belong to a different order of beings from the balance of mankind. In many instances the sermons were written out and read from these unphilosophical, miserably ill-adapted and stupidly arranged pulpits, with as little religious effect upon an audience as the reading of an essay on anatomy or astronomy would produce. In other instances, the sermon was extemporeaneous, but without sense, or adaptation to this world, and consequently without anything like the real effect of preaching the gospel.

In addition to the textuary system of preaching, the ill-arranged houses and pul-
pits, the reading of sermons and other ineffectual methods of doing, as if all aimed to defeat the gospel and effectually block its great work, in its mission to save man, a large portion of the preachers taught the people, that they could not understand the gospel, could not believe it—in a word, that they could do nothing—that they were totally depraved—wholly corrupt—that the word of God was a dead letter—that the letter killeth—that faith was a direct gift from God—that a man could no more become a Christian than he could make a world till this direct gift was bestowed. Yet, if he did not become a Christian, he would be lost! A preacher in one church, would be heard trying to prove that a man could turn to the Lord at will, and become a Christian; while at the same hour, and probably in the same town, another would be trying to prove that a man could do nothing. The only wonder is, that the gospel has not been entirely defeated, completely nullified and put down; and indeed, one of the strongest evidences we know of its divinity—that it is the power of God to salvation to every one who believes—that it is to them who are saved the power of God and the wisdom of God—is, that it has survived, the miserable, badly arranged pulpits, the ineffectual ministry and false theories, which it has had to encounter, maintained its place in the world, and is doing a good work among men. Had not God been with it, and his divine power in it, long since it would have been crushed out of the earth.

What has been the result from all this? It has been, 1. That many sensible and well disposed men, who will go into nothing that they can not understand, decide that they can not see any sense in it, can not see much difference among them, nor decide who, or whether any party, is in the right, and that they will hear none of them. These cease attending places of public worship at all, turn their attention to schemes of making money, or political fame, and many of them are hardened so that they can never be saved. 2. Many are driven into infidelity. Their process of reasoning is short and easy. They say, "If the Lord had called these men, they would all have preached the same doctrine. They do not preach the same doctrine; therefore, the Lord never called them. If they claim to be called and sent, when it is so obvious that they are not, the same may have been the case with the apostles and all other preachers. I, therefore, do not believe there is any reality in the entire matter of religion." This class of men read Paine's *Age of Reason*, falsely so called, talk about and deride religion on the corners of the streets and carp upon the flaws in professors of religion. 3. Still another class, find that they can not understand the matter, and, after puzzling over it for a time, fall into something like the following train of reflection: "God is a benevolent being, as all parties admit; he is infinitely good; he therefore, would not punish a finite creature forever, for not being a Christian, when the matter of becoming a Christian is involved in so much obscurity, darkness and uncertainty, that the most sincere, honest and candid persons, under the instructions of the best preachers, are frequently known to seek for months and even years, and, in many instances even to die without finding salvation. I, therefore, conclude that we are all poor imperfect creatures, that the Lord will be good and merciful to us all, and that we all will be saved." Even this reaches not the climax. Among the conflicting preachers, there is such a struggle for members, pulling this way and that, besetting all on every side, that the people get to looking at it as a kind of rivalry among the preachers, who shall gain the most members. They lose all sight of the Lord, or of their own salvation, and see nothing but the competition between these men, and you hear them every now and then saying, with emphasis, "They won't get me." Thus vast multitudes are hardened, continue and die in their sins, in the midst of a numerous, but wonderfully inefficient ministry.

In the place of any improvement, with all the helps that have so abundantly multiplied upon us, with the freest toleration any
people ever had, we are fully assured that a large portion of the ministry are not improving one iota. The clearest things the Lord has vouched safe to man, the things most important of all, and things that must be known first of all, if a man would be happy and do any good in religion, are the most obscure in the minds of popular preachers generally. Nothing can be more important to the sinner than the remission of sins. What does all talk of religion amount to, for a man who can not learn where and how he is to obtain pardon? What is all preaching worth, so long as it fails to set forth clearly the ground of pardon, and show the sinner how he may come to the Lord and obtain the remission of his sins? What is a preacher worth to the world, who can not, or can and will not, show the sinner what steps he is to take, or what he is to do, to come to the promise of God, that he shall be pardoned, or saved from his sins? What does it avail, to show the sinfulness of sin, that man is sinful and lost, and not show him how to be saved? It certainly avails but little. Yet, who, in this country, does not know that thousands of humble, penitent and sincere souls have been under the immediate instructions of their preachers, for years, seeking, mourning and grieving, and still, have never been shown and do not know where the Lord has promised them pardon. Who does not know that thousands of these continue to grieve, strive and sorrow till they die, without finding pardon? and that too, under the immediate instructions of their preachers? They do everything the preachers tell them to do, do all seriously and honestly, and still, are not pardoned! Why this failure? Certainly the word of the Lord has not failed. The plan of heaven has not failed! What has failed? Where has the failure been? The ministry has failed to point the penitents to the way laid down in the scriptures to pardon. The failure is not in the plan of heaven, nor in the promise of the Lord, but in the ministry, to show the seekers the manifest way to the promise of pardon, and then teach them to rely upon the promise.

Nor can any man living make the least excuse for all this. Nothing in the Book of God, in the nature of the case, should and would be laid down more clearly, than the way to pardon: for remission of sins is something to which all must come or be lost. And nothing is presented, in the Holy Volume, we presume to say, with more clearness, in a greater variety of forms, and with more simplicity, than the terms of pardon, and the man who can not present these terms so that any rational and sincere penitent can understand what to do to be saved, is certainly useless to the world as a preacher. Surely the merciful, benevolent and glorious Savior, would not have left anything so important, as the remission of sins, and something too, relating to every person, in the dark, or in any obscurity. This he has not done. “The way is so plain that the wayfaring men though fools should not err therein.” “They who seek shall find,” says the Lord. Those who came to the first preachers did find pardon, as soon as they found a man of God to tell them what to do, and they did what was commanded. Not a case of failure can be found.

A BLESSED INTIMACY.

A friend once asked Professor Franke how he maintained so constant a peace of mind. "By stirring up my mind a hundred times a day," replied Franke. "Wherever I am, whatever I do, 'Blessed Jesus,' 'have I a share in thy redemption? Are my sins forgiven? Am I guided by thy Spirit? Renew me; strengthen me.' By this constant intercourse with Jesus, I enjoy serenity of mind and a settled peace of soul."
THE ANNALS OR HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

By C. Anderson, of England.

(Continued.)

John Wickliffe, a native of Yorkshire, was born in the year 1324, and, in 1360, at the age of thirty-six, first came into public view, where he conspicuously remained to the day of his death, or the 31st of December 1384. For his life and opinions we refer to other sources, and must here confine our attention to that work which will ever give the chief distinction to his name.

Before the commencement of such a design, the position of Wickliffe should be contemplated. To say nothing of the Mahometan and Pagan worlds, two other communities had extended their influence over the nations. Alike opposed to the right of private judgment, and the rising freedom of the human mind, and now equally sunk into a state of unutterable depravity, both had fixed a malignant eye on that very book which Wickliffe had determined to give to his country. These two, it is well known, were the Eastern and Western, or the Greek and Latin Churches. Both had not only, and long since, utterly neglected and contemned the Sacred Writings, but both had interdicted their translation into any vernacular tongue. That it was not only unlawful, but injurious, for the people at large to read the Scriptures, had, indeed, for ages, been regarded as an axiom, by all these nations. Nor was this idea left to pass current merely as a received opinion. Not to mention other proofs, more than an hundred and fifty years before Wickliffe had finished his determined purpose, or in the year 1229, at the Council of Toulouse, when forty-five canons were passed and issued for the extinction of heresy and the re-establishment of peace, what were two of those canons? One involved the first court of inquisition, and another the first canon, which forbade the Scriptures to the laity, or the translation of any portion of them into the vulgar tongue. The latter was expressed in very pointed terms.

“We also forbid the laity to possess any of the books of the Old or New Testament, except, perhaps, the Psalter or Breviary for the Divine Offices, or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin, which some, out of devotion, wishto have; but having any of these books translated, into the vulgar tongue, we strictly forbid.”

In the face of all this, and far more than can now be explained, must Wickliffe commence his heartfelt task; and so he did, with his eyes open to the prejudices of the world.

His translation, which was finished in the year 1380, is supposed to have occupied him, amidst various interruptions, for many years. Some have imagined that this great work employed the translator for ten years, only, but Mr. Baber, with far greater probability, has said, “From an early period of life he had devoted his various learning, and all the powerful energies his mind, to effect this, and, at length, by intense application on his own part, and with some assistance from a few of the most learned of his followers, he had the glory to complete a book, which, alone, would have been sufficient (or at least ought) to have procured him the veneration of his own age, and the commendations of posterity.”

In accounting for such a movement as this, it has been but too common to inquire after something similar which had happened in the earth, and loosely supposing some connexion between them, as cause and effect, thus leave the extraordinary event, without the slightest reference to the finger of God. Any influential connexion, however, between the Waldenses or Vaudois and Wickliffe has never been clearly proved, and probably never will. At all events, before he could be stimulated by their example, he seems to have taken his ground, as it is only in his latest compositions that a few slight references to them are to be found, as to a people with whose sufferings he sym-
pathized. He was on the Continent, at Bruges, it is true, from 1374 to 1376, but he had commenced, and must have been far advanced in his undertaking, long before then. In short, as far as the term can be applied to any human being, the claims of Wicliffe to originality have now come to be better understood, and every Christian will recognize the "secret mover," while, in reference to the times following, when tracing the history of Divine Truth throughout Europe, the habit of ascending no higher than Germany is past, or passing away.

Down to the period of about two years before Wicliffe had completed his translation, the only ideas or incidents which had any powerful influence upon mankind generally, were such as stood connected with the Pontiff, and his peculiar system of rule or government; but, in reference to this subject, by the year 1378, among the European nations, there had sprung up a marked difference of opinion. One question engrossed them all, and it was nothing less than this — Who was Pontiff? In the year 1305, through the influence of France, the Court of Rome had been translated into that Kingdom, and there it remained for seventy-four years, to the great damage of Rome as a city, but without any rentor division in the system. Edward the Third had expired on the 21st of June 1377, after a reign of above half a century, and about that very moment Gregory XI. had ordered Wicliffe to be seized and imprisoned, till farther orders. Early in the following year, although our translator of the Scriptures had not only stood high in favour with the late King, but still did so with many in Parliament, and was powerfully protected by John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, he was summoned by the Bishops to answer for himself at St. Paul's. Thus did this body of men first come out, appearing as a distinct interest in the kingdom, and thus they will remain for above five generations to come; proving ever and anon, upon all occasions of alarm, that they were the determined opponents of Divine Truth. As a body, they will oppose its being conveyed to the people, and at every successive step of progress. Their malice at this time, however, was overruled, as it will so often and conspicuously be, a century and a half later; but, in the meanwhile, nothing must prevent Wicliffe from finishing his translation.

The year 1378 was in truth an important one as it regarded our translator's design. On the 27th of March the reigning Pontiff had died; an event which not only put an end to the bulls against Wicliffe, but gave rise to what was called "the great schism," so that soon after there were two Pontiffs — one beyond the mountains, as the Italians said, and one at Rome—consigning each other to perdition. Of this state of things Wicliffe did not fail to avail himself. "He saw the head of the body cloven in twain, and the two parts made to fight with each other," and he immediately sent forth two tracts, one upon "the schism" itself, and the other upon "the truth of Scripture." Every city and state became agitated, and as the question soon divided the nations throughout, it so happened that England and Scotland were of opposite opinions: the former holding fast by Urban VI. of Rome, who had been first chosen; the latter followed Clement VII. of Avignon. England and France indeed became the most ardent supporters of the opposite parties, while such was the extent to which the controversy had gone that some men of the University of Paris had begun to think of a plurality of Pontiffs, and the appointment of one to every kingdom. The idea of one power exercising authority over all nations had seemed to them untenable, if not injurious.

Soon after this, in the year 1379, Wicliffe, as divinity professor, had gone to fulfil his accustomed annual duty at Oxford, but there he was seized with an alarming illness. The friars, imagining that his course was now near an end, contrived to visit him. Four of their ablest men had been selected, or a friar from each of the mendicant orders, and they were admitted to a patient hearing. After reminding him of the great
injury he had done to their order—for Wickliffe was a determined enemy to all idleness and all extortion—they exhorted him, as one near to death, that he would, now, as a true penitent, bewail and revoke in their presence, whatever he had said to their disparagement. As soon as they had done, Wickliffe calling for his servant, desired to be raised upon his pillow; when collecting all his strength, with a severe and expressive countenance, and in a tone of voice not to be misunderstood, he exclaimed, "I shall not die, but live, to declare the evil deeds of the friars." Confused, if not confused, little expecting such a reply, they immediately left him; and Wickliffe recovered, to finish in the year following his translation of the entire Bible.

Extraordinary, however, as the character of Wickliffe was,—a man confessedly far above all his contemporaries, it may still be inquired, whether he was qualified for the task of translating the Sacred Volume? The Scriptures had been originally given in Hebrew and Greek; but so far from the nations of the West furnishing men sufficiently acquainted with either, England at least had sunk into greater ignorance even since the days of Grossteste; nay, an hundred and fifty years later, when Tyndale had translated from the original tongues, some of the priests of the day were trying to persuade the people that Greek and Hebrew were newly invented. Here, it is true, was Wickliffe, an able and acute, a zealous and determined man; and withal an excellent Latin scholar, but of Greek or Hebrew he knew nothing. Nor was it at all necessary that he should possess such erudition, since a translation from either Greek or Hebrew would not have harmonized with the first, or the present, intention of Divine Providence. A reason there was, and one worthy of infinite wisdom, why not only the English translation, but most of the first European versions must be made from the Latin. These nations, including our own, had nothing in common with the Greek community, but for ages they had been overrun by the Latin. This language, long since dead, even in Italy, had been the refuge and stronghold of their oppressor, from generation to generation; and upon looking back, no spectacle presented to the eye is so remarkable, as that of so many different nations, equally spell-bound by the same expedient. There was a Latin, service, and there was a Latin Bible, professedly received, but the possession of even this had been forbidden to the people at large; very much in the same spirit as the Shasters of India are forbidden by the Brahmins to be looked upon, or even heard, by the people. It was the Latin Bible, therefore, long buried in cloisters, or covered with the dust of ages, which must now be brought forth to view. Confessedly imperfect, it was of importance first to prove that it had all along contained enough for mortal man to know, in order to his eternal salvation; and once translated into any native tongue, not only will the language touch the heart, but the people at last know what that mysterious book was, from which they had been debarred, so wickedly and so long. Although, therefore, the nation was yet an hundred and fifty years distant from the English Bible, properly so called, the present should be regarded as the first preliminary step. An all-disposing foresight, far above that of any human agent, is now distinctly visible in drawing first upon that very language which had been employed for ages as the instrument of mental bondage. It shall now be made to contribute to the emancipation of the human mind. Latin, it is true, had been the conventional language of the priests and students of different countries; but still, so long as this language remained untouched by a translation of the Scriptures into any vernacular tongue, it is a historical canon that no nation was ever greatly moved. This holds true of our own country, in the age of manuscript; but it will become far more emphatically so, even seventy years after the invention of printing, when the Scriptures, once translated from the original tongues, come to be printed in the language then spoken, and spoken still.

At such a period as this the translation
of Wickliffe could only be diffused, of course, by the laborious process of transcription; but transcribed it was diligently, both entire and in parts, and as eagerly read. There were those who, at every hazard, sought wisdom from the Book of God, and their number could not be few. A contemporary writer has affirmed that "a man could not meet two people on the road, but one of them was a disciple of Wickliffe." This was the testimony of an enemy, and not improbably the language of hatred and fear combined, uttered with a wish to damage the cause; it was the testimony of an ecclesiastic, a Canon of Leicester, in reference to an era hailed by the people; and although the Word of Truth had not "free course," there can be no question that it was glorified in the reception given to it by many. "The soldiery," he says "with the dukes and earls, were the chief adherents of this sect—they were their most strenuous promoters and boldest combatants—their most powerful defenders and their invincible protectors." A very remarkable admission, as it accounts for the great progress made, in spite of opposition. All this and much more is uttered in the tone of lamentation; and what was the occasion, as expressed by the Canon himself? "This Master John Wickliffe," says he, "hath translated the Gospel out of Latin into English, which Christ had intrusted with the clergy and doctors of the Church, that they might minister it to the laity and weaker sort, according to the state of the times and the wants of men. So that by this means the Gospel is made vulgar, and laid more open to the laity, and even to women who can read, than it used to be to the mostlearned of the clergy and those of the best understanding! And what was before the chief gift of the clergy and doctors of the Church, is made for ever common to the laity!"

It was in the same spirit that another contemporary writer urged that "the prelates ought not to suffer that every one at his pleasure should read the Scripture, translated even into Latin; because, as is plain from experience, this has been many ways the occasion of falling into heresies and errors. It is not, therefore, politic that any one, wheresoever and whensoever he will, should give himself to the frequent study of the Scriptures."

These men specially referred to a period which lasted for about twenty years, or from 1380 to 1400, and it was one, though but too short, which distinguished this country from every other in Europe. However transient, or but like an handful of corn for all England in any sketch of the times it should never pass unnoticed.

While the nations generally were discussing the respective claims of two rival Pontiffs, amidst all the confusion of the times, and although there were many adversaries, for the last twenty years of the fourteenth century in England, no authoritative stop must be put to the perusal of the Divine record. The Bishops, it is true, with the Primate of Canterbury at their head, may rage and remonstrate, may write to Rome and receive replies, but in vain. The entire Sacred Volume had been translated, the people were transcribing and reading, and the translator had frequently expressed himself in the boldest terms. "The authority of the Holy Scriptures," said he, "infinitely surpasses any writing, how authentic soever it may appear, because the authority of Jesus Christ is infinitely above that of all mankind."—"The authority of the Scriptures is independent of any other authority, and is preferable to every other writing, but especially to the books of the Church of Rome."—"I am certain, indeed, from the Scriptures, that neither Antichrist, nor all his disciples, nor all men, may really impugn any part of that volume as it regards the excellence of its doctrine. But in all these things it appears to me that the believing man should use this rule—If he soundly understands the Sacred Scripture, let him bless God; if he be deficient in such perception, let him labour for soundness of mind. Let him also dwell as a grammarian upon the letter, but be fully aware of imposing a sense upon Scripture which he doubts the Holy Spirit does not demand."
Many other passages, in terms as strong, might be quoted from his writings; and "among his latest acts," says Vaughan, "was a defence in Parliament of the translation of the Scriptures into English. These he declared to be the property of the people, and one which no party should be allowed to wrest from them."

Now that the cause of such a man, as well as that he himself should have been so befriended, was one of the distinguishing features of the present period. The Duke of Lancaster continued to be his shield for years; and although, when Wickliffe, in addition to grievances felt, went on to Christian doctrines, the Duke faltered in his support, yet nearly six years after the translator was in his grave, the same voice was heard in favor of the translation. In the thirteenth of Richard II., or 1390, a bill was proposed to be brought into the House of Lords for suppressing it, when Lancaster, in boldly opposing this, told them, "That he would maintain our having this law in our own tongue, whoever they should be that brought in the bill," and once introduced, it was immediately thrown out. But Lancaster was not the only friend: to his brother, the Duke of Gloucester, Wickliffe dedicated at least one of his pieces; and on one important occasion, when the former gave way, the Queen-Mother, or widow of the Black Prince, put a stop to persecution. Lord Percy, Earl-Marshal, was also friendly; but perhaps, above all, much was owing to the reigning Queen, and that for ten years after Wickliffe's death. Ann of Luxemburg, the sister of the Emperor Wenceslaus and of the King of Bohemia, as consort of Richard II., had arrived in this country in December 1381; an event of great importance in connexion with Wickliffe's exertions. If he had so far enlightened England, his writings were also to electrify Bohemia, so that Ann had "come to the kingdom for such a time as this." This lady, already acquainted with three languages, Bohemian, German, and Latin, soon acquired that of this country, and for years was distinguished for her diligent perusal of the Scriptures in English. This much was testified of her by a very notable witness—the Lord Chancellor Arundel, then Archbishop of York, when he came to preach at her interment. "Although she was a stranger," he said, "yet she constantly studied the four gospels in English; and in the study of these, and reading of godly books, she was more diligent than the prelates, though their office and business require this of them." The gospels in English, he added, the Queen had sent to himself to peruse, and he had replied that they were "good and true." Queen Ann's course of reading was even well known to Wickliffe, before he expired in 1384, so that she must have served as a powerful example to others, for at least ten years. The translator had thus early inquired, whether "to hereticate" her on account of her practice, "would not be Luciferian folly."

The Queen, says Rapin, was a great favorer of Wickliffe's doctrine, and had she lived longer would have saved his followers; but the illustrious foreigner once interred, and thus so remarkably eulogized, a different scene immediately opened to view.

After his Queen's death, Richard II., the grandchild of Edward III., had gone to Ireland, there to prolong the misgovernment of that country; and only four months had elapsed, when this very man, Arundel, who afterwards was the main instrument in de-throning the King, and one of the bitterest enemies of Divine Truth in the next century, was in great alarm. In deep hypocrisy, at Westminster, he might choose to twit the prelates with their ignorance of Scripture, in comparison with a Queen who had to acquire the language, and thus please the ear of his Majesty, as well as seem to lament his loss; but he had no intention that the people should take the hint, or advance, and shew him, as well as his brethren, the way. The remarkable though transient period, however, to which we now refer, was as distinguished for boldness of sentiment, as for the protection providen-
trifles, and thought of nothing save his own pleasures, that the close of the fourteenth century should have been thus distinguished, must appear strange, but it is not accountable. This was only the commencement of a series of striking proofs, that, in first conveying to the people of this country the Word of Life, Divine Providence would dispense with what has been called "royal sanction." Certain individuals near the throne, and more enlightened, had been permitted to act, and Richard must have allowed his Queen to have had considerable influence, and so gratify her wishes; but, independently of these parties, the King himself, bent upon increasing the royal prerogative, was no friend to any control from abroad. For a hundred years past, under the three first Edwards, the power of the Crown, and the influence of the Commons, as a branch of the legislature, had been increasing by slow degrees, and, more especially, three memorable statutes had been passed, viz.: those of Mortmain, Provisors, and Proununire. Now, these, even under this present monarch, had been not merely recognised, but the power of the last two generally strengthened. Some parties having ventured abroad, to solicit their repeal, Richard, by a proclamation, ordered their return to England, on pain of death and forfeiture of estate. Nor could these statutes ever be repealed. Why they lay inoperative or dormant for an hundred and thirty years will be afterwards explained, but there they were, as powerful instruments, to be wielded another day, by Henry the Eighth, upon the fall of Cardinal Wolsey. As for Richard II., he drove on, till the power which he sought rather to reduce than promote, at last, and through Arundel, artfully secured his deposition, in September 1399.

At the conclusion, therefore, of the fourteenth century, we concede to Petrarch, or Boccaccio and his fellows, all that is demanded as to the revival of learning in Italy; nor has England any occasion to be ashamed of the contrast or distinction between the two countries. The pursuits of
both were but in their infancy. In the former, "imagining that all knowledge was to be found in the ancient Masters," they were beginning to seek after Mount Parnassus and their old Romans; but in the latter they were in search of Mount Zion and the fishermen of Galilee. The Italian had become eager after the wisdom of Greece, and the nervous oratory of his forefathers; the Englishman, after the wisdom of God, and the course pursued by the first planters of Christianity. If any of our countrymen were looking to Greece at all, it might be only to such as had proved to "be the first-fruits of Achaia unto God," and if to Rome, it was only to those in the imperial city, once so beloved, "whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world."

The manuscripts of Wickliffe's version complete, are numerous still; and perhaps not much less so than those of the New Testament separately, not to mention different pieces, or entire books of the translation. In examining some of these, whether in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, in the British Museum, or in private collections, we have been struck with their legibility and beauty. They have all, indiscriminately, been called Wickliffe's version, but variations of expression are to be found in a few; and it is not so generally known that we possess two distinct versions, one under Wickliffe's own eye, and another a recreation of the entire sacred text.

It is certainly a singular circumstance that this translation of Wickliffe has never been printed! The New Testament, it is true, was published by Mr. Lewis, in the year 1731, or three hundred and fifty years after it was finished, and once more by Mr. Baber, in 1810; but the Bible entire, now four hundred and sixty-four years old, has never yet been published. By the time that Tyndale was born, indeed, it would not have been intelligible to the people at large; moreover, it was from the Latin Vulgate, and the period had arrived when the translation must be drawn from the original tongues. But still, even as a most interesting literary production, one could never have imagined that above twenty sovereigns would have sat on the throne of England since the invention of printing, before such a work had issued from the press. By Fabricius, a foreigner, as well as others, this has been often referred to as a national disgrace, but happily, the reproach, at last, is in the course of being wiped away. Both these versions to which we have alluded are now in the press, printing in parallel columns, at the Oxford University press, and under the eye of Sir Frederick Madden and the Rev. J. Forshall, of the British Museum.

Thus then, whatever darkness reigned, or enmity was shewn in this country, throughout the whole of the next century, these precious volumes were preserved, and the surviving copies remain, like so many veritable torch-bearers for the time being. They may, and indeed must have shone often in secret, or at the midnight hour, and certainly not without effects, to be disclosed another day: but at all events, here is one palpable existing distinction between this country, and every other, at the moment. It is one which stands in the finest keeping with all that took place in the days of Tyndale. The favor of God, even at this early period, had already begun to place this Island in that conspicuous position which it was afterwards to occupy among the nations of Europe, with regard to the possession and the diffusion of his blessed Word.

Let this ever be regarded as the grand distinction of Britain. And while the Italian historian, down to the present hour, continues to rejoice in the triumph of literature and the arts upon his native soil, nearly five hundred years ago; let not the British Christian fall behind him in joy and gratitude over that contemporaneous triumph which at last led his country to a better hope and a brighter day. Let him rather compare the two countries now, and observe the too-much neglected, but all-sufficient reason, for the prodigious distinction between the two.

No storm, however, arose in Italy, nor any cloud, to obscure the rising sun of her
classical literature. On the contrary, though Rome itself may still be troubled, that sun is only about to burst upon the country in all its splendor, and the men of Italy are to be allowed ample scope still, for above an hundred years, to do their utmost. Very different was the reception given by our forefathers, as a nation or as a government, to the voice of God. Here at home, in some resemblance to the visit paid by the Almighty to Elijah, there must it seems be first the wind, and then the earthquake, and then the fire, before ever the "still small voice" is heard with effect. Nay, and when once it comes through Tyndale's version, and is heard by the people, we shall find, however strange, that no official man in England will be able to divine from whence it came, or by what mysterious conveyance it had reached their ears!

THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS.

BY ELDER JACOB CREATH, OF PALMYRA, MO.

6. I have made known thy name to the men, whom thou gavest me from the world. thine they were, and thou gavest them to me and they have kept thy word. 7. Now I have known that whatsoever thou hast given me was from thee. 8. For the words thou gavest to me, I have given to them; and they have received them, and have known certainly that I came from thee; and they have believed that thou didst send me. 9. And I pray for them; it is not for the world that I pray, but for them whom thou hast given me, for they are thine. 10. And all that is mine is thine, and what is thine is mine; and I am glorified in them. 11. Henceforth I am not in the world; but these are in the world and I go to thee, Holy Father, keep them in that thy name, which thou hast given to me; that they may be one, as we are. 12. While I was with them in the world, I have kept them in thy name. whom thou gavest me, I have kept; and none of them is lost but the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled. 13. But now I come to thee; and the things I speak in the world, that my joy may be complete in them. 14. I have given them thy words: all the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world. even as I am not of the world. I pray not, that thou wouldst take them out of the world, out that they wouldst keep them from evil. 16. For they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. 17. Father, sanctify them by thy truth, thy word is truth. 18. As thou didst send me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world. 19. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified by the truth.—The Intercessory prayer of our Lord and Savior for the twelve Legates: Syrian Translation.

WASHING THE DISCIPLES' FEET.

There can not be a symmetrical growth of Christian character without sympathy and intercourse with the poor, especially the poorer brethren. What Christ did so much of, must surely form a part of our duty. One of his last and most significant lessons to his disciples, that of washing their feet and commanding them "so to wash one another's feet," was not so much to teach humility in the ordinary sense of the word, as to impress upon them a sense of willingness to do even the most lowly and troublesome service for each other. By nature we stand aloof from each other, and try to slip the noose of every menial office. But Christ came to reveal a love which must sacrifice ease, carelessness, and selfishness, to do kindnesses, and to perform even the lowliest services if need be, for our brethren and each other.

My first object will be to rescue these verses from the grasp of sectarianism. Like a large portion of the divine witnesses, they have not been allowed to give in their testimony; until they have first been placed on the theological wheel and racked until their joints are dislocated, to make them support a cause which had no existence at the time this prayer was uttered. I, like many others, was taught that this part of the prayer was for the eternally elect persons. I have an objection or two to offer against thus wresting this part of the prayer. Jesus says, verse 12, "Those whom thou hast given me, I have so guarded, (ephulaza,) so protected, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled." Psalm cix. 8. According to Peter, Acts i. 20, the109th Psalm was spoken with reference to Judas, verse viii. Psalm
109. Let another take his office—not his bishoprick, as the common episcopalian version says, unless we desire to make Judas the first bishop in the succession of papistical and episcopal prelates, as the J. mes' version does. So far is this eternal decree, concerning the elect, from being unchangeable, that according to this part of the prayer one of the eternally elect was lost. The son of perdition signifies one who deservedly perishes: as a son of death, 2 Samuel xii. 5; children of hell, Matt. xxiii. 15; and children of wrath, Ephes. ii. 3; signify persons justly obnoxious to death, hell and wrath. Again, Jesus says, John xviii. 8, 9, "I have told you I am he: if therefore you seek me, let these go; that the saying might be fulfilled. Of them whom thou hast given me, I have lost none."

My second objection to applying these twelve verses to all the eternally elect is that our Savior says here, I have manifested my name, in the perfect and past time or tense, which could not in truth be said of all the elect past, then present, and future. I will let these two objections suffice for the present, until some person obviates them. I have given them the words which thou gavest me, that could not have been said of all the persons who have lived since they were spoken, and who shall live hereafter.

From the sixth to the twentieth verse then he prays for the apostles. And why pray for the twelve apostles next to himself? Because, they were next to him in importance and authority. They, immediately after his resurrection and ascension to his mediatorial kingdom, were placed on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes, ruling his church and people of which the twelve tribes were a type. There is only one instance of disagreement among the apostles in the book of Acts xv. 39, and that was not about doctrines, but about a man. Paul and Barnabas disagreed respecting John Mark. There was a paroxysm or fit of a fever. Paul and Peter had a contest, which was on account of Peter's dissimulation, not about doctrines. Gallatians ii. 11, 16. The church at Corinth was divided in sentiment on account of undue attachment to men or leaders. 1 Cor. i. I am of Paul and I am of Cephas. The apostles were united in their lives, and not divided in their deaths. United they lived, united they died in their teaching. We refer to the Book of Acts as proof of this. There are but two events in the New Testament of greater importance than the unity of the apostles and of the primitive Christians, and they are the annunciation and the erection of the first Christian congregation. Luke ii. Acts ii. The word name in verse 6, xi. xii. xxvi. In the Hebrew language the name of a thing signifies the thing itself. They that know thy name (God) will put their trust in Thee. Thou hast a few names or persons in Sardis who have not filed their garments. The following note is from George Campbell, D. D., F. R. S., of Edinburgh. Name is used in scripture for person sometimes, Rev. 3, 4; sometimes for fame, Psalm lxvi. 1; and sometimes, when applied to God, for his power, or other perfections, Ps. xx. 1, 7.

When mention is made of making known God's name to the heathen, we always understand it to mean, declaring to them his nature and attributes, as the only true God. It is surely to the heathen or those who before knew not God, that in the Old Testament, we find mention of revealing his name. But let it be observed that they were Jews of whom our Lord spoke, verse 6, when he said, I have made known thy name to the men whom thou hast given me. The sequel shows he meant the apostles, who, before they became his disciples, were the disciples of Moses. Now, by making known the name of God to those who enjoyed the old dispensation, is plainly suggested that additional light was conveyed to them which they could not have derived from it. By manifesting God's name to them, therefore we must understand the communication of those truths which peculiarly characterize the new dispensation. And as every revelation which God gives tends further to illustrate the divine character, the instructions which our Lord gave...
his disciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of sinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which in the Hebrew idiom is the same) the name of God to them. When the connection in this prayer, is considered with any degree of attention, we must be sensible that the words, the name of God, in verses 6, 11, 12, 26, denote the same thing. If, then, by the name of God, verses 6 and 26, be meant the great foundations of Christian institution, the being preserved or kept in it, verses 11, 12, must mean their being enabled to continue in the faith of that religion. The great foundation of the Christian institution were the incarnation, truth, life, miracles, sermons, death, resurrection, ascension and glorification of the Son of God. These he made known to the apostles, and they to the world, and they continued in them, in these great facts; in these distinguishing peculiarities of the new dispensation. The rapid propagation of the gospel was owing, in a great measure, to the unity, devotion, zeal, simplicity and faithfulness of the apostles. I have explained thy nature and thy perfections, thy mercifull designs, thy will and worship to the apostles. They were one in their teaching, and commissioned by one authority, illuminated by the same Spirit, and their labors all tended to one object, the glory of God and the salvation of men. I have declared to them thy new test name—Love. A little of the divine nature was known by the works of creation; a little more was known by the Mosaic revelation; but the full manifestation of God—his nature and his attributes, came only through the revelation of Jesus Christ. That they may be one, that they and all who believe had no other creed than the New Testament, nor had the Christians of the three first centuries and a quarter, till the year 325. The same cause will produce the same effect. During this period the congregations were purer, and in a better condition than they have ever been since. Second proposition: Original Christianity stands upon original records, the New Testament creeds are parts and mutila-
tions of this record, and are not Christianity. Third proposition: The churches, creeds, and religions, may be reformed and improved, but the gospel of Jesus Christ can neither be improved nor reformed; we might as well attempt to improve the brilliancy of a diamond, or the splendor of the sun, or to improve any of the works of God.

Fourth proposition. The gospel as taught and practiced by Christ and the apostles is the only religion that can unite all good men in its support. Fifth: The Christianity of the New Testament is the only religion that can become the universal religion of mankind. All other religions are either dead or dying, or will die. Christianity is growing, strengthening, and enlarging, and will embrace all that will be saved by it. It is the only religion now obligatory on mankind, which has God for its author, and without any mixture of error. Sixth proposition: The original primitive Christian congregations were built upon the gospel as preached by the apostles; sectarian churches are built upon creeds, or profess to be built upon the Bible, while they are built upon creeds and the Bible. Seventh: The plan of union as laid down in the New Testament is over 1,800 years old, and is inspired, infallible, and can become practicable and universal. Most other plans of union are about 300 years old, and are fallible, human, and impracticable. Eighth: Christ never prayed that all sects might be united; sedarian churches are necessary, but, like clothes, they often enfeeble the strong. Ninth: There is only one Christian church, no more. If two mathematical lines run parallel to each other, 10,000 miles, and never vary, they can never meet, while these societies remain as they are, and never change, they can never thrive.

Tenth proposition: The present divisions of professed Christians are of men, and are not of God, and are therefore wicked, sinful, and ruinous to the souls of men. Eleventh: Are they ever to cease, when, where and how are they to cease, or are they to be perpetuated? Twelfth: They can cease by setting aside every opinion and practice which has originated since the death of the apostle John, in either accident or whim. Thirteenth: If the line of Christianity could be clearly drawn between human opinions and the positive dictates of revelation, and one separated from the other, the way would be prepared for a more intimate and harmonious union among professed Christians. They are now divided about that which the Bible is silent, not about what is in the Bible, but about what is not in it. Fourteenth: Before Christians can ever be united, those partition walls which now divide the people of God must be broken down; the sects must abandon their creeds. They must make mutual concessions to each, and the best way to do that is to abandon their creeds, and come to the Bible, and the Bible alone, as they have said they would do. We must have apostolic precept or example for our practice. The diversity is in opinion, not in faith.

THE WORTH OF ADVANTAGES.

"The greatest men have been those who ventured their way to success through difficulties. Moses, Elijah, Abraham, John the Baptist, the giants of both Testaments; were not men nurtured in the hot-house of religious advantages. Many a man would have done good if he had not a superabundance of the means of doing it. Understand therefore the real amount of advantage which there is in religious privileges; necessary especially for the feeble, as crutches are necessary, but, like crutches, they often enfeeble the strong. For every advantage which facilitates performance and supersedes toil, a corresponding price is paid in loss."
A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.—
NO. VIII.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING.—NO. VI.

In previous articles enough has been said, at least for the present, about spurious preaching. Our attention has also been directed to those authorized to preach, and their authority for preaching. The next thing to be considered, is the preaching, and the proper manner of preaching, in our time. What should be preached? In what manner should preaching be done? For an answer to these important questions, we apply to the only divine source of information—the example and teaching of our Lord and his apostles.

“If any man speak,” says a holy writer, “let him speak as the oracles of God,” (1st Pet. iv. 11.) The minister of Christ can not turn aside to infidelity, in any of its bolder and more manly forms, much less to any of the more sly, stealthy and insidious forms, in shrinking from a single item at a time; nor can he yield to any pseudo philosophy, that is everlastingly evading the gospel, at one time setting aside its terrible sanctions, at another time trying to find some way to serve God, be Christians and acceptable worshippers, without doing his commandments; and then, again, trying to induce men to believe that there are some direct communications from God, to be adhered to as a guide to heaven, in the form of special influences of the Spirit, Spirit manifestations, or reason. “When they say, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter, should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isa. viii. 18, 20.) This leaves no room for evasion. “Wo to them who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.” (Isa. v. 20.) Let us hear the great apostle to the Gentiles: “I marvel that you are so soon removed from him who called you into the grace of Christ to another gospel; which is not another; but there be some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you, than that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel to you, than that which you have received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.” (Gal. 1. 6-10.) There is no tampering in this—no man-pleasing spirit. It is straight forward, decided and determined language. Let us again hear the divine scriptures: “I testify to every man who hears the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add to those things God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things that are written in this book.” (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) To evade the force of this terrible language, some have said, that it relates wholly to the book of Revelations. But we ask such, if we may then add to, or take from the writings of Paul, Peter, James or Jude? Certainly not, for if we add to, or take from any of the inspired writings, we shall do so at the peril of our souls. The fiercest and most terrible of the judgments of God will be visited upon us.

Jude says, “I gave all diligence to write to you of the common salvation, and exhort you, that you should contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.” (Jude 3.) Even the prayers of the saints have reference to the manner in which the gospel should be preached. Hear Paul, directing the saints how to pray: “Praying always with all prayer and supplication in
the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given to me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel; for which I am an ambassador in bonds; that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.” (Eph. vi. 18-20.) Let us hear this old soldier of the cross, in a few words, in a letter to a young preacher, just before he suffered martyrdom: “I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing.” (2d Tim. iv. 6-8.)

Hear his solemn charge to young preachers: “I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season; out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” (2d Tim iv. 1-4.)

Hear the affectionate words of this holy man again: “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thee trust, avoiding profane babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith.” (2d Tim. vi. 20, 21.)

Having guarded Timothy against many of the distracting, speculative and mischievous questions that would be liable to mar the peace of the church and tend to schism, he adds, “If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings, perverse dis-

putings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.” (1st Tim. vi. 3-5.)

Let us now attend to some of Luke’s laconic statements in regard to the preaching, as found in a few instances, in his “treaties.” Speaking of Paul, he says, “There came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.” (Acts xxviii. 23.)

Another specimen is given in the last words of the same chapter: “And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.” Again, speaking of the preaching of Philip, in Samaria, he says: “Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them.” (Acts viii. 5.)

Of his preaching to the officer of Candace, Luke says, verse 35, “Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus.” To preach Jesus, is to preach the gospel of Jesus, or the things authorized by him. To read Moses, was to read the law of Moses, the things authorized by Moses. Christ is the foundation of all true preaching, true religion and true piety. The first preachers made him the center and circumference, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, the way, the truth and the life, and maintained manfully that no man comes to the Father but by him—that there is no other name given under heaven, nor among men, whereby we can be saved.

The reader will see from the specimens given, that the first preachers had something definite, tangible and intelligible to preach, and something too, that they could express in few words, so as to be perfectly under-
stood. They called it "the faith," "the faith of Christ," "the doctrine of the Lord," "the word," "the gospel." In describing what was preached, they said, "He preached Jesus"—"preached Christ"—"preached the word"—"preached the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ"—"preached the faith which once he destroyed"—"preached the gospel to them"—"reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come." No account of any good man preaching his opinions, views, speculations or philosophies. Their language was, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 8.)

We do not now need men to improve on the gospel, but men who love it and him who gave it, who are true to it, as a whole, and also true to it in all its parts, who will preach the gospel itself, with fervency, earnestness and power, and enforce it on mankind, as the only means of saving a lost and ruined world. In this gospel of the blessed God is contained the clearest, most momentous and enduring interest ever made known to a world lying in sin, under the power of the wicked one. The preaching of this gospel is the greatest, the most noble and God-like of all the works to which the noblest gifts of the greatest and best men were ever consecrated. Bringing the authority of our Lord to bear upon the minds of men, bringing the authority of the gospel, in all its ponderous force, so as to induce them to turn to the Lord, is the sublime work of the preacher of Christ. The man who does this work well, preaches not himself, but Christ and him crucified. He determines to glory in nothing save the cross of Christ—to make known nothing but Christ and him crucified. He will not be drawn aside by any worldly machinations, schismatical questions or speculative theories of men. He has before him his polar star; his purpose is firmly fixed; his determination is a settled one; and he bears forward with a most unyielding, unwavering and undying persistence in the work to which the Lord has called him. He has his one work, and he keeps an eye single to that one work. Anything that conflicts with that one work, he withstands with every power, not because he loves opposition, or strife, but because he can not see the cause he loves, for which Jesus died, and emphatically, the cause of God, crushed down and make no resistance.

Paul, in describing what kind of a man is suited to be an overseer in the congregation of the Lord, says, "Holding fast the faithful word, as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and convince the gainsayers; for there are many unruly, and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. i. 9, 10.) This has more direct reference to those in the church, than to preaching to those without. The work of the preacher of the gospel is divided into two chapters, as we find in the commission:

1. To disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

2. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever be commanded them.

In laboring to disciple, or convert the nations, the great matter is more to present the gospel in its concentrated form, or to present Christ, as the embodiment, or living personification of the gospel, and try and win the souls of men to him. In his pure, spotless and holy life; in his kindness, benevolence and humanity, he was an exemplification of what his religion is designed to make men. The great matter is to induce the sinner to fall in love with him, to become his disciples and follow him. This is the work of the faithful evangelist of Jesus Christ. Then when the person has consecrated himself to him, become his disciple and fully put himself under him he should be taught in detail all
things that Jesus commanded, that he may observe them.

POINTED THOUGHTS.

Immersion. In immersion the whole body goes under the water: and the baptized, is "buried in baptism," and "his body washed with pure water." There is, therefore, in this case, no difficulty in respect to the application of water. But if immersion is rejected, and sprinkling, or pouring substituted, to what part of the body shall the water be applied? One may say, "to the forehead!" But does God say so? None, I presume will contend that he does. Unless God names the portion of the body to which the water shall be applied, it would seem that the application of water on this principle, to any part of the human body, would constitute a valid baptism. For example; should one say the foot, another the hand, another the forehead, how would you effect a scriptural settlement of the question? In no other way, that I can perceive, than by demonstrating, that, in baptism, the subject is applied to the water, and not, in any possible case, the water to the subject! John poured, sprinkled, or immersed the people in the river Jordan. The action of the verb, baptized, terminates on the people, not on the water: and if pouring is baptism, the people were, consequently, previously to baptism, converted into a liquid, in order to be poured. John could dip the people, but could not pour them! Better give it up!

One said, I know of no instances of immersion, recorded in the New Testament, but that of the demons, which were permitted to enter into the swine!" "Yes," said another, "and they have hated it ever since!"

"Sheep," said one, "have a strong aversion to going into the water!" "Goats," said another, "have an equally strong aversion to going into the water!"

A baptist preacher showing a strong disinclination to going out into a shower of rain, a Pedobaptist said to him, "I am surprized at you. I thought that you Baptists were not afraid of water." "In that," said the baptist, "you are right: but we despise sprinkling!"

Old brother John Smith, who has always an appropriate answer in readiness, as he came in out of a shower, was asked how he bore the sprinkling with so much apparent good will? "I thought," said the querist, "that you despised sprinkling!" "No, indeed," said brother Smith, not when it comes from heaven! It is only when it comes from the fingers of a priest, that I despise it!"

By the by, brother Smith says, "he never intends to die while he lives!" There is a volume in this short sentence. As age approaches, too, many yield to it, in a good measure, not from a weight of infirmity, but through the force of imagination. Others, without the plea of old age, "die while they live." All who are "lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God," are dead while, they live! How many corpses are in the church? Horrible!

A minister of another denomination, once sent me the following query which he requested me to answer in public: "Suppose a sinner should make the good confession, at the meeting house, and when in the act of going to the water, a limb should fall on him, and kill him, would he be lost?"

Ans. 1. Suppose I should be compelled to acknowledge total ignorance of the man's destiny, would that be a sufficient reason for preaching "another gospel?" The Savior says, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," must I not still preach this, and the whole gospel of Christ whether I can tell the destiny, in any spe-
cial case, of the unbaptized, or not? I will so preach it, and leave the unbaptized in the hands of a merciful God.

2. But as God is merciful, and the individual in the case referred to had believed in, and confessed the Lord, and was on his way, according to his best ability, to baptism, and a subsequent life of obedience, if by any casualty, he should die by the way, I would hope for his salvation. I might not be so well satisfied, as if he had obeyed the Lord fully; but, I would at least hope, I might not be capable of giving satisfactory proof of his salvation; but God being merciful, I would still hope.

3. But, said I, there is another side to this question! Suppose, a person sitting on the way side, ridiculing the person in question—calling the gospel Campbellism, and baptism a ducking, and a limb should fall on him and kill him, I should, no matter how loud might be his pretensions to orthodoxy and religion, have very little hope of his salvation! Let those who sneer at, and ridicule the apostolic gospel, and its ordinances, take warning!

A brother who had not been long a professor, approached me to obtain some instructions relative to the foreknowledge of God. Are you, said I, a good swimmer? He said “he was not.” “I would advise you, then, said I, not to go into deep waters: for, you would be in great danger of getting drowned. But the foreknowledge of God, said I, is deeper than any literal water, and has its dangers too. It is an ocean without bottom or bounds; and, for myself, I am afraid to venture into it. I have known many “drowned in the destruction and perdition” by speculations on the foreknowledge of God, and other kindred topics. Our safety, consists in believing what God testifies, and obeying what he commands. When we can compress the ocean within the limits of a thimble, then may we comprehend the foreknowledge of God, or any other infinity: but, questions of religious privilege and duty, are plain, so that the wayfaring man, though a simpleton, need not err.

A. Raines.

THE ANNALS OR HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

BY C. ANDERSON, OF ENGLAND.

[Continued.]

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Although, strictly speaking, only a century of preparation, still the fifteenth must ever be esteemed more important than any that had preceded it, and, in one point of view, more influential than any that has followed since. When it is observed that an art, then first applied, though nearly four hundred years old, is only now rising to greater power in this country every day, and is evidently destined to be employed by all the nations, no wonder that it should be so regarded. It is true that “in the wisdom of God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching,” nay, and the preaching of what was deemed foolishness, “to save them that believe.” This sovereign appointment remains unrepealed—it is but awaiting its mightiest triumphs—God will be his own interpreter, and make his purpose good. The power of the press, great as it is, will yet be demonstrated to be far inferior to the power of the tongue. The enlightening of the world depends not upon the ingenuity of man upon the march of intellect, of the school of arts, but upon the fixed appointment of Heaven. Yet after this is granted, it is evident that to this new influence, as far as it goes, first employed in the fifteenth century, there can be no limits, short of the earth which we inhabit. In connexion, therefore, with the Divine assurances in Scripture, which of themselves are all-sufficient, it may be viewed as an additional indication, a providential hint, that the knowledge of the true God is to be universal. Of course, we refer to the invention of printing.

This deeply interesting century throughout must ever be viewed in two very different lights. First, as an ever-shifting scene
of agitation among all the nations of Europe, in their connexion with Italy; and then as the era so distinguished for the revival of learning and the invention of printing. How all this, so far as Britain was concerned, is to be regarded as only an introduction to the printing of the Sacred Volume in our vernacular tongue, will appear when the century has passed away.

Generally speaking, it has been said, that this was the period when "the relations of governments with each other began to be more frequent, regular, and permanent." It was the season for great combinations, whether for peace or for war, in which the Pontiff must now come down, and form merely one of the parties on either side. This course operated powerfully in favor of civil states, while no other authority in Europe exhibited such occasional marks of impotence, or waning political influence, as that of Rome.

The fifteenth century, however, still requires to be considered half and half, as there was a material difference between the first and the second. During the first, we see the continuance of the great Western schism, the union of the Eastern and Western Churches before they were shaken to the ground, closing with the noted licentious jubilee, under Nicholas V., at Rome in 1450. During the second, we are engrossed by other affairs. The fall of the Greek Empire, the rapid progress of literature in Italy, and the invention of printing in Germany. All these were so many preparatives, for the emancipation of the human mind, or that war of opinion by which the sixteenth century was to be so distinguished.

But to return, and commence with the great schism. It continued without interruption for fifty-one years, from 1378 to 1429, though the consequences were deeply felt by the Pontiff for twenty years longer. This could not fail to operate powerfully on the whole of Europe. It was the first "shaking" of the nations, before the coming of Him, to whom all nations should turn. This noted schism has been called great, to distinguish it from all those which had preceded. It at last suggested the necessity for a General Council, so that, during the first half of the fifteenth century, Councils became the order of the day. The first, held at Pisa in 1409, tried to heal the breach by deposing both Pontiffs, (Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII.,) and choosing a third, or Alexander V., in which decision England acquiesced, but Scotland still dissented. Alexander, a feeble character, was succeeded in 1410, or next year, by Balthasar Cossa, or John XXIII., a man as distinguished for violence of temper as licentiousness of morals. Three years after he summoned a Council to meet at Rome, but so far from this city being attractive at that time, only a few attended to the call. The consequence was, that, although his Council sat from the close of 1412 to the 11th of June following, no other business was accomplished save some condemnation of the writings of Wickliffe.

In the year following a far more imposing Council was held at Constance, where the man who had sat in judgment upon Wickliffe must be himself condemned, though not on that account. John was deposed, however, and Gregory XII., who had stood out for five years, or ever since his deposition at Pisa, abdicated; but Peter de Luna, Benedict XIII., still held fast by his claim; and, whoever withdrew from him, Scotland would not. Thus it curiously happened that, for two years and four months, from July 1415, the only Pontiff in existence was a deposed one, and the only kingdom or province that adhered to him in the end, was Scotland! It was during this strange period that the merits of Wickliffe were afresh discussed and condemned, not by an individual Pontiff, but a General Council; and to such an excrable length did they proceed, that though our translator had now been in his grave full thirty years, they ordered his bones to be dug up, (if they could be distinguished), and burnt to ashes. Their spite was not, indeed, immediately gratified, for what reason does not appear; but so mean is the malice of the wicked, that, thirteen years afterwards, Martin V., whom this Council was about to
elect, sent peremptory orders to have the sentence strictly fulfilled. Thus, nearly forty-four years after his dissolution, they attempted it, burning certain bones presumed to be Wickliffe's and throwing the ashes into the Swift, an adjoining brook, which runs into the Severn.

The bones of the illustrious dead having been solemnly denounced, the Council then proceeded to the living, or the well known disciple of Wickliffe, John Huss: and on the 6th of July 1415, they condemned him to be burnt, as they also did his fellow-countryman, Jerome of Prague, in May 1416. These men of violence and blood, having thus covered themselves with never-dying infamy, were very eager to have rendered their sittings periodical, and the Council a permanent branch of their church constitution; but at last having elected Otho Colonna as Pontiff, on the 11th of November 1417, he took the name of Martin V., and the Council broke up in April 1418.

This man, however, still had arrival in Benedict, till November 1424; nay, in Clement VIII., chosen as his successor, who did not resign till July 1429. Martin dying in 1431, before the close of the year, another General Council had assembled at Basil, which did not dissolve for twelve years. To any Pontiff, these were seasons of anxiety, and by no means in favour of any claim to infallibility, but this Council assumed a tone hitherto unknown. Not only asserting the supremacy of a Council, but divesting the Pontiff of several highly-valued and acknowledged rights; they prohibited him from creating new cardinals, and suppressed a large portion of his revenue, arising from the first year's income on all benefices. Eugenius IV., the successor of Martin, at length feeling this assembly so irksome and untoward, tried to hold another Council, first at Ferrara, in 1438, and then at Florence in the following year; so that as there had been Pontiff against Pontiff for many years, and each of them choosing its own Pontiff. The Council of Basil, deposing Eugenius, chose for their head the retired Duke of Savoy, who assumed the title of Felix V.

A moment such as had not occurred for nearly seventy years, or since 1378—a moment favorable to the sovereignty of the Pontiff, now at last arrived. It was the accession of Nicholas V., in March 1447, as the successor of Eugenius. Even after this, indeed, a rival still remained; but the Emperor interposed, and in April 1449, securing the retirement and renunciation of Felix to all claims, the pontifical authority at once rose to a height which it had not enjoyed for many years. The jubilee of 1450, a scene of riot and licentiousness, to which people from all parts of Europe came, seemed not only to prove that Rome was an attractive point of union still, but that the Pontiff might lift up his head once more, and say, "I sit secure, and shall see no sorrow." Assailed, for above seventy years, from without and from within—from without by the influence of Wickliffe and Huss, and from within by men of the Pontiff's own order—still there seemed to be little or nothing lost. General Councils had wrangled for many years, though, as such, they had now failed, and there will be no General Council now, till long after a very different scene has opened on the world.

But still though they had failed, it was only in one sense. The principles then and there broached could not die. The principles maintained, especially at Basil, continued to operate throughout the rest of this century, and in a way so obnoxious to Rome, as to agitate every successive Pontiff. They were these principles, and more especially the tenet, that the authority of a General Council was superior to that of the Pontiff, which suggested to the Sovereign of France, Charles VII., what was styled "the pragmatic sanction" in 1438, while Germany had adopted it in 1439; both Sovereigns having made it the law of their respective kingdoms. Germany, indeed, had bowed allegiance before the jubilee, but France would not. This "sanction," like the stat-
utes of provisors and præmunire in England, was meant to operate powerfully in preventing the wealth of France from flowing into Italy; a mode of resistance to pontifical authority, to which that power was ever most tenderly alive. The King of France might occasionally waver, as did Louis XI., when Eneas Sylvias, or Pius II., wept for joy; but then the Parliament of Paris must now also be acknowledged, and they firmly resisted. One Pontiff after another might denounce the measure, as they did also the English statutes, but still there was no change throughout this century. No change, till one obscure individual was raised up in this country, and another in Germany, who, under God, were to accomplish a work, to which neither Kings nor General Councils were equal or disposed.

But if subjects such as these engrossed or agitated the masses of men; there was a movement on the part of individuals, and these possessing no civil, no official power whatever; another influence of a far more powerful, penetrating, and enduring character, by which this century was distinguished. In the midst of such a thorny maze, or perpetual convulsion, on the Continent, it might certainly have been presumed that there was not one moment left for anything else; but there is yet that other view of this century, to which any reader must now be glad to escape. Forming such a contrast to these broils, and going forward, not by connivance, but in open day, it is like another world; although, before long, both courses will turn out to have been in perfect harmony with the great end in view. Ancient prejudices, and certain long-fixed associations of the mind, were shaken to the root, by the events at which we have already glanced; but for the entrance of new ideas, and the notable reception of Divine Truth itself, Providence was preparing at the same time, or throughout the entire century.

The triumph of Classical Learning.

We have already conceded to Italy the precedence which she claims, as the revi-valist of classical learning; and truly the first buds of promise in the fourteenth, were as nothing to the full blown garden of the fifteenth century. In the first years of its commencement, individual natives of Greece were finding their way into that country, nay, from about the year 1395, their language was taught in Florence and Venice, in Milan and Genoa, by Emanuel Chrysoloras. The Pontiff chosen in 1409, Alexander V., was a Grecian by birth. The whole lives of Italian scholars, we are told, were now devoted to the recovery of ancient works, and the revival of philology; while the discovery of an unknown manuscript, was regarded says Tiraboschi, “almost as the conquest of a kingdom.” But “that ardor which animated Italy in the first part of the fifteenth century, was by no means common to the rest of Europe. Neither England, nor France, nor Germany, seemed aware of the approaching change.” So says Mr. Hallam, in perfect harmony with Sismondi. Learning, indeed, such as it was, had even begun to decline at Oxford, but the eastern empire was now hastening to its end, and in 1453, came the fall of Constantinople. Long, therefore, before the close of the century, the roads to Italy will be crowded with many a traveler, and among the number we shall find that Englishmen, though the most distant, were not the last to hasten after classical attainments. Native Italians, we are perfectly aware, have been jealous of our ascribing too much to the event just hinted, but there can be no question that, in its consequences, it proved the first powerful summons to Europe to awake. On the sacking of Constantinople, we know of five vessels at least, that were loaded with the learned men of Greece, who escaped into Italy. Of course they brought their most valued treasure, or their books, with them; and thus by one and another, as well as the eager Italian himself, a stock of manuscript was accumulated on Italian ground, which was just about to be honored with a reception, very different, indeed, from that of being slowly increased by the pen of the copyist! Italy
The Invention of Printing.

An obscure German had been revolving in his mind, the first principles of an art, applicable to any language on the face of the earth, which was to prove the most important discovery in the annals of mankind. At the moment when they were storming Constantinople in the east, he was thus busy; spending all his substance, in plying his new art with vigor upon a book, and upon such a book! Neither Kings, nor Pontiffs, nor Councils had been, or were to be, consulted here; nor was he encouraged to proceed by one smile from his own Emperor, or from any princely patron. No mechanical invention having proved so powerful in its effects as that of printing, it is not wonderful that so much research has been bestowed on the history of its origin and progress. The precise order in which some particular cities first enjoyed its advantages, still continues to afford room for minute criticism, but the progress of inquiry has reduced the field of controversy to a very narrow compass. A better history of the art, indeed, and more especially of its curious and rapid progress throughout Europe, may, and should still, be written; but the general results already ascertained, have now approached to such accuracy, as to suggest and justify several important and striking reflections. These results demand our notice at the close of the century, as they will be found to involve one important bearing on the subsequent history of the Sacred Volume, when it came to be first printed in the vernacular tongue.

MENTZ, in the Duchy of Hesse (Mayence or Mainz,) on the left bank of the Rhine, and four hundred miles from Vienna, may be regarded as the mother city of printing; and although three individuals shared the honor of perfecting the art on the same spot, if not under the same roof, the invention itself is due to only one man. Henne Gensfleisch, commonly called John Gutenberg, (Anglice, Goodhill,) the individual referred to, was born in Mentz, not Strasburg, as sometimes stated, about the year 1400; but, in 1424, he had taken up his abode in the latter city as a merchant. About ten years after this, or in 1435, we have positive evidence that his invention, then a profound secret, engrossed his thoughts; and here, in conjunction with one Andrew Dritzehen and two other citizens, all bound to secrecy, Gutenberg had made some experiments in printing with metal types before the year 1439. By this time Dritzehen was dead; and in six or seven years more, the money embarked being exhausted, not one fragment survives in proof of what they had attempted. Gutenberg, returning to his native city in 1445-6, he found it absolutely necessary to disclose his progress. More money was demanded, if ever he was to succeed; and having once opened his mind fully to a citizen, a goldsmith of Mentz, John Fust, he engaged to co-operate by affording the needful advances. At last, therefore, between the years 1450 and 1455, for it has no date, their first great work was finished. This was no other than the Bible itself—the Latin Bible. Altogether unknown to the rest of the world, this was what had been doing at Mentz, in the West, when Constantinople, in the East, was storming, and the Italian "brief men," or copyists, were so very busy with their pens. This Latin Bible, of 641 leaves, formed the first im
portant specimen of printing with metal types. The very first homage was to be paid to that Sacred Volume, which had been sacrilegiously buried, nay, interdicted so long; as if it had been, with pointing finger, to mark at once the greatest honor ever to be bestowed on the art, and infinitely the highest purpose to which it was ever to be applied. Nor was this all. Had it been a single page, or even an entire sheet which was then produced, there might have been less occasion to have noticed it; but there was something in the whole character of the affair which, if not unprecedented, rendered it singular in the usual current of human events. This Bible formed two volumes in folio, which have been "justly praised for the strength and beauty of the paper, the exactness of the register, the lustre of the ink." It was a work of 1282 pages, finely executed—a most laborious process, involving not only a considerable period of time, but no small amount of mental, manual, and mechanical labor; and yet, now that it had been finished, and now offered for sale, not a single human being, save the artists themselves, knew how it had been accomplished! The profound secret remained with themselves, while the entire process was probably still confined to the bosom of only two or three!

Of this splendid work, in two volumes, at least 18 copies are known to exist, four on vellum, and fourteen on paper. Of the former, two are in this country, one of which is in the Grenville collection; the other two are in the Royal Libraries of Paris and Berlin. Of the fourteen paper copies there are ten in Britain: three in public libraries at Oxford, London, and Edinburg, and seven in the private collections of different noblemen and gentlemen. The vellum copy has been sold as low as £260, though in 1827, as high as £504 sterling. Even the paper Sussex copy lately brought £190. Thus, as if it had been to mark the noblest purpose to which the art would ever be applied, the first Book printed with moveable metal types, and so beautifully, was the Bible.

Like almost all original inventors, Gutenberg made nothing by the discovery, at which he had labored for at least twenty years, from 1435 to 1455. The expenses had been very great; and, in the course of business, after the Bible was finished, the inventor was in debt to the goldsmith, who, though opulent, now exhibited a character certainly not to be admired. He insisted on Gutenberg paying up his debt; and, having him in his power, actually instituted a suit against him, when, in the course of law, the whole printing apparatus fell into Fust's possession, on the 6th of November 1455. According to Trithemius, one of the best authorities, poor Gutenberg had spent his whole estate in this difficult discovery; but still, not discouraged, he contrived to print till 1463, though on a humbler scale.—Having been appointed by Adolphus the Elector of Mentz one of his gentlemen, (inter auticos.), with an annual pension, he was less dependent on an art which to him had been a source of trouble, if not of vexation. He died in the city of his birth in February 1468.

Fust had, from 1456, pursued his advantage, and with great vigor, having adopted as his acting partner Peter Schoeffer, (A. gilce, Shepherd,) a young man of genius, already trained to the business, to whom he afterwards gave his daughter in marriage. The types employed hitherto had been made of brass, cut by the hand. An advance to the present mode of producing types by letter-founding was still wanted, and the art of cutting steel punches and casting matrices has been ascribed to Schoeffer.

The first publication of Fust and Schoeffer was a beautiful edition of the Psalms, still in Latin, finished on the 14th of August 1457, and there was a second in 1459; but the year 1462 arrived, and this was a marked and decisive era in the history of this extraordinary invention; not merely for a second edition of the Latin Bible, in two volumes folio, dated 1462, and now executed according to the improved state of the art; but on account of what took place in Mentz at the same moment.
A change had arrived, far from being anticipated by these the inventors of printing, and one which they, no doubt, regarded as the greatest calamity which could have befallen them. Gutenberg had been the father of printing, and Schoeffer the main improver of it, while Fust, not only by his ingenuity, but his wealth, had assisted both; but all these men were bent upon keeping the art secret; and, left to themselves, unquestionably they would have confined the printing press to Mentz as long as they lived. Fust and Schoeffer, however, especially eager to acquire wealth, had resolved to proceed in a very unhallowed course, by palming off their productions as manuscripts, that so they might obtain a larger price for each copy. The glory of promoting or extending the art must now, therefore, be immediately and suddenly taken from them. Invention, of whatever character, like Nature itself, is but a name for an effect, whose cause is God. The ingenuity He gives to whomsoever He will but He still reigns over the invention, and directs its future progress. At this crisis, therefore, just as if to make the reference to Himself more striking, and upon our part more imperative, we have only to observe what then took place, and the consequences which immediately followed.

Fust and Schoeffer had completed their first dated Bible, of 1462, but this very year the city of Mentz must be invaded. Like Constantinople, it was taken by storm, and by a member too of that body, who in future times so lamented over the effects of printing. This was the Archbishop, or Adolphus, already mentioned. The consequences were immediate, and afford an impressive illustration of that ease with which Providence accomplishes its mightiest operations. The mind of Europe was to be roused to action, and materials sufficient to engage all its activity, must not be wanting. But this demanded nothing more than the capture of two cities, and these two, far distant from each other! If when Constantinople fell in the east, the Greeks, with their manuscripts and learning, rushed into Italy, to join the already awakened Italian scholars; Mentz also is taken, and the art of printing spreads over Europe, with a rapidity, which still excites astonishment.

This city, once deprived, by the sword of the conqueror, of those laws and privileges which belonged to it as a member of the Rhenish Commercial Confederation; all previous ties or obligations between master and servant were loosened, and oaths of secrecy imposed under a former regime, were at an end. Amidst the confusion that ensued, the operative printers felt free to accept of invitations from any quarter. But whither will they bend their steps, or in what direction will the art proceed?—Where will it meet with its warmest welcome, and in which capital of Europe will it be first established? The reader may anticipate that the welcome came from Italy, but it is still more observable, that the first capital was Rome! Yes, after the capture of Mentz, Rome and its vicinity, the city of the future Index Expurgatorius, gave most cordial welcome. The art, while in its cradle in Italy, must be nursed under the inquisitive and much amused eye of the Pontiff himself!

Woman's Influence on the Ocean.—Forty-two captains of the whaling fleet in the Pacific have their families on ship-board. The average catch of nine of these ships was seven hundred and fifty barrels, while the average catch of the fleet was five hundred and seventy-five barrels. If the presence of a wife inspires a man with courage and enterprise on land, why may not her power be equally great on the ocean? And may we not hope that her presence may so harmonize life on ship-board, that severities may be lessened, and the ferocities which have disgraced both cabin and forecastle disappear before her benign and redeeming influence?
THE SANCTITY AND OBLIGATIONS OF
OATHS.

"An oath," says Webster, "is a solemn affirmation, or declaration made with an appeal to God, for the truth of what is affirmed. The appeal to God in an oath implies that the person imprecates his vengeance, and renounces his favor, if the declaration is false; or, if the declaration is a promise, the person invokes the vengeance of God if he should fail to fulfill it."

From another author we collect the following: "A solemn invocation of a superior power, admitted to be acquainted with all the secrets of our hearts, with our inward thoughts as well as outward actions, to witness the truth of what we assert, and to inflict his vengeance upon us if we assert what is not true, or promise what we do not mean to perform. Almost all nations, whether savage or civilized, whether enjoying the light of revelation, or led only by the light of reason, knowing the importance of truth, and willing to obtain a barrier against falsehood, have had recourse to oaths, by which they have endeavored to make men fearful of uttering lies, under the dread of an avenging Deity. Among Christians, an oath is a solemn appeal for the truth of our assertions, the sincerity of our promises, and the fidelity of our engagements to the one only God, the Judge of the whole earth, who is every where present, and sees, and hears, and knows, whatever is said, or done, or thought, in any part of the world. Such is the being whom Christians, when they take an oath, invoke to bear testimony to the truth of their words, and the integrity of their hearts. Surely, then, if oaths be a matter of so much moment, it will behoove us not to treat them with levity, nor ever to take them without due consideration. Hence, we ought, with the greatest vigilance to refrain from mingling oaths in our ordinary discourse, and from associating the name of God with low or disgusting images, or using it on trivial occasions, as not only a profane levity in itself, but tending to destroy that reverence for the Supreme Majesty which ought to prevail in society, and to dwell in our own hearts."

"The administration of oaths supposes that God will punish false swearing with more severity than a simple lie or breach of promise; for which belief there are the following reasons:

1. Perjury is a sin of greater deliberation.
2. It violates a superior confidence.
3. God directed the Israelites to swear by his name, (Deut. vi. 13-20,) and was pleased to confirm his covenant with that people, by an oath: neither of which, it is probable, he would have done, had he not intended to represent oaths as having some meaning and effect beyond the obligation of a bare promise."

In connexion with the above, let the following remarks be well considered:

1. Without true heartedness, we can neither serve God acceptably, nor perform well our duties to man, in the diversified relations of life. "Let us draw near," says the apostle, "with true hearts." And he could say, "We have corrupted no man, we have wronged no man, we have defrauded no man;" and "pray for us; for we trust that we have a good conscience in all things: willing also to live honestly." How different from false heartedness! A man with a big black lie, or the principles which give rise to it, in his heart, differs from the true hearted, as an imp from a seraph, or a demon from the archangel. Lying is one of the worst attributes of Satan: and, hence, it is said in holy writ, that "whosoever loveth, or maketh a lie, shall have his part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

2. True heartedness is a production of truth. "Sanctify them," said the Savior, "through thy truth." "Ye have purified your souls," said Peter, "in obeying the truth." We "receive the love of the truth that we may be saved." This truth, implanted in the human heart, produces "some
thirty, some sixty, and some an hundred fold;” and being at all points antagonistic to falsehood, and having the mastery over it, the individual thus receiving the truth, has truth ingrained into, and a part of his moral nature, is possessed of a true heart, becomes a hater of lies, “abhors iniquity, and cleaves to that which is good;” and, consequently, in being saved from sin in general, and from ordinary lying in particular, he is preserved infallibly, so long as he loves the truth against perjury, which we take to be the superlative of lying!—a rank, and often a rankerous weed, sprouting from the moral rottenness of a mean, a false, a degenerate heart! What a pity, a thousand pities, that truth, especially “the truth as it is in Jesus,” has not been more highly appreciated.

3. There is nothing in the universe permanent, unless underpropped and sustained by truth. The earth and the heavens will flee away, but the word of the Lord endureth forever. What security for life, character, property, should perjury become general? What security for liberty, either civil or religious? Without truthfulness, in so far as human instrumentality is concerned, all our institutions, nay, all our precious rights and privileges, are founded upon the crumbling crust of a volcano of monster passions and appetites; and obligations become a rope of sand, crumbling at the touch of every earth-born selfish interest. Go to France, and contemplate the reign of terror, and witness an attempt to govern a nation without the restraints of religion, and you will perceive that without religion to give sanctity and obligation to oaths, and to restrain the evil propensities of the human heart, civil government can not be maintained.

4. “An oath, for confirmation,” is said by Paul, “to be an end of all strife,”—only among those, however, who recognize in their hearts and consciences, the tremendous obligations of an oath; only among those, who like David’s good man, in the fifteenth Psalm, swear to their own hurt, and never change! Not among such as “swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” and to give their oath an apparent sanctity, and in compliance with the forms of law, say, at the close, “So help me God,” whilst their fixed determination is, that in so far as their oath might conflict with their worldly interests, or partialities, they will tell as little truth as possible. Not among those who swear with “a mental reservation.” Those who thus swear, practice a stupendous fraud in the very act, the turpitude of which is as broad as the interests involved, and as high as is the throne of Him who is called to witness the transaction, and as black as the nethermost pit of pitchy and eternal darkness. Call on God to witness that you are telling the truth, when you know that you are acting the part of a deceiver! Call on God to withhold from you all that is good, and to inflict upon you all that is evil, if you do not, “to the best of your knowledge, tell the whole truth,” and then, deliberately, and with fixed intent, through some sinister motive, withhold a part of the truth!—he who would do this, we may well say:

“Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils.”

His oath confirms nothing but his own depravity; and, as such invokes the vengeance of God, it is probable that they will, in due time, drink to its bitter dregs, the unmixed cup of the righteous wrath of Almighty God.

5. The germinal principle of all sin was a lie. It was hatched, by some mysterious operation, in the bosom of an angel of light, whom it forthwith constituted an angel of darkness. “He abode not in the truth, because there was no truth in him,” and becoming “the father of lies,” he became the father of sin. Hence, sin is said to be “the works of the devil.” First the contagion spread among those angels “who kept not their first estate.” These were cast down to hell. Next, our first mother is deceived. Adam next conceives the lie and falls. Thus the flood-gate of all abominations was opened upon our world to the latest generation; the whole viperous
brood having for their seminal principle a lie. From its incipiency the tide of corruption broadened and deepened, for more than sixteen centuries, and it is broadening and deepening still. A check was put upon it, in the first instance, by a flood of water, and at the last, a perpetual end shall be put to it by a flood of fire. But whither do I roam? Sin is not a thing to be parlied with. It is like the letting out of water: at first, like a diminutive stream breaking over the level; but, as it displaces the sand in its course, its volume becomes larger and larger; it runs; it rushes with greater impetuosity. It dashes onward with resistless fury, and spreads terror and desolation and destruction in its course. So it is with sin. The pettiest theft may prepare for a greater, and this for a still greater, and so on ad infinitum. The first draught of ardent spirits prepares for the second, and this for the third, and soon, until its victim dies a sot. Thus one lie, or one profane oath, prepares for another! The heart meanwhile "being hardened by the deceitfulness of sin," until the sinner being goaded on by passion, or appetite, or both, rushes into the commission of perjury; and, it may be, if he escapes the temporal, or civil penalty due his crime, will think that he has done a very smart thing!! A lie, cherished in the heart, enervates the whole moral constitution of man; and, whether it exhibits itself in the breach of an ordinary promise, or in that almost total want of punctuality, which characterizes not a few of our race, its primal principle is the same, and the same its tendency and its goal!

6. The flippant manner in which oaths are frequently, not to say commonly administered, is altogether in very bad taste. In the usual Gilpin style of running over the words of oaths, there is certainly nothing to impress the mind with solemnity; and, it seems a question of very great doubt whether even the mind of the administrator is much impressed. Hence, like many formalities, practiced by many religionists, it is utterly powerless. Add to this, the frequency of oaths, administered on comparably trivial occasions, and we need not wonder, if in innumerable instances, they should have but little influence on the subsequent conduct of those to whom they are administered. In these respects a great reformation is called for: and in all respects the fear and love of God are absolute pre-requisites to insure fidelity to our oaths. What we term honor, may, in many instances, assist efficiently in this essential work, but there are so many counterfeits in this department, that without an unfeigned faith, relative to the eternal judgment, it is not much to be relied upon.

To conclude: Whether an oath taken by compulsion is binding, or whether a man ought not to die rather than to take an oath by compulsion, with the terms of which he does not intend to comply, are questions of casuistry, with which I have no inclination to meddle, at this sitting. Brethren, "grace, mercy and peace to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

A. Raines.

HOME DELIGHTS.—"No man can tell," says Taylor, "but he that loves his children, how many delicious accents make a man's heart dance in their pretty conversation: their childishness, their stammering, their little angers, their innocence, their imperfection, their necessities, are so many little emanations of joy and comfort to him that delights in their person and society."

"I have always loved," says Lamartine, "to know the homes and the domestic circumstances of those with whom I have any thing to do in the world. It is a part of themselves; it is a second external physiognomy, which gives the key to their disposition and destiny."
REVIEW OF BRETHREN PENDLETON AND ERRETT.

We aim to give our readers a pretty full and fair exhibit of what is appearing, of religious interest especially from among the brethren. To do this, we have spread out in full in our columns, of last week and this, the articles of brethren Pendleton and Errett, in defense of their previous articles, under the head, "Communion with the Sects," with their definitions of their position and explanations, all of which, we trust, has been carefully read. These are lengthy documents, and we are assured there is more yet to be said. Let us then, be patient, take our time for it and examine what has been said, before we trouble ourselves about what is yet to come.

I. The first thing to be noticed is the original heading, "COMMUNION WITH THE SECTS." Bro. Pendleton has taken the responsibility of the heading: He remarks, "That the general heading in the case, neither affirms nor denies—it only suggests generally the subject considered." That is certainly the case with a proper heading; but when brethren Pendleton and Errett come to define their position, they have nothing to do with the question of "communing with the sects," and consider no question of that sort. They do not consider even the question of communing with sectarianism, much less with the sects. When pressed to the wall, and their position explained, they do not even allow us to say, they invite or urge, sects or sectarianism to commune with us; but simply, that Christians from among the sects, when they meet with us, may, on their own responsibility, the church neither inviting nor forbidding them, commune with us. And has not that been admitted among us from the beginning? Certainly it has, and we never doubted, nor do we now doubt, that Christians, from among the sects, or from any place, may commune, or participate in any other blessing in the house of the Lord. But when these brethren start to find their Christians among the sects, they find them unconverted, and their main defense is on the ground, that these are unbaptized Christians, and because they are Christians, they should commune with the disciples. They do not defend open communion or communion with the people of the world, or any who are not Christians. They perfectly agree with us, that the communion is in the house of the Lord an item of worship, for Christians, the people of God, and nobody else; but they maintain that these are unbaptised Christians, people of God, saints, and that they may commune because they are such.

Now a man may discuss any subject under a certain heading, whether indicated in the heading or not, but a proper heading indicates the subject treated. It does not necessarily affirm, or deny, or even ask a question, but, as we have seen, the former heading does not in any degree indicate the subject of the articles under it. It was therefore, no "fallacious play upon an accident—what logicians call fallacia accidentis." but a complete misnomer in the heading. This, however, is a matter of but little consequence—a mere oversight.

We desire no confusion of ideas in reference to the position of brethren Pendleton and Errett, and therefore, state farther, that it is not in reference to there being a people of God among the sects, in Babylon, whom the Lord calls upon to come out of her. That there are Christians among the sects, a people of God in Babylon, we have believed, admitted, and committed to print many years ago, and we believe the same now. That these have a right to commune and enjoy, in common with all Christians, all the blessings of the house of the Lord, we presume is not doubted by any brother. The simple question is, are there unbaptized Christians? This is short and easy, and all the question there is in the case, so far as we are concerned. We to not come forward and volunteer to prove that there are no unbaptized Christians, or to maintain or sustain any negative proposition of that kind. The
brethren stand in the affirmative, and, as the matter in hand is one concerning which we must practice in some way, we have nothing to do but look for their proof, that there are unbaptized Christians. If they will make this one matter clear, sustain this, their affirmative, to our satisfaction—show that the Lord has received unbaptized persons, pardoned them, and that they are children of God, we will not stop where they do, coolly refusing to invite or debar them, but will maintain their right not only to commune, but to be received into the full fellowship of the church. If it can be clearly shown that the Lord receives persons without baptism, pardons them and that they are his children—that they are Christians—we too, will unite in maintaining, that baptism is not unconditionally necessary and essential, as a prerequisite to a communicant, nor even membership in the church. We cannot believe that baptism can be an essential to membership or communion, and not to being a Christian. Shall a church refuse to receive those whom the Lord receives? Who are Christians?

If Bro. Errett's new heading evidently indicates more than he defends, and it may be, as in the case of Bro. Pendleton, more than he meant. As the reader will observe, his twelve pages in the "Harbinger" are headed, "LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS FELLOWSHIP." If we understand him, he makes the communion and the limits of religious fellowship extend to all Christians. In this we agree with him. But when he undertakes to find his Christians, he finds the tallest, most exalted and praiseworthy of them unbaptized. This narrows the argument down to a single point, removes all obscurity from it and leaves it a tangible question. Can these brethren show that the Lord receives, or pardons persons without baptism, or before they are baptized? If they can, then they are Christians, disciples of Christ, and in the kingdom, and not only have a right to commune, but an equal right to enjoy any other privilege in the kingdom, or even to be received into the church itself. If it cannot be shown that persons are in the kingdom, in Christ, received of the Lord, and pardoned before baptism, or without baptism, then it cannot be proved that they are Christians before, or without baptism, and persons who cannot be shown to be Christians, certainly cannot be shown to be communicants. This brings us out to their last resort—to prove that there are Christians not baptized, or that persons become Christians without baptism. This is a new position; nor have these brethren introduced any new arguments, or better than those we have encountered from many others, especially Dr. Rice and Mr. Merrill.

III. Grant the argument of the brethren and the position to which it tends—that there are Christians not baptized, pardoned, justified and accepted by the Lord, and the plan of salvation is unsettled, the terms of pardon thrown into confusion, and the question comes up, When were they pardoned? Yes, and other questions quickly follow, such as, Where were they pardoned? Where is the evidence that they were pardoned? How can it be shown that they were pardoned? If it can be shown that one man was pardoned, without baptism, or before baptism, and made a Christian, why may it not be shown that another and another, and so on indefinitely, is also pardoned without baptism? And is not this opening the flood-gates for the old system of seeking, mourning and doubting—throwing the entire matter into uncertainty, confusion and mysticism, so that it can not be determined who is in the kingdom of God and who is not? Is it not as certain as certainty can be, that the result would be to set the public mind to watching inward impulses, dreams and voices, or anything and everything but the promise of God, for an assurance of pardon. Unsettle the minds of the brethren, in regard to the terms of pardon thus making it uncertain where the penitent comes to remission of sins, and open the way for the people to look for pardon any place and every place, and one grand item of the labor of the brotherhood, during the past forty years, is sunk and discarded forever, The Lord promises the
penitent pardon upon his confession and baptism. When, with his whole heart he comes, in the spirit of obedience, obeys from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to him by the Lord, he comes to the promise of the Lord, rests his soul upon it, and through faith in the promise, he enjoys remission of sins. But he who tries to make it appear that men are Christians, or pardoned before they come to that promise, in the Lord's positive appointment, is, to the extent of his effort, throwing the question of pardon into the confusion of former times, and will immediately commence seeking, trying to produce, as well as inducing others to seek and try to produce other evidences of pardon than the unfailling promise of God.

IV. The Lord has not set us to looking at "the spirit of obedience" and "the hearts" of men. He looks at these himself, and he can act upon them; but we can not. Hence he has appointed visible actions for men to perform, in obedience to divine law; and not merely that men should have the spirit of obedience, in which we can be so easily mistaken, but in obedience itself. If the Lord sees the heart of any mistaken soul, possessing the spirit of obedience, receives and saves him, all right; but he has certainly given us no such rule to work by. His language to us is, not that "he is the author of eternal salvation to all them who have the spirit of obedience," but "to all them who obey him." His language is not, that "they who have the spirit of obedience shall enter into the kingdom of God," but those "who do the will of my Father," says he.—He does not say, that "they who have the spirit of obedience shall enter by the gates into the city," but they who do his commandments. The commission does not read, "He who believes and has the spirit of obedience shall be saved," but "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved." The Lord did not say, "Except a man believe and have the spirit of obedience, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." but "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

It is evident that persons must have the spirit of obedience, but this is invisible to us, unless evinced by obedience itself. We can not see the spirit of obedience, especially so long as a person continues in disobedience to the clearest requirements of heaven.

V. The persons the brethren are trying to prove to be Christians, who have never been baptized, they excuse on the ground that they do not understand baptism. But we should think that a person who cannot be induced to understand the simplest and easiest requirement—a commandment understood by thousands of Jews sufficiently well to submit to it on the same day on which they heard the first gospel sermon, certainly would be but poorly prepared to understand the communion. It is surely, to say the least of it, as easy to understand baptism, so as rightly to submit to the command to be baptized, as it is to understand the communion so as rightly to observe it. If any person's intelligence is so limited, or if the understanding is so darkened by prejudice and modern mysticism, that we can not induce him to understand the mostsimple and frequently mentioned commandment of God in the New Testament, such an one has but little use for the communion; and if the spirit of obedience is to be taken for obedience itself, in the case of baptism, we see no reason why we may not take the spirit of obedience for obedience itself, in the case of the Lord's Supper, and do the same in reference to every commandment of God, and thus taking the spirit of obedience for obedience itself all the way through, we can have the land full of Christians, on the ground of their having the spirit of obedience, without any obedience. Inaugurate such a principle once, and we shall soon have them feeding the hungry and clothing the destitute in the spirit of obedience.

VI. Bro. Pendleton says, "If I am to say to the devoted Pedobaptist, 'Stand back, friend—the symbols of the Savior's sufferings and sacrifice are not for you;' I confess that I feel the want of something more than the authority of my own poor judgment, to cover me from the charge of intel-
lectual arrogance and self-righteous bigotry.” This is stated in the most prejudicial form possible, and when rid of this prejudicial form, nothing remains to make any impression. Suppose the devoted Pedia-baptist should present himself in the congregation in Bethany for membership; would Bro. Pendleton say, “Stand back, friend—the church is not for you?” Certainly not. Would he receive him without baptism? He surely would not. Would he say, “I confess that I want something more than the authority of my poor judgment, to cover me from the charge of intellectual arrogance and self-righteous bigotry?” He certainly would not, nor would he use the prejudicial language he employs to prejudice the case. What would he do? He would do as Aquilla and Priscilla did with Apollos—he would teach him the way of the Lord more perfectly. He would not abruptly, rudely and repulsively say, “Stand back, friend—the kingdom of God is not for you;” nor would he reject him on the authority of his own judgment, but kindly inform him, that the Lord says, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God”—that “He who believes and is baptized shall be saved”—that Paul says, “By one spirit we are all baptized into one body;” or church—that “so many of us as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ”—that this matter is not left to us, to our judgment, or the authority of our own judgment, but to the authority of the Lord. But the true state of case is, that where the gospel is properly preached, such a case never occurs with persons of ordinary intelligence. The people of any community will soon understand that the invitations of the gospel are to those possessing the spirit of obedience, and that the way to come to the Lord is to come in obedience itself. Brethren Pendleton and Errett find no trouble in refusing to receive persons into the church, or kingdom, without baptism, thus at once debarring them from the whole church, and, if consistent, from all that is in it—no “intellectual arrogance and self-righteous bigotry,” thought of in explaining their position. Why then, should any be thought of in explaining what all in the kingdom ought to know—that the communion is in Christ, in the church, in the kingdom and for those in the body, and not for those without. These brethren have added to the inconsistency of even the Old Landmark Baptists, for, while they agree with them, that persons may be Christians without baptism, but may not be members of the church, they disagree with them, and are more inconsistent, in maintaining that they may commune. The Baptists make baptism a little more essential than the brethren, for they make it not essential to being a Christian, but essential to being a Baptist, a member in the church, or a communicant, while the brethren, after agreeing with the Baptists, that it is not essential to being a Christian, make it essential to admission into the church, but not essential to the privilege of communion in the church.

VII. Bro. Pendleton says, “The true rule and test are given us in the scriptures.” Certainly. Where does he find it? He quotes from Paul as follows: “I myself received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you.” Who does he mean by the word “you?” The church certainly—all immersed. “I delivered to you, the church, that which I received of the Lord Jesus, in the same night on which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he said, “Take, eat.” Who then, did the apostle deliver to eat? Any but those in the church—immersed persons? He proceeds, “This is my body, broken for you.” In the same manner, also, he took the cup, after supper, saying, “This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye.” Who does he mean by the word, “ye?” Certainly the church and none else. Who then, did the apostle deliver the communion to? That which he received of the Lord? The church, beyond dispute. Where then, can authority be found for delivering it, to others? We must have authority, and not the authority of our poor
judgments," but *divine authority.* Where can it be found?

VIII. We do not desire to examine the criticisms of Bro. Pendleton upon Bro. Elly, especially the one out of which he labors to manufacture the most capital—the criticism upon the expression, "avowedly born again." But there is a much more serious work for Bro. Pendleton, than criticising Bro. Elly's use of terms, though it should be shown that he was a little unfortunate in some expressions. Criticising his language, if the criticisms were admitted to be correct, though he makes some show of argument, and may induce some to think he has handled his opponent with much adroitness and shown a fair amount of finesse, *may not disprove the position of Bro. Elly, or prove any other.* If Bro. Pendleton would meet the matter fairly and squarely, let the word "avowedly," go for nothing, and attend to the main matter at once. Can he show that any man is a Christian who has not been born again? There need be no circumlocution here. The question is easy and proper. When that question is disposed of, if he please, let the following be answered: Can he show that any man is born of God unless born of water and of the Spirit? When he answers this, let the following be answered: Can he show that any man has been born of water and of the Spirit, who has not been baptized? Again, can he show that any man is in the kingdom and not born of water and of the Spirit? There can be but one answer to these questions. To be in the kingdom, is to be in a state of justification—to be pardoned—to be a Christian. Not to be in the kingdom is not to be in a state of justification, not to be pardoned—not to be a Christian. The Lord says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The apostle says, "we are all baptized into one body"—"baptized into Christ"—"baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Can he show that any man is in the kingdom, in the one body, in Christ, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, who has not been "born of water and of the Spirit"—"baptized into one body"—"baptized into Christ"—"baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? Can he show that any man is a Christian till he is in the kingdom—in the one body—in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit? If he can, the sects will give him a premium, for they have tried to do it for forty years and failed.

IX. After the comment of Bro. Pendleton, on the language of Paul, 1st Cor. xi. he adds: "How very minute and fearfully searching these awful announcements. They cover the whole ground and go to the very root of the matter. Yet there is not one word about "avowedly born again" in the whole passage. Neither is there any allusion to "immersion!" Indeed! and why should there be, seeing that there were none there trying to show that persons not "born of water and of the Spirit," were Christians, and trying to introduce, encourage and maintain the wholly unauthorized, unscriptural and inconsistent practice of encouraging those who have never been baptized into Christ, to commune? Why should the apostle, in addressing those who had been immersed, were in the kingdom, in Christ, in the one body, have said anything about "avowedly born again?" or about "immersion?" There was no question before his mind about persons not born again, not immersed, communing. His eye was upon evils existing among those in the kingdom—immersed—on account of which they did not discern the Lord's body, and thus ate and drank unworthily, and brought condemnation upon themselves. Instead of the apostle here lifting the flood-gates for persons not born of water and of the Spirit to commune—those not in the kingdom—he is showing that some in the kingdom—that had been immersed—by eating and drinking unworthily, had been eating and drinking damnation to themselves, and the judgments of heaven had been visited upon them.
X. Bro. Pendleton says, "It is remarkable in this, the most definite teaching on this subject which is delivered to us in the New Testament, the criterion and the caution are addressed not to the elders, nor to those who minister at the table, but to the communicants themselves. It does not say, let the elders see to it that none participate who have not been *immersed* in water upon a public avowal of his faith and repentance, but to all such as have *obeyed the form of doctrine,* (?) dispense it without scruple, for they, and they only, are citizens of Christ's kingdom and entitled to the ordinances of God's house." The allusion here is to 1st Cor. xi. chap. Who has contended for anything such as here implied? Why this change of the issue? this effort to throw the burden of proof on the other side? Why not come up to the work and maintain his affirmative ground—that persons not baptized, may be Christians and communicants? Why the prejudicial allusion to "immersion in water?" Were not all the first Christians *immersed,* yes, and in water, at that? Why this prejudicial allusion to the expression: "obey the form of doctrine," italicised and followed by a parenthetical interrogation point? Were not those to whom Paul wrote all immersed in water? Had they not all "obeyed from the heart" (why were the words, "from the heart," left out?) "that form of doctrine," which was delivered to them? There is a very good reason why such instructions as Bro. Pendleton names were not given to the elders. No one attempted to justify, or thought of such a thing, so far as we know, as far as a person not baptized, not having obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to him, coming to the Lord's table; but many who had been "immersed in water," and had "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine," came and partook unworthily, and it was these with whom the apostle was dealing, and not with persons not baptized. The latter were not under his jurisdiction. Had he been dealing with them, he would not have troubled them with the communion; but the first requirement of the Lord, to which they had not submitted, in the way leading to the Father, he would have brought to their consideration. If he could not have induced them to submit to that, he would not have troubled them with the communion. Paul's instructions were to those baptized, Christians, and they must be careful and not partake unworthily, *not discerning the Lord's body,* and those not Christians have nothing to do with the directions of Paul.

XI. We now turn to the piercing questions of Bro. Errett. He comes at us with a terrific parade of questions, seven in Catechism part first, and a like sacred number in part second. The whole logic of these questions, if we understand the matter, is to demonstrate that we do some things not authorized by scripture precept or example, and therefore, we may commune with unbaptized persons—pious ones—without scripture authority. But let us look at this formidable array of questions:

"1. Can any person be a Christian who is not in Christ?" We do not know that such person can be a Christian. Can he show that any not "in Christ," are Christians?

"2. Can any one put him on who has not been baptized into him?" Certainly he can, if a proper subject, by being "baptized into him." But, in fairness to Bro. Errett, we shall take it, that he was so enraptured, overwhelmed and absorbed, in the contemplation of his stupendous, transcendently sublime, and all glorious galaxy of unbaptized worthies, in their immortal splendor, as he gazed after them ascending "on chariots of fire to the heavens," that, like Peter in the mountain of transfiguration, he uttered this question, "not knowing what he said." We suppose he simply meant, "Has any one put him on who has not been baptized into him?" If this is what he meant, we know of no evidence that any one has put him on who has not been baptized "into him." Can he produce any evidences to this point?

"3. Can any one be freed, from sin who has not obeyed the form of doctrine deliver-
ed to him by the Holy Spirit?” The question is not whether any one can be made free from sin without obeying from the heart the form of doctrine, but can Bro. Errett show that any person is made free from sin without obeying from the heart the form of doctrine?” If he can, let him do so, as thousands of sectarians will regard it as a great work, and assume and keep stating that there are Christians, who have never obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine. He adds, “If not, can be rightfully allowed to sing, pray, and give money, by the action of the church?” If a man is not made free from sin, or pardoned, which is the same thing, the action of the church has no jurisdiction over him, and what he does is on his own responsibility, unless he can be induced to take the proper steps to become a Christian. What he does is an outside matter entirely, and the church has no action in his case, unless brethren Pendleton and Errett can show that the church should open the way for such to worship with the people of God.

“4. Can an unsaved and unpardoned person be allowed to sing and pray, and contribute money by church consent?” The church has nothing to do with any such matters. The church does not control, or govern “unsaved and unpardoned men.”

“5. Is baptism demanded of penitent persons, in order to pardon or sonship? Do not the prayers, and praises, and contributions, and the Christian sympathies and friendships of God’s house, belong to the children? And shall we take the children’s bread and give it to the dogs?” We answer the first two of these questions affirmatively, but that does not prove that we shall not extend Christian sympathies and friendships to mankind everywhere, or that in doing so, we give the children’s bread to dogs.

“6. Did the first Christian show Christian love to unimmersed persons? And shall we deliberately do what we admit they did not do?” In reference to the first question, we answer, that they did and to everybody else; but this does not prove that they extended to them the worship of the house of God. The second question, we answer in the negative.

“7. Did the first Christians receive money from unimmersed persons?” We do not know. Did they ask unimmersed persons to sing, or pray, or give thanks? Not that we know of, nor have we any authority for doing so now. Can Bro. Errett produce an authority for asking an unimmersed person to sing, pray etc.?

We are now through part first of our catechism, and shall proceed to part second.

“1. Do the scriptures recognize any as Christians, or accept any to baptism, on the narration of a religious experience?” They do not.

“2. Do they admit any to baptism who come with an avowal that there sins have already been pardoned?” No one came to them with any such avowal, that we know of.

“3. Do they recognize admission to church membership by subscription to human articles of faith?” Certainly not; neither do we.

“4. Does the gospel recognize any baptism but that for remission of sins?” Certainly not; neither do we. We have received some who, at the time of their baptism, were mistaken about it, not knowing that it was for the remission of sins.

“5. Did any come to the Lord’s table in primitive times who had not been baptized for the remission of sins?” Certainly not; but that they all understood all about the design, at the time of their baptism; we can not say. They believed on Christ and did what he commanded, and were not received on the spirit of obedience, without the obedience itself.

“6. Did the apostles or first Christians invite to the Lord’s table all immersed persons, who have piety?” They had nothing to with inviting. Paul says, “That which I received of the Lord Jesus, I delivered to you.” The communion was delivered to the church, whose members were all immersed. “Did they have fellowship with immersed persons not members of the Christian Church?” There were no immersed persons not mem-
bers of the church of Christ, unless they had forfeited their membership by transgression. We speak not of a single congregation, but of the church, or kingdom of Christ, the body of Christ, containing all everywhere who are in Christ. "Did they receive persons to membership who had been immersed by unimmersed persons?" We know of no account of any such case. In many instances, we are not informed who baptized.

7. And shall we deliberately do what we admit they did not? Certainly not; and if it could be shown that we do this, in one case, let no man think that a proof that we may in another.

XII. The main argument of Bro. Errett is to maintain that we have a condition of things—such a state of case—as did not exist in New Testament times, and consequently not provided for in scripture; and it requires a procedure for which we have no clear precept nor example—that we have to depart from primitive practice to meet this new condition of things. This he undertakes, to justify in several ways. One expedient to which he has resorted for this purpose, was to show that Bro. Elly and myself, with the brethren generally, have made similar departures. This however, proves nothing, if true. Two wrongs do not make one right. He then tortures the Bible for precedents in departing from the letter of the law of God, and finds a relief in circumcision, as others of his long list of worthies and predecessors have done before him; the passover being kept "otherwise than it was written," and the claim that the "Savior overstepped the limits of the letter of his commission." This, we confess, is a specimen of argumentation that we did not expect to be called upon to meet, in this case. In extenuation of the same principle, it is urged that, "in millions of instances the letter of this law (the law of circumcision) was violated without the visitation of the penalty." And, pray, what is reference to these special cases, some of them cases of necessity, and all peculiar, for? Why, to satisfy the people of this generation, that an item in the commission, the apostolic commission, the general commission, for all the world, given by the Lord after all authority was given to him, the concluding item in turning to God, the initiatory rite, or to express it in the Lord's own words, being "born of water," and without which he says, a man, "cannot enter into the kingdom of God:" in country, where the gospel is preached and all who have the spirit of obedience, may obey—the command to be baptized, may be omitted, and no penalty be visited on the transgressors! Nay, more, that "where the spirit of obedience is found, a person is accepted of God, even when failing to obey positive commands, because it was not in his heart to disobey." Yet he would not "weaken the hands of those who are laboring to induce all to enter into the kingdom of God according to the scriptures!" And what is this all to prove? Why, that there are Christians among the popular sects who have never obeyed the command to be baptized? On what ground, is it to be made out that they are Christians, while they have not obeyed the command to be baptized? Why, on the ground that they have the spirit of obedience! Why, then, is it that they will not obey?

Bro. Pendleton joins in the same strain, and says, "There is no such connection between Christian baptism and the Lord's supper as to make one an unconditionally necessary and essential antecedent to the other." Again, he remarks, "Faith in Christ, and the spirit of obedience to him—these are unconditionally necessary and essential prerequisites in the participants." This is not new, but is another gospel, which is not another, but certainly a perversion of the gospel. The Lord does say, "He who hears the sayings of mine and has the spirit of obedience shall be linked to a wise man," but "He who hears these sayings of mine and does them," &c.—not "He who has the spirit of obedience shall enter into the kingdom of God," but "He who does the will of my Father." "He who shall break one of the least commandments and teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." This lat-
ter expression, was uttered in reference to the law, but does not the same principle hold good in reference to the gospel also? If persons who did not submit to the baptism of John, "rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by John;" what shall we say of those who refuse to submit to the greater appointment of our Lord? When Paul says; "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them who know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," he makes no discriminations between the two classes of disobedient—those who have the spirit of obedience, and those who have not. If the Lord intends to make any such discriminations, he certainly has not revealed that intention, much less authorized any man to preach it. The hasany such intention, it is certainly in his "secret will," and Moses says, "secret things belong to God, but revealed things to us and to our children forever." It would be well for us to attend to the revealed will, and not presume upon the secret, for fear that we should find the revealed and secret will both to amount to the same.

XIII. Bro. Pendleton says, "Mere human judgments—themselves inferences—we do not feel under any obligation to submit to as divine law, nor to take any part in its enforcement against others." We perfectly agree to all that. But is it a mere "human judgment—itself inference," that the communion is in Christ, in the body, in the kingdom?—that Paul delivered that which he received of the Lord—the communion—to the church? And is it a mere human inference that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?" But why this shifting round to the negative? The argument is not about excluding from the communion, nor from the church, but communing with unimmersed persons. Brethren Pendleton and Errett are in affirmative! Their proposition, if they have any, is that we may commune with unimmersed persons, or when shifted round a little, that unimmersed persons having the spirit of obedience, may commune with us. Now brethren, "mere human judgments—themselves inferences—we do not feel under any obligation to submit to as divine law, nor to take any part in its enforcement." Would you, brethren, "make a mere opinion—a logical inference, of your own—a rule of faith or practice to others?" Come to the point, brethren, and let us hear from you. Have you anything to offer, in proof of your affirmative position, but "mere human judgments—themselves inferences? Where is your scripture authority for the practice you set out to justify? Are you not as conscious as that you live that you have none—that you are trying to induce the brethren to acknowledge a practice wholly unknown to scripture, and that too, upon "mere human judgments—themselves inferences and nothing but inferences? Are you not trying to show that we may "overstep the letter of the law?" practice "otherwise than it was written?" and offering in proof, that "in millions of instances," under a former dispensation, the law had been violated, without the penalty being visited upon the violators? What have you offered but "mere human judgments—themselves inferences," in support of the practice you maintain? Your argument in favor of Pedobaptists is like their argument for infant baptism—it is inference without anything to infer it from. You then, like them, turn round, with a air of triumph, and demand scripture for excluding Pedobaptists? We have nothing to do with excluding them, but demand of you, where is your scripture for receiving them? Come up to the work; take the burden of proof, and show your authority—yes, divine authority—not the authority of your own judgments—themselves inferences—mere "logical inferences of your own"—which you would make "a rule of faith and practice for others."

XIV. We come now to the hard place—probably to the main trouble—that which is most trying to the spirits of these brethren. Bro. Errett says, "We trust our brethren are not about to plant themselves on the position of ineffable diminutiveness occupied
by the regular Baptists—that baptism is a mere prerequisite to church membership and communion, while every other Christian rite and act of fellowship may be shared with the unbaptized." We are inclined to the opinion, that this is a pretty bad misrepresentation of the regular Baptists. We do not think they ever have maintained, that "every other Christian rite (aside from baptism,) and act of fellowship may be freely shared with the unbaptized," nor do we think anything can be produced justifying the statement; and we know that we have assumed no such inconsistent ground, and would no more undertake to maintain and defend such a position, than we would the utterly offenceless position of Bro. Errett. What ground has he for intimating that we make baptism a mere prerequisite to membership and communion? It is a prerequisite to pardon, to admission into Christ, into the Kingdom; not "merely a prerequisite to fellowship and communion," but a prerequisite to everything else in Christ. To deny this, is to set aside the entire force of the gospel plea to induce men to come into Christ, into his kingdom, unsettle the terms of pardon, encourage disorder, by supporting the idea, that men may enjoy church fellowship without church responsibility—that men can serve God in the kingdom or out of it—that "whatever a man thinks right, that is right to him."

Bro. Errett has a terrible dread of Old Landmark Baptists. He says, "Whether we shall not outvie the Old Landmark Baptists themselves in exclusiveness, and make ourselves ridiculous before the whole religious world by the monstrous extravagance of our assumptions." What this sentence would have been, had it been completed, we cannot tell; still, there is enough of it to show that our worthy brother has a great horror of being rendered "ridiculous before the whole religious world." This is a little humiliating to human pride and worldly feeling, we admit. It does not suit his taste to belong to a church "everywhere spoken against." Again, having exhausted his fine discursive powers, and exercised his most vivid and splendid imagination, in extolling, lauding, and glorifying, his triumphal hosts of Pedobaptists, as he behold them on chariots of fire ascending to the heavens in contrast with poor Baptists and ourselves—mere dwarfs and pigmies—who should ask the question, whether we might commune with them—he says, "To ignore their faith and obedience, and to deal with them, as heathen men and publicans, will be indeed to weaken the hands of the pleaders for reformation, and expose ourselves, by a judgment of extreme narrowness and harshness, to the pity, if not the scorn, of good men everywhere." But who, we ask, with painful regret, proposes to "ignore their faith and obedience," or to detract aught from all the good they have ever done, or said anything of the kind? Who has said one word about treating them "as heathen men and publicans," or even intimated anything of the kind, where fairly construed? Surely no one. Why then, this harsh and unfair representation? Do we not give them full credit for all their faith? and all their obedience too? Certainly we do. Why then, by implication, this misrepresentation? Because, where they did not obey, we do not receive the unsupported assumption that they had the spirit of obedience; and then receive the additional unsupported assumption, that the Lord accepted the spirit of obedience, for obedience itself, and then, join him, in associating them with Paul's ancient worthies, of whom the world was not worthy, being wafted on chariots of fire to the heavens; and still farther, conclude with the assumption, that Pedobaptists, who cannot be induced to understand and obey the clearest commandment the Lord ever gave, have the spirit of obedience, which is to be taken for obedience itself, and are therefore Christians, and per consequence may commune, but not be received into the church—that the Lord has received them, and will waft them on chariots of fire to the heavens, but they may not be received into the church—thus making the entrance into the church more close and narrow than the entrance into heaven itself! This is not and
would not be "rendering ourselves ridiculous before the whole religious world!"
The truth is there is nothing ridiculous about the position we maintain, and we have nothing to do in making the law stringent or not stringent. The Lord established his kingdom and placed the communion in it, and declared that, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom." If a man desires to enjoy the peculiar blessings in the kingdom, let him take the proper steps of induction into it. If any man does take these steps, he does not enter; nor is he to be treated as a heathen and publican, but according to his character, as a man not in the kingdom. There is nothing harsh about this nor exclusive. We cannot change the law of the kingdom, nor practice "otherwise than it was written." If a man is an honorable gentleman of the world, treat him as such; if he is a Jew, treat him as such; if a sectarian, treat him as such; but not as a heathen man and publican. Give him due credit for all his good qualities as far as they go; but do not deceive him by any assumptions, supported only by the authority of "mere human judgments—themselves inferences," such as that the spirit obedience will be taken for obedience itself. If I take out the initiatory steps to become a Mason, they do not treat me narrowly, nor harshly, or say, "Stand off, I am holier than thou," or treat me as a heathen or publican; when they maintain that I am not a participant of the immunities of that order. There is nothing harsh, narrow or rude in the case. The kingdom of God is for all, and all are invited to come, and the way is laid down in which for them to come, and if persons are not willing to come, or will not agree to the way pointed out and come in it, the fault is not ours.

What do all the fears of Bro. Errett, of being "rendered ridiculous before the whole religious world," amount to? nothing under the shining sun, only that he has been looking at his mighty phalanx of Pedobaptists, at a distance, till they have wonderfully magnified in his vision, and obscured important facts. Have we not rising up and, in thirty-five years, achieved more then any of them ever did in the same time? In the most enlightened country in the world, and in the brightest spots in that country, in defiance of the combined influence of all sorts of Pedobaptists and Baptists too? Have we not carried the reformation triumphantly forward? Is not its prospects brighter now than ever before? Have not the whole Pedobaptists demonstrated themselves to be perfect weakness before us. Shall we, then, cringe and bow to them? No, never; they have nothing for us to fear. If we desire to do good, and be honored of the Lord, let us maintain the divine and holy principles we have espoused, and the Lord who has brought us safely thus far, will be with us to the end.

XV. When a Pedobaptist preacher comes to unite with us, what are the steps to be taken? He keeps all the faith he has, all the penitence and the obedience—all he has authorized of Heaven—all the good; but that in which he was wrong—wherein he had failed to do as commanded, he is required to set right, evincing the spirit of obedience itself. Like our gifted Bro. Walk, a few weeks since, they confess Christ, and are buried with him in baptism, and then, teach others to begin according to the scriptures—follow the example of the first Christians, not only in the initiatory steps, but all the other steps through the whole journey of life.

XVI. Bro. Errett exalts Pedobaptists to the heavens, and makes ourselves mere dwarfs—pigmies—by the side of them, and thinks we should esteem it a great honor for us to be permitted to commune with them; and then, says, "Our reformation movement is the legitimate offspring of theirs." If our reformation movement is as much inferior to theirs, as he represents us inferior to them, the tracing up of ancestry, in this case, will be like that of some wretched, diminutive and almost useless creature, trying to show that he had a great father, or grandfather. In the case in hand, Bro. Errett gives much more credit and shows much more affection to the parent than to the offspring.
XVII. Bro. Errett, in arraying his Pedobaptist ranks before us, and calling for our "immersed believers," in Babylon, comes to the conclusion that there were but few immersed. We simply state, that for the first thirteen hundred years, all except clinicians, who were but a small proportion of the whole number, were immersed, and certainly, since then, there have been many immersionists all the time. It may be farther stated, that in thousands of instances, among his Pedobaptist heroes, when they were professedly baptized, there was as little of the spirit of obedience, as there was of obedience itself. The ceremony was performed before they knew their right hand from their left—in their infancy.

XVIII. It will be seen, that our trouble is not so much with the position of brethren Pendleton and Errett, when defined, as we have done it, as with the arguments introduced to prove it. We do not anticipate any serious difficulty in our practice, or any particular change, in reference to the communion; but we do anticipate difficulty with such arguments as they have resorted to in its defense. If they can explain all they have said to mean, about what we have defined their position to be, or what Bro. Richardson has defined it to be, there need be but little more said. Mercy and peace upon the Israel of God.

One of the best things which you can give your minister is to give him your attention in the house of God. It will warm his heart, brighten his hopes, quicken his efforts, give fervency to his prayers, and bring a blessing to yourself.

Not the truth which a man knows, but that which he feels and lives, becomes the soul's life. Truth can not bless, except when it is lived, proclaimed, and suffered for.

THE ANNALS OR HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

BY C. ANDERSON, OF ENGLAND.

One might very naturally have presumed, that the enemies of light and learning, or of all innovation, would have been up in arms; and it is certainly not the least extraordinary fact connected with the memorable invention of printing, that no alarm was expressed—neither at its discovery, nor its first application, even though the very first book was the Bible. The brief men or copyists, it is true, were angry in prospect of losing their means of subsistence; and in Paris they had talked of necromancy, or the black art, being the origin of all this; but there was not a whisper of the kind in Italy. Indeed, as to an existing establishment of any kind, any where, no dangerous consequences were apprehended, by a single human being as far as we know; but most certainly none by the reigning Pontiff himself, or even by the conclave with all its wonted foresight. On the contrary, the invention was hailed with joy, and its first effects were received with enthusiasm. Not one man appears to have perceived its bearing, or once dreamt of its ultimate results. No, the German invention was to be carried to its perfection on Italian ground. Residents and official persons in Rome itself, are to be its first promoters, and that under the immediate eye of Paul II., a man by no means friendly, either to learning, or to learned men.

This curious incident is rendered much more so, by one or two others in immediate connexion with it. Even while the art was yet a secret in Germany, the very first individual of whom we read as having longed for its being brought to Rome, was a Cardinal, Nicholas de Cusa; the first ardent promoter of the press in that city was a Bishop, John Andreas the Bishop of Aleria and Secretary to the Vatican Library. He
furnished the manuscripts for the press, prepared the editions, and added the epistles dedicatory. It had been on the summit of a hill, twenty-eight miles east of Rome near Subiaco, and close by the villa once occupied by the Emperor Nero, that the first printing press was set up. In the monastery there, by Conrad Sweynheim and Arnold Pannartz from Germany, an edition of Lactantius' Institutions was finished in the year 1465; but next year, they removed, by invitation, into the mansion house of two kights in Rome itself. They were two brothers, Peter and Francis de Maximis. Here it was that, aided by the purse of Andreas, the first fount of types in the Roman character, so called ever since, was prepared, and all other materials being ready, they commenced with such spirit and vigor, that the Secretary of the Vatican "scarcely allowed himself time to sleep." Let him speak once for himself, in one of his dedications prefixed to Jerome's Epistles.

"It was," says he to the Pontiff, "in your days, that among other divine favors this blessing was bestowed on the Christian world, that every poor scholar can purchase for himself a library for a small sum—that these volumes which heretofore could scarce be bought for an hundred crowns may now be procured for less than twenty, very well printed, and free from those faults with which manuscripts used to abound—for such is the art of our printers and letter makers, that no ancient or modern discovery is comparable to it. Surely the German nation deserves our highest esteem for the invention of the most useful of arts. The wish of the noble and divine Cardinal Cusa is now, in your time, accomplished, who earnestly desired that this sacred art, which then seemed rising in Germany, might be brought to Rome. It is my chief aim in this epistle to let posterity know that the art of printing and type-making was brought to Rome under Paul II. Receive, then, the first volume of St. Jerome graciously,—and take the excellent masters of the art, Conrad Sweynheim and Arnold Pannartz, Germans, under your protection.”

This Pontiff, named Peter Barbo, and a Venetian by birth, had no sooner come into office, in 1464, than he immediately suppressed the College of abbreviators and turned out all the clerks of the breves, regardless of the sums they had paid for their places. And although this body was composed of the most distinguished men of genius and learning in Rome, he chose to say they were of no use, or unlearned! Yet now, scarcely two years after, the same man was sauntering into the printing office, nay, it is affirmed that he visited it frequently, and examined with admiration every branch of this new art! Would he have done this had he foreseen the consequences? And what must future Pontiffs have sometimes thought or said as to his idle simplicity, or his lack of foresight?

Meanwhile, so zealous were these men, that in five years only, or from 1467 to 1472, they had printed not fewer than twelve thousand four hundred and seventy five volumes, in twenty-eight editions, some of them of large size, and all beautifully executed. Among these we find the Latin Bible of 1471. It was the second edition with a date, the first printed in Rome, and however beautiful in execution, well known to be by no means distinguished for its accuracy; a circumstance which ought, in common modesty, to have infused a forbearing or lenient temper with regard to all future first attempts. It by no means followed, however, although Rome had taken the lead, that it was also to furnish a ready market for the sale of books. On the contrary, the printers now labored under such a load of printed folio volumes, that unless relieved, they must have sunk altogether, as no doubt they suffered, yet still, by the year 1476, twelve other works had issued from the press. Among these were the "Postils," or Notes of Nicholas de Lyra, the first printed Commentary on the scriptures. But the Commentary brought them down! They had better have never touched it, as it was by this huge work, in five folio volumes, they were nearly, if not entirely, ruined in business. Such,
however, was the fruit of only one printing office, and in less than ten years. Ulric Han, or Gallus, had commenced printing soon after these, the first two, and at least thirteen other printers followed; so that, before the close of the fifteenth century, the different works published in the Imperial city alone, had amounted to nearly one thousand!

We have been thus particular as to the capital of Italy, not forgetful of the place it then occupied in the world, and especially afterwards, in the sixteenth century.

The facts now mentioned place that power in a point of view not unworthy of observation ever since. Before long, no invention was to occasion such perplexity to Rome and her conclave as that of printing, and yet the art enters Italy, and the Pontiff himself, as it were, cordially sanctions the insertion of a wedge which all Italy will drive; or, in other words, he breaks the ground, and gives the first onset in a direction which his successors have toiled in vain to arrest. Little did Peter Barbo, the Venetian Pontiff, know what he was about, when wandering into the printing office for his amusement. When examining, with a mixture of wonder and delight, the different movements of the printing machine, had he only suspected the mighty and irresistible consequences, how soon would he have reduced the whole concern to ashes, and discharged the thunders of the Vatican in every direction! But no, and in Rome itself, the printers, compositors and pressmen, shall go on issuing folio after folio, and of works which still exist and enrich the libraries of Europe.

Independently, however, of all this, what signified Rome, when compared with the extent to which the art had now reached. Had a single city or town waited for the concurrence or sanction of the Pontiff? So far from it, Bamberg in Franconia, and Cologne, had preceded Rome, and in ten years only after the capture of Mentz, the art had reached to upwards of thirty cities and towns, including Venice, and Strasburg, Paris, and Antwerp; in only ten years more ninety other places had followed the example, including Basle and Brussels, Westminster, Oxford, and London, Geneva, Leipsic, and Vienna. With regard to Germany, the mother country of this invention Koberger of Nuremberg was supposed to be the most extensive printer of the fifteenth century. Having twenty-four presses, and one hundred men, constantly at work, besides employing the presses of Switzerland and France, he printed at least twelve editions of the Latin Bible. And when we turn to the native capital of the reigning Pontiff, Venice, where printing had commenced only two years after Rome, what had ensued in the next thirty, or before 1500? Panzer has reckoned up not fewer than one hundred and ninety-eight printers in Venice alone, more than sixty of whom had commenced business before the year 1450, and altogether, by the close of the century, they had put forth at least two thousand nine hundred and eighty distinct publications, among which are to be found more than twenty editions of the Latin Bible. As the roman letter was first used in Rome, so the italic was in Venice, where Aldus had offered a piece of gold for every typographical error which could be detected in any of his printed pages.

In short, before the close of this century, a space of only thirty-eight years from the capture of Mentz, the press was busy, in at least two hundred and twenty different places, throughout Europe, and the number of printing presses was far above a thousand! This rapidity, rendered so much the more astonishing from the art having risen to its perfection all at once, producing works so beautiful that they have never been excelled, has been often remarked, though it has never yet been fully described. To mark its swift and singular career throughout Europe with accuracy and effect, would require a volume, and, to certain readers, it would prove one of the deepest interest.

Such an extraordinary revival of the arts and of literature could not fail to affect and greatly improve the external appear-
Quartely Review.

There is, perhaps, no history so sad, no period, perhaps, during which the lot of man appears to have been so agitated, subject to so many deplorable chances, and which so abounds in dissensions, crimes, and misfortunes. Another fact strikes us at the same moment; in the political life of the greater part of these Republics, liberty was always growing less and less. The want of security was so great that the people were unavoidably driven to take shelter in a system less stormy, less popular than that in which the state existed. Look at the history of Florence, Venice, Genoa, Milan, or Pisa; in all of them we find the course of events, instead of aiding the progress of liberty, instead of enlarging the circle of institutions, tending to repress it—tending to concentrate power in the hands of a smaller number of individuals.

In a word, we find in these Republics, otherwise so energetic, so brilliant, and so rich, two things wanting—security of life, and the progress of institutions."

Whether, then, as to Italy or any where else, we need scarcely again inquire, what had all this learning and refinement done for the emancipation of the soul from bondage, or its clear escape from tyrannizing lust? What, for its way of access unto God, or the only way of acceptance with Him? Absolutely nothing; nay, to speak correctly, if the uses to which all things had been converted be observed, far worse than nothing. Those venerated and confessedly beautiful piles throughout Europe, with all that they contained, and in many instances now contain, assume a very grave and sombre aspect, whenever it is remembered that in them we behold but the ingenious and laborious efforts of the blind, mistaking their way to "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." They stand before us as the professed and united homage of thousands, in their lifetime and by their dying testaments, to that Being, before whom all external display, all outward adorning, the magnificence of building or the melody of sounds—may the extended hands, the bended knee and the
uplifted eye are as nothing, without the intelligent exercise of the inward faculties.

Now, not to speak of other nations, what in Britain had yet been done with regard to there? Were the inward faculties cultivated, or even allowed to be so? Was there any attention yet paid to a vernacular literature which could interest or enlarge the general mind? So far from it, for any one man to read a fragment of Scripture in his native tongue, though yet merely in manuscript, was sure to expose to oppression; and for the first half of this very century, whether in England or Scotland, the barbarity of burning to ashes, and of severe persecution for opinions held, had been practiced by all the authorities. Nor were they, in England, diverted from such cruelty till engrossed by war with France. Then came those intestine divisions and heartburnings—the wars of the White and Red Rose—those deadly feuds between the Houses of York and Lancaster, when, as Fuller has expressed it, in reference to any who thought for themselves, "the storm was their shelter." These wars, however, so far from affecting the hold which the Pontiff had of this country, were only so many too evident proofs of the secret but prodigious influence of his votaries, in murdering one man and setting up another. At the close of the long conflict, therefore, by the downfall of Richard III.—after thirteen pitched battles—at the expense of more than an hundred thousand men—Henry the Seventh, or the first prince of the House of Tudor, most dutifully allied himself with the paramount power of Rome; and began to educate his second son as an ecclesiastic, afterwards to be known as Henry the Eighth. The father had, indeed, humbled the Barons of England, while he himself remained the devoted vassal of the Pontiff; and, at the end of the fifteenth century, the capital of Italy was still, in its own ancient sense, the capital of the world.

At the close, then, of this brief sketch, however imperfect, it must now be evident that to have overlooked, what have been styled by way of courtesy, the immortal trophies of painting, music, and song, of sculpture and architecture, nay, and of printing, for the first seventy years of its existence, would have been doing great injustice to what was about to follow, in the sixteenth century. Of all these sources of attraction, that singular power which held court and council at Rome, had been permitted to take the fullest advantage; nor was she slow to perceive the power they possessed, to charm both the eye and the ear. Printing, however, was the most intellectual of all the arts, and yet it will now be manifest, that Infinite Wisdom was by no means in any haste to employ it. The orators of Greece and Rome had been allowed to try their skill once more in improving mankind. The classics were permitted to enjoy their second, and more splendid triumph, and appear before the world in a richer dress than they had ever done; and since the colloquial dialect, the tongue spoken by the people, was not the language of what was called the Church, in any nation of Europe, and Latin alone was her language everywhere, then let that tongue, through the press, also enjoy unprecedented scope. Let no Pontiff, ever after, have any reason to complain that ample justice was not first done to his system.

Let him first have his fill of letters, even to overflowing. Let him richly enjoy the first fruits, or the highest place, nay, the monopoly of all the arts, and even the printing press to boot; and before the close of the fifteenth century, let there be issued from the press, above an hundred editions of the Latin Bible, for such was the fact: and throughout Europe, let there be hourly spoken still, more than "ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

After all this, and with an especial reference to our native land, we now ask—could there have been a more marked approach towards the importation of Divine Truth into our Island, in the language then spoken by the people, and spoken still? A more impressive series of events, as introductory to the printing of the Scriptures in our vernacular tongue? The Sacred boon was
Twenty-five years of the sixteenth century have indeed still to pass away, before the New Testament in English, as translated and committed to the press by Tyndale, will be given to England and Scotland, but these years will only render the event more striking—an event which, even in our own day, and at such a singularly momentous period as the present, will be found to deserve and reward far more thoughtful consideration, not in itself merely, but especially in its consequences, than it has ever yet, for three hundred years, at any previous point of time, received.

The mighty movement of the sixteenth century was at hand. The outward forms of society had undergone a great change, and this, it is freely granted, had produced a class of less fearful thinkers. But the tide of human activity having been first permitted to rise so high, and accomplish so little, ought never to have been overlooked. The distinction was about to be drawn, between mere intellectual culture and mental vigor, or in other words, between all that man had been able to effect, and what the Savior of the world was about to do, by means so simple, and an agency soon to be so deprecated by human authority; or rather by only one selected individual then so generally despised, and since so unaccountably forgotten!

Thus are we imperatively bound to distinguish between the oratory of Greece and Rome, or the feeble language of literature and the voice of Jehovah in his word, when it once reached the ear or the eye of our forefathers, in their native tongue; to distinguish as carefully, between the power of the press, and the power of what issued from it; between printing, however splendid to the eye, and what is printed, when addressed by the Almighty to the heart; between all the wisdom of this world, and that which cometh down from above; between printed books without exception, and "the oracles of God."

POINTED THOUGHTS

Visit to a Library.—Said the visitor to the librarian, "What are these huge volumes that fill the whole side of the library?"

"These," said the librarian, "are the interpreters of the Scriptures." "If," said the visitor, "it takes all these to interpret the Scriptures, they must have been very dark formerly, and very clear at present. Do there still exist any difficulties in the Scriptures?"

"Almost as many," said the librarian, "as there are lines!" "You astonish me," said the visitor; what, then, have all these authors been doing?" "These authors," returned the librarian, "never searched the Scriptures to ascertain what ought to be believed, but to obtain proof of what they did believe themselves. They did not consider them a book wherein were contained the truths which they were under infinite obligations to receive and obey, but a work made to authorize their own preconceived theories!" Comment. The speculation, or theory of the sect, is with that sect the supreme law of the universe. God and the Bible must bow in its august presence, and be in all respects obsequious to its mandates!

Application was made to a gentleman for
a subscription to build a Universalist meeting house. "I can not give anything," replied the gentleman. "How so," said the applicant: "we had calculated that you would give us a very liberal subscription." "My reasons for not giving," said the gentleman, are as follows: If Universalism is true, I can go to heaven without the meeting house, and in such case, would rather have my money than the house: but, if it is not true, the house might prove a hindrance to my getting to heaven, and I would, therefore, in this latter case, rather have my money than the house; and so, in either case, I prefer to keep my money, and leave those to build the house, who choose the risk." Good, hard, common sense!

"There are many men now living," said a conceited sceptic, at a wedding party, "capable of making a better book than the Bible." A preacher who was present, thinking that he would take a little of the starch out of the sceptic, replied, "you are doubtless a considerate gentleman, and would not hazard so serious an assertion without due consideration! The sceptic said "he would not." "Tell us then," said the preacher, "where those smart infidels would begin the world of improvement, and in what respects the better book would differ from the Bible?" The sceptic was silent, and the young folks began to titter. "You are no doubt a gentleman of enlarged intelligence," said the preacher, "and can give some strong reasons for what you, a while ago, so strongly affirmed. It is true, however, that Jefferson, who was a Deist, with all his intelligence, says, that Jesus Christ improved on all the systems of philosophy, which preceded him, but that, for the last eighteen hundred years, no philosopher had improved on the system taught by Jesus Christ. "You, however, may have light on this subject which Jefferson had not. I ask, therefore, again, where would your sceptics begin the work of improvement?" The sceptic was mum! and the young folks, and some of the old ones, tittered louder than before! For the time being, at least, the starch was out!

"I do not," said a young gentleman, just from college, and covered with all the glories of his alma mater, "believe one word of the Bible!" O, yes, said I, I presume you do. Thomas Paine admits that there was once a man living in the land of Judea whose name was Jesus Christ; and that he was a good moral man, and preached a good moral doctrine. You believe this, said I, do you not? "O yes," he said, he "believed that." Very well, said I, the Bible is full of this doctrine. You believe, said I, likewise, that there is but one only living and true God: or, at least, whether you believe it or not, Mr. Paine professed to believe it. "Yes," he said, he also "believed that." Well, said I, the Bible is full of this doctrine. You also believe, I suppose, that men ought "to deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God."—"Yes," he said he also believed that." The Bible, said I, is also full of this doctrine. Why, said I, you must have been greatly mistaken when you said that you "did not believe one word in the Bible;" for you have already professed faith in a great part of it. But, said I, to make short work of it, will you be so kind as to inform me what part of the Bible, it is, in which you do not believe? The poor fellow had never read the Bible, and, consequently, knew nothing of its contents, and was, therefore, incapable of picking a flaw, even had there been flaws to pick! The gas escaped, and the starch was limbered! O how much gaseous talk is in the world—gas and nothing else!!

Gibbon, the historian, reputed as among the greatest of infidels, says, "The Christian religion is a religion that diffuses among the people a pure, benevolent, and universal system of ethics, adapted to every condition in life, and recommended as the will and reason of the Supreme Deity, and enforced by the sanction of eternal rewards and punishments."

Answer. If this is true, infidelity is
false; or else the lie is better than the truth! for, christianity and infidelity are eternal antagonisms. Christianity, which according to infidelity, is the lie, diffuses pure, benevolent principles, adapted to every condition of life—the will and reason of God! How wondrous this! Can all this, or one single word of it, be said of infidelity, which is the perfect negative of christianity? Christianity, then, is a most marvelously efficacious lie, suited as a purifier of the corrupt heart of man, and recommended by the will and reason of the Great Supreme. Well, the wise will: take what the will and reason of God approves, and infidels may take that which is better, if they can find it.

"The British Parliament," said an infidel lady to Lord Chesterfield, "consists of five or six hundred of the best informed men in the kingdom. What then can be the reason they tolerate such an absurdity as the Christian religion?" "I suppose," replied his lordship, "it is because they have not been able to substitute any thing better in its stead; when they can, I do not doubt but that, in their wisdom, they will readily adopt it." So say I, and so says common sense, in regard to all things secular, civil, religious, political—have you got any thing better? I do not swap "unsight, unseen," as the boys sometimes do! Let me see it, and assure myself that I would be benefited, and not worsted by an exchange!

A brother said to me, do you believe that any of the people of the sects will be saved? I answered, it is my opinion that many of them will be saved. "I, too, said he, might have arrived at the same conclusion, had it not been for what Christ said to Peter." What is that, said I? "Why," said he, "Christ said to Peter, whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall lose on earth shall be lost in heaven." "Now," said he, "if they are lost in heaven, how are you going to save them? I perceive that his complaint was incurable—he had the bighead, and I was ashamed to expose him in company, and I answered, I never thought of that before! A. Raines.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.
NUMBER NINE.
PREACHERS AND PREACHING—NO. VII.

We come now to consider the kind of preachers and preaching wanted. This is a matter of the first importance, and we should be patient while we give it a careful consideration.

I. The preacher of the gospel, to be really profitable to the cause and successful, must be, in the highest sense, a good man. A preacher might be limited, in talent, in knowledge or learning, and still do much good, be very acceptable and, even profitable, as a preacher. But, with all the talent, learning and knowledge a man can have, and not be strictly a good man, we have no use for him as a preacher. We have no confidence in the usefulness of unprincipled, unsound, tricky or slippery men, no matter how brilliant—men not sound at heart—designing men, ready at any moment, when opportunity shall serve, to prostitute the cause to the lowest, most corrupt and base purposes. Such men may make a little show for a time, and seem at least, to have an ephemeral success, but in the end, more evil than good is achieved.

There can be no compensation for the deficiency in goodness on the part of a preacher. He may be shrewd, managing, artful and fluent, but if not, after all, a good man, the world is all the worse for his being a preacher. To be truly and properly a good man, is an absolute indispensable on the part of the preacher of Christ. One of the first and greatest lessons of study, on the part of the man who would be a profitable minister of the word, is simply how to be good.

Like his Divine Master, he must literally
about doing good. The truly good man
studies two great lessons: 1. To do no
evil. 2. To do all the good he can. These
are short lessons, but require a great
amount of study and practice. Some pro-
nounce the merely innocent man, or the
man who does no harm, a good man. But
that is only the negative quality of a good
man, standing in antithesis with the affirma-
tive, doing good.

II. He must have that rare commodity,

called *good, hard, sound, common sense.*
Without this, no matter what a man’s ac-
quisitions may be, nor what his advantages,
he can not be a profitable and successful
preacher. It is most lamentable to see some
men who have had fine educational advantages
and imposing surroundings, of whom the
public expect much, but in whom they are
constantly disappointed, all for the want of
plain old-fashioned common sense. When
they find they are not well received, but
repulsed by the masses, they know not the
reason, and think it is because the vulgar
horde can not appreciate their greatness; or
that the masses are *all fools,* while these
same vulgar masses *know them to be such,*
and that too, the greatest and worst kind—
*learned fools.* Learning is a great and good
thing and greatly to be desired, but no
learning can supply a deficiency in plain
common sense. In the preacher, if possi-
ble, let us have both the learning and the
good common sense combined. But if com-
pelled to dispense with one or the other, let
the learning go. The common sense we
must have; the learning we ought to have.

III. The preacher must have adaptation
to the people. We want preachers for the
people. This is one of the peculiarities of
Spurgeon. He is a preacher for the masses.
The people of the old country—the masses,
find, that at last, one man has appeared,
who is emphatically *a man for the people.*
Our American Beecher is also a man for
the people. If Beecher and Spurgeon
knew the gospel, had their souls committed
to it, as divine, a system from God, bind-
ing upon men, and the only system having
any salvation in it, they might, with their
adaptation to the masses of the people,
make an impression on the world that would
last till the end of time. We want men
that will speak to the people, the masses
of the people, so that they can understand
it. The ability to do this is one of the
most rare arts in the world. It is the high-
est order of learning and talent. There is
no danger but learned men and great men
of every grade will understand a man, if
the masses of the people can understand
him. If we intend to do good, we must
write and preach, not to great men, learned
men and philosophers, but to the masses.
Preach to these and make them understand,
and there is no danger but the balance will
understand.

IV. The preacher of the gospel should
understand the people, so as to know what
to say; how to say it, and when to say it.
He must understand his community, what
they most need and what they will endure
at a time, or how long they must have milk
before they can receive strong food. He
must also understand his own influence, for
what may be said by one man on one occa-
sion may not be said by another man on
another occasion. It is a miserable weakness
for a man to miscalculate his own influence
and ability, so as to be constantly undertak-
ing what is impossible to him. These are
matters of much importance, and must be
carefully studied to be a profitable and suc-
cessful preacher. It requires as much gen-
eralship to conduct a meeting well and
bring it off happily, as it does to manage
an army.

V. The preacher must be a man of faith.
He must appreciate his Bible as *true—divine—'
*from God.* He must not look upon the
Bible merely as a good book, containing
good moral lessons and wise maxims. All
that may be said of many other books be-
sides the Bible. The Bible is *true,* without
any error, and faithful from first to last.
It is the highest authority in the universe—
the mighty authority of the throne in the
heavens. The God who gave it is a real
being, a personal existence—the eternal
Deity—the I Am, Creator of all things,
The one Lord Jesus the Christ, or the Anointed, whom it reveals, is also a real being, the Prophet of all the prophets, the Priest of all the priests, the King of all the kings and Lord of all the lords—God manifest in the flesh—the express image of the invisible God and the brightness of the Father's glory—in whom dwells all the fulness of the Divinity bodily. The preacher must have a constant realization in his mind, that man is lost; that the world lies under the power of the wicked one; that all are included under sin; that the Lord has declared man in his unreconciled state, in unbelief, and that he that believeth not shall be damned—that he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. He must have all confidence in the Lord's plan of saving men according to the gospel; and that saving men means something—that it is not mere empty, idle and senseless theorizing, about a nonentity, or salvation from nothing in time or eternity, but a real deliverance from utter ruin—banishment from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power forever. He must have a realization that this salvation is so great that there is joy in heaven among the angels of God over one sinner who repents. The work of saving men must be a burden on his soul, so that it will dwell upon his lips and be the very anxiety of his heart. He will then speak like a man having a mission, and one too, of which he is not ashamed. He will not descend to empty, dry and insipid ditties without soul, life or power, but diffuse the power of his faith all round him. Nothing that we know of is so utterly repulsive as a faithless, worldly-minded and popularity seeking preacher. He will concede away, or compromise the most solemn, grand and awful truths of the volume of God. He will shrink and truckle before the most frivolous, light and idle spirits the world contains. He will yield the most imperative commandment God ever gave before the pressure of a giddy, an ignorant and thoughtless world. Such an one can never be relied on as an inflexible, undaunted and unyielding friend of the truth.

The gospel of Jesus the Christ is our only hope. We have identified our all with it. God has graciously committed it to our hands, in this evil and faithless age, and requires us to advocate, propagate and perpetuate it; defend, maintain and push it through the world, not in a mutilated, maimed and imperfect form, but in the purity in which the Lord gave it; and, at the same time yield an implicit obedience to it ourselves, and demand the same of all others who would yield to its sacred b Worcester. Let there be no pseudo charity, benevolence or philosophy, in shrinking from an item at a time of the gospel. The adversary does not ask a man to give up the whole gospel at once, but encroaches a little at one point and then at another, thus aiming to subvert and overthrow the gospel by gaining one small item after another at a time. Remember that a man can be just as kind, lovely and charitable, while he yields no principle, but stands up inflexibly for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as any man in the world. It is not love, to God or man, that starts back, shrinks, and deserts principle, or truth, or evades the plain and obvious word of the Lord. We care not what the pretext, how plausible, nor what the apology may be for departures from the clear letter of the law of God, nor does it matter how slight the departures may be, the manifest tendency of every departure will constantly be to strengthen the hands of men in disobedience, and thus defeat the success of the gospel. The successful preachers of the gospel are faithful men, who maintain the gospel, defend sound principle and adhere all the time to the right from first to last. A man who shrinks from his principles, soon convinces his hearers that he cares nothing for them, is unsound and insincere, and will have no good influence among men. The man of genuine integrity believes the Bible, and in proportion to his confidence in the Bible will be his defence of it and his zeal in advocating it. It is unbelief that shrinks
from sound and manly principle and refuses to stand up for it, especially in the day of trial, and not faith. The believing preacher talks in such a manner, in such confidence, and with such determination and hope that he inspires confidence in all around him.

VI. The preacher of the gospel must be an earnest man. No dry, prosing and tedious reading, or talking over sermons, or prayers, will arouse the people of this generation from the slumber of carnal security in their sins. We want the eloquence, fluency and life of the best orators the world can afford. There is no reason, or even common sense, because the gospel is true, divine, and from God, in having it murdered, crucified and tortured, by the dry, lifeless and spiritless preacher. Let it have the advantage of the best eloquence, most fluent and powerful orators, who can set it forth in its greatest grandeur, power and glory. We want the animated, spirited and stirring speaker, so that there shall be no sleeping, gaping, yawning or laughing in the audience. Keep the audience busy, so that they will not only not get out their watches and snap them at the preacher, as signals that he should conclude, but not even think of the time. Nothing is more ridiculous, than to hear a man professedly preaching to save men, in a cold, dry and indifferent manner. We have heard some men that appeared to have nothing in their view, unless to save themselves from weariness and exhaustion. We have noticed that attorneys at law, when they would carry a point, that the politicians when they would control an election, and the statesman, when he would gain an object, speak with earnestness, life and animation. Shall not he then, who would save men from ruin, snatch them as brands from the burnings and bring them to God, be equally earnest? nay, shall he not be more earnest? His is a greater mission, and the point he is pleading to gain is higher and transcendentally more important than all others. His responsibility is the mightiest of all the public men in this world; and of all men he should be, not in appearance merely, but in reality, the most in earnest. The preacher must realize the importance of his work, and have his own soul impressed with it, or he will not have the earnestness, the solicitude and deep concern necessary for this great work, and will not work in such a way as to bring men to God.

VII. The preacher must be a man of perseverance, endurance and real unconquerable persistence. There must be no giving up. When he enters a community, he must have the work of saving men upon his soul, in his constant thoughts and prayers, and enter upon his work with the determination that it shall be done. When he looks upon men and women on the way to ruin, he must fix it in his mind, that they can be saved and must be saved—that the Lord has appointed him to the work and it must be done. Who can view the thousands all round us, rushing on in vast masses to eternity, in numerous instances too, without the least thought or preparation for the judgment of the great day, and not feel his whole moral and spiritual nature roused up and put in motion to make every effort in his power to turn them to the Lord. “Knowing the terrors of the Lord,” says the apostle, “we persuade men.” Let it not appear in the great day that we might have saved many more—that thousands were lost on account of our neglect—but let us be diligent and bring every one to the kingdom of God in our reach.

VIII. The ministry must be industrious and enterprising. Nothing is more disgraceful than an indolent, idle and loafting preacher. The preacher should be a most active, industrious and enterprising man, constantly on the lookout and pushing his work. Let no man be more industrious, active and enterprising than the preacher of Christ. Besides four or five hours of reading, study, and writing, the preacher should spend several hours in visiting, talking and imparting instruction from house to house and preach from one to two public discourses each day. He can not be a man of leisure, or pleasure, unless he counts it his
THE FAITH.

BY F. W. EMMONS.

The Apostle Jude, in his short Epistle, addressed to "the sanctified by God the Father and preserved in Jesus Christ and called," exhorts them to "contend earnestly for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints:" and on such he invokes the multiplication of mercy, peace, and love. All "sanctified" ones, by God the father; are saints; and if "preserved and called by Jesus Christ," they are Christians. The import of "sanctified" and "saints," is set apart and made holy; and the import of "Christians" is, Chr Ist ed or anointed—the anointed by the Holy Spirit, by which they are sealed as a consequence of their faith in and obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ.

John the Immerser, was a Saint, as were all the truly pious, who lived under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, from Abel to his time. But none of them were Christians, nor was John; because he lived before Christ had vanquished him who had the power of death, before "all power and authority in heaven and in earth were given to him, and before his Kingdom on earth was established. Hence, our Lord, in speaking of John the Immerser, declared him the greatest of them born of women; but less than the least of those who should enter his Kingdom. "Nevertheless," said he to his disciples, "I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to you." (Jno. 16:7.)

Hence, says the Apostle John, in his general epistle, to all his brethren in Christ, (2. 20): "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." Again; (ver. 27): "But the anointing, which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

Are we Christians, possessing the character and sustaining the relations of those addressed by Jude and John; this exhortation is addressed to us—"That ye should earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.

What, now, is this Faith? When was it delivered to the saints? Why, and how should we contend for it? Let us consider these questions, And,

1. The term "faith" is defined by the apostle to the Hebrews thus: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Or according to the translation of Dr. McKnight, it is, "...the confidence of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." (Heb. 11:1). And to make this definition plain he proceeds to illustrate it: Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things that are seen were not made of things which do appear." (ver. 2.)—But how do we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God? Answer: Because of, and by its being so recorded in the Scriptures of truth. It is the first sentence and oracle of divine revelation, that "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." Because it is so written, we believe—that is divine testimony, and this is divine faith. Hence, it appears that faith is belief, and is the consequent or effect of testimony. "So, then," says Paul to the Romans, (10:17), "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." But how do we believe? Is it with the head—with the understanding? Answer, Yes; for testimony to be believed, must always be understood. But is it with the understanding only? certainly not: for the Apostle to the Romans had before said, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." (ver. 10) God looks at the heart and no perceptive act merely, is by him regarded as either morally good or evil. The demons we are informed...
believe and tremble." In so far as faith is merely a percipient act—an act of the intellect, they possess or exercise it, alike with the saints of God; but they believe not with the heart. They believe and hate the truth; the child of God believes and loves it. Yes more, the very exercise of faith, as moulded by the understanding in the heart is melted over and now comes out in trust and confidence. The Christian believes that God is and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and so believes, as to 'come to God' and 'seek him diligently.' He believes that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God; and as such, he embraces him with all the heart as his Redeemer, Savior, Lord, and Master.

Such was "the faith," as to its origin and nature, which was "once delivered to the saints," of which they all were participants. And that "God is," that "in the beginning, He 'created the heaven and the earth,'" and that "he is the rewarder of all them that diligently seek him," were among the first articles of this faith.

Hence, "faith in the exhortation of Jude imports more than simply believing, trusting, confiding—not as exercises, but as a subject; and, subjectively, more than these articles of the existence of God and his rewarding goodness. While they are first—first propounded, first in importance and fundamental to all religion: It imports the whole system of divine revelation, all the truths and facts and doctrine, spoken and written by holy men of old, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Where shall we find this faith in all its articles, as thus defined? Not in the confession of the Westminster Assembly of Divines—not in the Thirty nine articles of the church of England—not in any, nor in all other written or printed Creeds or Confessions of Faith fabricated by man, before or since the fabrication of these; but in the Bible—the whole Bible, and no where else, and in nothing else than the Bible. The Bible, therefore, is our creed—the Bible is our Confession of Faith. It ever has been and it ever shall be so regarded by us; and before it, and to it all the abstractions and epitomes of man have fallen and shall fall.

"And that from a child you have known the sacred Scriptures," says Paul to Timothy, "which are able to make you wise to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus." And, he immediately adds: "All Scripture, given by divine inspiration, is indeed profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect—completely fitted for every good work." (2 Tim. 3: 15, 16).

"That the man of God may be perfect"—Mark this. The Scriptures—all the Scriptures, if received by faith; understood and practiced according to their requirements; will make the man of God perfect. They are able to make wise to salvation. Therefore we say, that the Bible is our creed and confession of Faith, and this only; because it is perfect, and can make us perfect, and which cannot be affirmed of any other book because it contains the articles, all the articles, and nothing more nor less than "the faith once delivered to the saints."

The term "saints," is a common designation of the people of God, in all ages of the world; whether sustaining the relation of sons, or of servants only. It belonged, therefore, to Abel, Enoch, and Noah; alike with Paul, John and Jude. The creed of the former and of the latter was the same, in as much as it even embraced the whole of divine revelation extant when and where they lived. To be a saint, servant of God, or Christian, God and Christ could never require less than faith in all accessible, that had been revealed; for all the revelations of God have ever been so attested as to be credible, and worthy of all acceptation. But did not the apostles write a creed—an abstract epitome of Christian doctrine, by which they tested the orthodoxy of those who would make a profession of religion, and which they delivered to the first churches to be used, in like manner by them? Answer: None—none but what is contained in the testimonies of Matthew,
Mark, Luke and John—called "the four gospels,"—the Acts of the Apostles, and their several Epistles, and the book of Revelation. And they required the belief of one of these, as much as another, and of all as much as one. Paul says, that "all Scripture is profitable." Again: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord," (1 Cor. xiv. 37.) And Peter ranks the writings of Paul with "other Scripture," "In which," he says, "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scripture to their own destruction." (2 Peter iii. 16.) saying, therefore, that "all Scripture is profitable," Paul said that such was the character of Peter's Epistles, and that such was the character of his own.

I am aware that there is extant a Confession of Faith, called "The Apostle's Creed"—that it is said to be very ancient; and some have claimed for it the honor of being composed and sanctioned by those ambassadors of Christ. But no mention being made of it in the New Testament; though we believe it, we believe not that it originated with them.

"Though we believe it." We believe it—every article: in other words, believe all the words and sentences of it, and, in our estimation, it is as good an abstract or epitome of Christian doctrine, and as comprehensive as any other which has been formed by uninspired men since the apostle's time. But we believe it and in it, not as a substitute for the sacred Scriptures, nor as an appendix to them; but as containing some of their leading teachings. We believe it, and in it, as we believe in any other abstract to which we assent, as authoritative, just so far as it contains the teaching of the word of God, and no farther. And how far such is its character, or that such is the character of any other, we decide for ourselves, granting to all others the same liberty of assenting and dissenting, of receiving and rejecting, that we ourselves claim.

The confession of faith called "the apostle's creed," reads something like this:

"I believe in God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, our Lord—that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary—that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified; died for our sins, was buried—that he descended into Hades—that he arose from the dead on the third day—that he ascended up into heaven, and is there seated on the right hand of God; whence he will come to judge the world at the last day. I believe in the Holy Spirit—in the holy universal church—in the communion of saints—in the resurrection of the body, and in life everlasting.

We believe this—every word and sentence of this creed; because we so understand the Scriptures to teach. But good and comprehensive as is this abstract, it is imperfect; it contains not all the teachings of the Bible, and, consequently, not all of our faith, nor all the faith of any other Christian.

We believe, also, in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; that, in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and was God; that all things were made by him.

We believe that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.

We believe that He, knowing no sin, was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

We believe that, by nature, there is none righteous; no, not one—that all have gone out of the way, and we have together become unprofitable.

We believe that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified—that by the law is the knowledge of sin.

We believe that we are justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God—that he
might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

We believe in justification by faith, without the deeds of the law.

We believe in baptism on a profession of faith—baptism for remission of sins; and that he that believes the gospel and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned.

We believe in baptism as an "immersion," a "burial," a "planting," by the authority of Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—that to be born again according to John iii. 5, is to be born of water and of the Spirit.

We believe that Christ is exalted to the right hand of God, far above all principality and power, to give repentance and remission of sins.

We believe that all who are truly regenerated are the "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

We believe that the sheep of Christ hear his voice—that he knows them, and they follow him—that he gives to them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of His hand.

We believe that Christ and the Father are one.

We believe that Christ being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ shall come again to this earth—that He shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.

And thus I might proceed on, for hours—yes; for days and weeks—and where could I stop and say, all is told? No where short of the final "amen," at the end of Revelation, having begun with the beginning of Genesis. I would put, "I believe," before every book, chapter and verse; for such was "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Am I now asked, How do you believe this or that, or the other article which you have named? I answer: Just as it reads in the Book—according to the most plain and obvious meaning of the sacred text; understanding that literally which is literal, and that figurative which is figurative.

But, that is the question, says one. What is literal? What is figurative? Answer: We are to apply and be governed by the same rules in reading, studying and seeking after the meaning of the Scriptures, that we apply and are governed by in ascertaining the meaning of any other book. "It is only by allowing the word of God to lead us according to the meaning of its language, when legitimately interpreted, that we can know the truth as it is in Jesus." * And whosoever will do the will of God, says our Lord, "shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (John vii. 17.)

Had all Christians, and all professed Christians, no creed but the Bible; were they all alike honest, sincere and diligent, according to their ability in the pursuit of truth; did all prize it as above hid treasures of silver and gold—would they sacrifice every thing to it, and it to nothing; and, then, would they all apply and be governed by the same rules of interpretation, the right rules—the rules which every sound philologist declares to be right; soon would there be no more Roman Catholics, nor Protestants, for there would be nothing to protest against; nor Episcopalians, nor Presbyterians, nor Lutherans, nor Congregationalists, nor Methodists, nor Baptists, nor Unitarians, nor Universalists, nor of any other sect or denomination, as such; but all would be Christians—Christians, indeed. The middle walls of partition that now ex—

*Church's Prize Essay on Religious Dissensions, p. 181.
ist, would fall. The name Christian would be sufficiently distinctive to designate all; and, "with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; while all would endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace. Then there would be but one body, the church of Christ; one Spirit, the Holy Spirit; one hope, the hope of the gospel; one Lord, the Lord Jesus Christ; one faith, that which was once delivered to the saints; one baptism, that instituted by Christ; and one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all—the Almighty. To the question, When and where was "the faith" spoken of by Jude, delivered to the saints? We answer: It was delivered whenever and wherever holy men of old spoke and wrote, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit—from the first to the last prophet of the Lord. Abel, the second son of Adam, was the subject of this faith, to the extent of the Divine testimony that the Lord had given when he lived to produce it. Whether he received it directly from the Spirit of God, or through our first parents, we are not informed; but, probably, through them. "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," was a prophet; and he prophesied concerning "the filthy dreamers," of whom Jude writes, "saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15). This faith was progressive and cumulative, as was the Divine testimony—from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to Christ and his apostles. When John, the beloved disciple and the last of the apostles, closed his testimony and died, the canon of holy Scripture was completed. Then was given to the church and to the world all that may be expected, by way of Divine revelation, till the Lord Jesus Christ again appears in person. Then, what the apostle John said at the beginning and near the close of the book of Revelation was applicable to all the books of the Bible: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand. "For I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. Why, now, we should "earnestly contend for this faith," must be obvious to all—because it is a divine faith. The testimony of Nature produces natural faith—the testimony of man, human faith—and the testimony of God, by the Spirit of God, faith supernatural and divine. All the knowledge that we have of God; of the existence in our own persons of a spirit, separate and capable of existing apart from our bodies; of other spirits; of our origin; of the origin of all things; of our relations to God and our fellow creatures, to time and to eternity; we know by faith, and that faith is the product of divine testimony, recorded in the volume of divine revelation—"the faith once delivered to the saints." We are aware that Dists, and some Doctors of Divinity professing to be Christians, have supposed and taught that some of this knowledge may have come from Nature's light by reason. But Paul attributes all to revelation and to faith. "He that cometh to God," says he, "must believe that he is." Again: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God," Reasonable as is faith, and impossible as it is to eradicate from the mind this knowledge of God and ourselves when once received there; yet, we are fully satisfied, from the examination we have given of the subject, that Nature's light and reason, unaided by divine revelation in words, could never have originated and given it to us.

As we never saw or heard or felt a spirit
—never saw something produced out of nothing, and can not draw the line of separation between our physical, mental and moral powers—can not tell where one begins and another ends; the names, creator, creature, creation, spirit, and the like—as well as the ideas which they represent, and for which they stand, must all have had a divine origin. So I reason. It was well said by Dr. Fishback,* that "The powers of the human mind, however penetrating and improved, can produce no effect upon matter, but through its laws and properties;" and "any effect produced in this way is as dissimilar to a creation, as the existence is dissimilar to the non-existence of matter;" consequently, that "There is nothing in the natural order of things, appertaining to mind, which proves that it is anything more than a quality of organized matter, under the influence of animal life."

I feel tempted now, as the book of this deep thinker is open before me; to give another and a little longer extract from him, as apposito to this place. "Such," he continues, "is the humble situation of man by nature, both in respect to his mind and body; without a knowledge of God in the world, ignorant of his origin, and the origin of all things, and of his own destiny; a creature of time, flesh, and sense; a mere animal—an atheist! The universal language of nature, in respect to animal beings, is death; the experience and observation of every day utter the same voice; from its cold, offensive embraces, there is no escape in all the resources of nature; nor is there a solitary ray from the light of nature which breaks through the deep, impenetrable gloom of the grave, and points to an hereafter! No light of life irradiates the horrid mansions of the dead, nor redeems humanity from its insatiable devourings! Her lesson is, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The last and best hope of man, derived from the lessons and illuminations of nature, has its final termination here! Here is none 'to deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage'—in all the domains of nature! The king of terrors and the terror of kings, has an absolute sway over men, and beasts, and all creeping things; over the fowls of the air and the fishes of the sea, and there is none to arraign him, or to say, Why or what doest thou? O death, thy sting is fearful! O grave, thou art victorious! There is no balm in nature—no physician there, that can more than allay for a moment the pangs of dissolution, or protract but for a short period, the declining life. The "iron scepter of death has unrestrained sovereignty. Such is the voice of nature, uttered from her thousand mouths, and by her thousand tongues."*

But the voice of Revelation is, that there is a God, and he is Spirit; that there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding; that life and incorruptibility are brought to light by the gospel. Such being the condition of man "by favor;" and such the faith which was once delivered to the saints;" is reason sufficient why we should contend earnestly for it. But yet, we offer another reason. It is this: As we believe, we act.

If our faith be good, such is our conduct. If our faith be false, our conduct is consequently evil. Hence it is, and it ever has been, that where the Bible is not where its light has not shone, and its teachings do not govern; the people are in darkness, and honor and honesty and integrity are not found. "Whatsoever is born of God," says John, "overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." And then, he triumphantly asks: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Christ?"

How we should contend for this faith, we are taught by the precept and example of the divine teachers, who have taught and teach it. "Let the same mind be in you, *

says an apostle, “which was in Christ Jesus.” He was meek and condescending; and ever actuated by love; the love of man, and the love of truth. Love for the truth and for our fellow men, therefore, must always actuate us, in contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, if we would convert them to it. We should prize it above everything else, because true and the truth—because it came from God, and it only can convert to him. And if we do not love those with whom we contend for this faith, vain will be all our efforts to benefit them by it. “But be gentle unto all men,” says Paul to Timothy, apt to teach, patient in meekness, instructing those that oppose themselves, or place themselves in opposition.” Why so? The apostle answers: “If God, peradventure, will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.” 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25, 26. We must love the truth better than our own lives, here in the flesh, and must love our neighbor as ourselves; and then, and not till then, will we be suitably prepared to contend as we ought, “earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.” “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.”

**FACTS OF NATURE AGAINST ATHEISM.**

BY G. L. PURDY, M. D.

Returning to the animal kingdom, and ascending from the past towards the present, the geologist meets with a dwindling away or falling off in the power of the dynasty of the fish that have been the monarchs of the earth for so many long and dreary ages, and comes in contact with the lowest forms of the second or reptile division of the fourth grand type of life—the vertebrate. In the upper formation of the carboniferous system the first traces of this reptilian division are found.

Ascending the stream of time still further, we find the reptilian forms of life gradually increasing—higher and higher forms are added—genera, orders, and species, increase—until it finally replaces the dynasty of the fish. After the fish had lost its dynamic power, it has, throughout the balance of creation, continued to hold a certain relation to the other four divisions of the vertebrate class. But in some of the characteristics of the fish, a great change was soon to take place.

There is a line occurring, and which divides the Permian system from the Triassic, where life upon the earth appears to have become almost extinct. This line also divides the great Paleozoic and secondary ages of the earth’s geological history. Here, at this line, a very great change has taken place in the programme of creation.

Throughout creation, and in all its ages, species have been of limited duration, and have interlaced into each other—the lower with the higher—thus forming a continuous cord, made up of species interlaced into those immediately preceding and following them. And, although species are of limited duration—that is, at a certain time in creation they “begun to be,” and at certain other time became extinct, forming throughout the immensely extended
history of creation a continuous cord. "New species," remarks Hugh Miller, "had come into being ere the old ones dropped away and disappeared; and there has been for long ages no break or hiatus in the course, just as in the human family there occurs no abrupt break or hiatus, from the circumstance that new generations come upon the stage ere the old ones make their final exit." But from some cause, this continuous cord is twice abruptly broken, once as already mentioned, and again at a line between the secondary and Tertiary ages. Upon either side of these abrupt breaks the same continuity and interlacing of species obtains, as mentioned above.

Across this dividing line, but few species of animal and vegetable life have passed. We might say an almost new creation had taken place, for on the secondary side of the line but little of the old creation is seen, and in its stead new and higher forms of life are met with.

The cause of this abrupt break, it is probable, man will never know; but that it was a wise one, we have no cause to doubt. The old and lower classes of life had fulfilled their mission in the great creative plan, and the time had come for them to pass away and make room for new and higher classes, which the progressive development of the condition of the earth now demanded, and could sustain. Thus the old and lower gave way to the new and higher, except a few strands, that the cord of existences might not be entirely severed.

This line not only brought to a close the long reigning dynasty of the fish, but also changed, in one universal feature, the new classes of fish that were to continue and bear a certain proportion to other classes of life from that time to the present. All fishes, before this time, were possessed of heterocereal, or unequally lobed tails, caused by the back bone being prolonged into the upper lobe. A few species of these crossed the line, and have continued to the present day. The successors to these old types of fish were of a higher scale of organization, having homocereal, or equally lobed tails—the back bone terminating at the commencement of the tail fin. This general characteristic has remained a marked feature in the fish from then until now.

Was the creative cause idle during this long time of dearth of animal and vegetable life that occurred upon each side of this dividing line? The geologist can truly answer this question with an emphatic, No. He finds the evidence of another preparation for the coming man—a preparation made, as was that of the coal, when it would interfere with life in the least degree. This preparation was the storing up of those vast beds of rock salt that are now found in the Permian and Triassic systems, and from which most of our supply is derived. Its use in the economy of man, I need not mention, for it is known by all. Now, was this wise adaptation of means to ends the mere result of chance, or was it the effect of intelligence?

The record of the geologist reads, that from this time the reptile gradually gained the ascendancy by new and higher species being added as time rolled on, until the reptilian form of life finally became the master existences of the earth, and had their fullest development in the Oolitic system. Among this class of life were monsters huge and dreadful to behold. The earth, within the history of man, has presented no monster reptiles as it did then. The crocodiles and sharks of the present day are Lilliputs beside them. When we looked at the remains here entombed, we can no longer say that the "flying dragons" and other monsters of legendary lore are mere chimeras of the brain, for here they were more than realized in the actual existence of nature. The Pterodactyle was a huge reptile of the Oolite, with the head and neck resembling a bird's, a mouth somewhat like a reptile's, the body and tail of a mammifer, and leathern wings like those of a bat, with an expanse of eighteen feet, might well affect the flying dragons of the olden tales. Among the reptile tyrants of water, land, and air, were some resembling sharks of the present time, that were from seventy to one hundred
feet in length, with jaws from six to eight feet in length, set round with far more formidable teeth than shark and crocodile can sport to-day. Ere the commencement of the Oolitic period, and before the reptile had received its fullest development, the succeeding or third division of the vertebrate type of life—the bird—was introduced. We find their tracks in the sandstones of the Liassic system—but from some cause their fossil remains are not found in any abundance, until the close of the Wealden period.

Though the tracks of an animal may seem to be more perishable than the animal itself, especially its bony parts, yet under certain circumstances this is not the fact. These tracks were made in the soft sandy mud, and the mud hardened into stone before their effasure, and when once imbedded in the stone, they would remain the same, age after age. That these foot prints in the stone are those of birds, there can scarcely be a doubt—for the general formation of the foot making the track, is that of the birds at the present time. Even at this great length of time after they were made, they retain their original distinctions to even the delicate marking of ridges and furrows of the skin of the foot. Connected with these tracks is another fact that may appear more strange still to those unacquainted with nature's perfect laws,—this fact is the record of the wind and storm, of this remote time. Imprinted in the sandstone alongside these tracks are the marks of rain drops which were made by a shower coming from the south, and accompanied by a wind that blew the drops so they descended in an angle of about sixty degrees.

We again ascend the stream of time, and as we pass along up through the Oolite, and the shorter one of the Wealden, we note the progress of creation's work. Age after age has been left behind—the reptile, at the close of the Oolite has lost much of its supremacy—in the Wealden its dynasty has failed still more—and in the Chalk it is no longer the monarch of the earth, its reign having come to an end.

The remains of birds—the succeeding dynasty—are from several causes very difficult of preservation, and therefore, their remains have not been found in any abundance at any time, but notwithstanding this, there can be no doubt of the fact that the dynasty of the birds succeeded that of the reptile, as the dynasty of the reptile had succeeded that of the fish.

The system of the Chalk closes the great secondary era of the earth, and brings us up to the second abrupt break in the cord of existence—a break that occurs just ere the commencement of the great Tertiary era—the age or dynasty of the mammal and of man. The time for the second and higher great change in the scale of organization had now come—the time for the introduction of the fourth great class of vertebrate life, and the creation of higher classes, orders, and species of the old classes—hence, they were permitted to die out, that the new ones might take their places; thus forming the abrupt dividing line between the old and the new creation. This line, says Hugh Miller, is crossed by none of the old creation, except the "microscopic, diatomaceal, and one species of shell and one of coral."

For the reception of the higher classes of life, the physical conditions of the earth had to undergo a change to fit it for the purpose; hence the almost entire absence of life during the change. That this change was wrought, "the testimony of the rocks" will bear witness, and not only "the testimony of the rocks," but the testimony of animal and vegetable life bear witness upon the point of a change in the condition of the earth.

At this line, the fish again change in one of their general characteristics. Before this period all fish had been divided into two great orders—the Placoid and the Ganoid—having an external armature of bone, and an internal skeleton of cartilage. From this time up to the present, the two great orders of Ctenoid and Cycloid have formed the great bulk of the fish family—
these orders are furnished with horny scales and bony skeletons."

At this line a great change also took place in the vegetable kingdom. Back of this line, all the true woods belonged to the Coniferal of the Pine and Araucarian families. From this line up to the present time, the Dicotyledonous or hard wood trees have had the precedence.

This line, then, emphatically marks the death of the old, and the beginning of the new creation—and that it was the result of intelligence, there can be no doubt, when the record of the change is correctly interpreted. That the earth, during the time of blank upon each side of this line, underwent some great change, is shown by the higher classes of organization that ensued immediately after. After this time, the earth could support the hard wooded trees—as well as higher types of life—which it would not before; for example, consider the barrenness of the soil upon which the Pines or soft woods grow at the present time, and, then, the productiveness of that upon which the hard woods, oak, walnut, sugar, &c., grow, and we think your doubts will be removed.

But we must hasten in our journey of investigation and approach still nearer the present time and a more recent state of created things. How changed and improved in the scale of organization is the life of the Tertiary era! Beyond the dividing line, the be-paddled reptile was the possessor and tyrant of the seas; now the be-paddled mammal has taken its place. In the secondary era, a different class of reptiles, and the bird class, possessed the lands; but in the Tertiary, the mammal reigned supreme. The introduction of the mammal, like that of the other classes, was gradual,—new and higher species succeeding each other in turn, until the fullest development of the class,—the higher species of the preceding class bearing some of the characteristics of the succeeding one; for instance, the reptile called the Ichthyosaurus bears some of the characteristics of both the fish and the lizard—hence the name, meaning fish-lizard.

As there were monsters in the several types of life, that of the crustacean, the fish, the reptile, and the birds, so we find monsters among the mammal type. I will mention two or three of the largest to give some idea of their size. The skeleton of the Newburg Mastadon weighs 2,000 pounds. The Mammoth was sixteen feet long and nine feet high. The Megatherium, an animal combining the characters of our sloth and armadillo, was twelve feet long and eight feet high. Such were some of the giant mammals, whose bones have been disinterred from the earth.

Approaching nearer and nearer the present time, we find all things assuming more and more the resemblance of those of the present day. The outer forms of the first and lower mammals are fading out, and those that are higher in the organic scale and more conformable to the wants of man, taking their places, and foreshadowing the more perfect ones yet to come. But we pass on and approach the latter part of the Tertiary period, where we find the forms of animal life becoming a little familiar—a little further on we find many of the contemporaries of man.

At last, our journey up through the strata of the earth is almost done, and we meet familiar forms upon every hand—such as are destined for the use of man. The earth at last, after having undergone untold ages of preparation, is so matured or perfected that the last great class of life can be sustained.

This class is man—intelligent, reasoning, godlike man—man who stands at the head of the long column of created existences, and who is well entitled to the distinction of creation's lord from the position he occupies of being highest of created things, in both physical and intellectual organization.

That there may be no break in the chain of reasoning, as well as in that of allied existences, the remains of man has been found in one instance in the fossil state—that of the stony skeleton of Gaudeoloupe. But
no remains of man in any state have been found beneath the alluvial deposit—the last of the geological systems, and occupying the surface of the earth, and to which man exclusively belongs.

With the assistance of the comparative anatomist and physiologist, the geologist now reviews, in a different aspect, the chain of existences from the beginning of life up to man, and if possible, finds the manifestation of intelligent order, design, and progress from the lower to the higher, still more striking. He now compares the brain—the true test of standing in the scale of organization—with the spinal cord, in the great classes of life, with the following results. Down in the radiate class, among the sponges and polypes, there is found no traces of a brain. When we ascend to the fish, we find the brain in proportion to the spinal cord as 2 to 11; in the reptile, as $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; in the bird, as 3 to 1; in the mammal, as 4 to 1; and in man, as 23 to 1.

Now why this increase of brain—the organ of intelligence—as we ascend towards man, and especially, in the case of reasonable and intelligent man. Is this fine and increasing grade of organization the result of chance, or is it the effect of an intelligent cause brought about in the fulfillment of a definite plan.

The geologist reviews these facts in yet another aspect, and finds the dynasty of the fish succeeding that of the crustacean, the reptile that of the fish, and the mammal that of the reptile in as “definite an order as the four great empires of the Ancient History of Rollin.” “Nor are the periods when single families arose and sank less carefully noted.

The geologist having finished his examination of the facts in the creative history of the earth, and having been denied any assistance from revelation in his investigations, is now ready to sum up the evidence and give us his conclusions. He finds a time away back in the distant past of the earth’s history when “order did not exist;” he then ascends towards the present, and finds a time when “order began to be. Now, from his acquaintance with science and physical law he knows that matter cannot create itself, nor can it, of itself, assume order when created by any cause. Chance, in the signification it would have to assume here, can have no existence, for as far as man knows, every particle of matter is governed by law, and where there is law, there can be no chance. From these conclusions, matter did not create itself, nor form itself into order, and could not be the result of chance.

This is the testimony of science. Science in all its history does not present one instance of matter creating itself—of something springing from nothing—an effect existing without a cause. The arrangement existing in the order of these geological facts is indicative of boundless intelligence. Matter, of itself, is not intelligent and could not have brought about this system of order. We might with equal reason contend that our dwellings, from the hut to the palace, created themselves—that all the materials of which they are composed, came together in a particular order of themselves—that in their order of construction, from foundation to roof, they show no evidence of intelligence as a constructing cause. There is as much sound reason and logic in the latter position, as in the former one.

Then we must look for some other cause beyond or outside of matter for the creation and arrangement of these geological facts, as we look beyond the dwelling for the intelligent cause of its being built. The character of this cause we must judge, as we judge of the character of other causes, by the character of its effects. We judge of the intelligence and capacity of a workman in any particular work by his workmanship; and if he excels in many different branches, his intelligence is increased in a proportionate ratio. A man is judged by his deeds, a tree by its fruits, and, in short, every cause is judged by its effects. We know nothing of a cause except through this means! Now, in judging of nature’s cause, we must employ the same method,
and the conclusion derived from these facts must be the following two: First, as far as we know—and the facts will amply sustain the inference—this cause possesses all wisdom—is omniscient. This is shown by its effects, as displayed in the intelligent mechanism of the earth, and its organisms. Here is wisdom beyond comparison. Wisdom infinite and boundless in degree; wisdom unlimited in capacity; wisdom competent to devise and execute creation's wondrous plan; wisdom that has not faltered in any respect, or been necessitated to experiments, nor to destroy and re-perform a portion of the work on account of mistakes, for not a trace of these is found; wisdom that advanced creation at every step, created a certain thing to accomplish a certain purpose, and ceasing with its accomplishment, to be succeeded by a higher one for a higher purpose, and so on, from the lowest crustacean up to man—from the foundation to the pinnacle of creation. What could be more wise than this steady progress of creation from the beginning to its completion. It is an infinite degree of the wisdom of man manifested in the creation of the dwelling alluded to, who proceeds in a definite and progressive order to erect it, after a plan well matured before it was commenced. He does not commence at the roof and build downward; not at the middle and build each way, but commences at the foundation and progresses after a definite order to the finishing stroke. In fact, in all the arts, sciences and literature, man has but followed the wise plan of nature's intelligent architect, commencing at the lowest and ascending to the highest parts—must first know the alphabet of art, science and literature, then, he can spell, then read, and then, can master the higher, and the highest branches, in succession. Any other plan will invariably fail.

Second, That the cause of nature had a power commensurate with its wisdom; a power omnipotent in degree, for the execution of its plans, we have but to refer to the fact of them all being executed. Nature does not present a single instance where it has failed.

In this connection we will bring side by side the wisdom and power displayed in the facts of astronomy and those of geology, and let their mute testimony of the intelligence and the unlimited wisdom and power of their first cause appeal to the intelligence of unprejudiced man.

Now, to what conclusion does our geologist, or any other man acquainted with the facts, arrive? Can it be any other than this? that the facts of geology unmistakably indicate the intelligence of their cause, and, also, that this cause possesses unbounded wisdom to design, and unlimited power to execute; and these powers being attributes of mind, must prove mind, and that of the highest order we know. Now, from the legitimate deductions drawn from these facts, the premises of our argument are proved, and the conclusion, that "the works of nature prove mind" must be received as true, also.

What exalted ideas do these facts give us of the character of the glorious, eternal and infinite God? What perfection of attributes is here portrayed? What a longing desire it implants in man to know more about the matchless Being that has portrayed the majesty of His nature in His works, and thus lead him to the Bible that takes up the grand theme where nature left it, and carries it to the great termination that nature could not—man's moral and eternal relation to nature's God.

This subject of man's moral and eternal relation to God being something nature could not teach, but had to be a direct revelation from God, will be noticed at the close of the next article; the facts of animated nature.

I would say to the true Christian, fear not that I am trying to sap the foundation of your faith, weaken your hope of immortality, or detract any thing from the attributes of your God, or to set up nature against the Bible. Far be this from me. I am trying in my humble way, to exalt your ideas of the great God of all; to delineate to you the matchless perfections, wisdom and power of the great Jehovah; to show to you that the God of nature is the God of the
Bible; but especially does the Bible show man's relation to God as a moral being, which nature could not—to raise God's character above the point where many, in their over zeal for revelation, have placed it, namely, that the existence of a God can not be proved from nature. We would candidly ask whether they would have us believe that God can not, or does not do as much as man in this respect—reveal himself in his works? Is it possible that we can not see a manifestation of God in the facts of nature we have noticed? If these works do not show forth intelligence, then the works of man do not! The one we think as susceptible of demonstration as the other, in the abstract. If man will only interpret these facts correctly, as God, in his own proper time, designed they should be, he will not only “see God in clouds and hear Him in the winds,” but will see Him in every thing, from the minutest point in creation to the mightiest world that rolls through boundless space.

But as I have said before, and here repeat, nature like any other book must be read and understood before it can benefit man. Of what use would the Bible be to man if he could not read and understand it? The day is coming when it will be read and understood; then every man will know God as He is; then we may hope for the millennium, when the God of nature is surely known to be the God of the Bible, and the Father of all. Of one thing we are certain, there must be a great change in man toward God before the millennium comes, and this knowing of God by his works, is as apt to produce it as any thing we know.

If there was more nature in the religion of the day, and less “creeds” and “discipline,” and quarreling over them, there would be more and better Christians, and less atheism and infidelity abroad in the land.

It has been said that “An undevout astronomer is mad,” and I will add to this a kindred saying, An undevout geologist is also mad.

Salem Station, O.

EDITORIAL REMARKS.

We desire it distinctly understood; that we grant most cheerfully and freely, that our very intelligent correspondent, Dr. Purdy, is sustaining most triumphantly the position, that the facts of nature are against Atheism. In this sense, his argument is valuable, and this is the main drift of all he has said. After a man has gained his position; his amount of light and intelligence, and has derived from revelation, the idea of the existence of the Deity, the facts of nature, as reduced by him, and thousands more equally clear, accord with the idea, corroborate and confirm it. But none of these, nor any other facts in nature, ever did, or ever can, give the idea of one supreme intelligence. The Apostolic position is, that “the world by wisdom”—human wisdom and science, without revelation—“know not God.” The Athenians had been worshiping and supplicating numerous pagan deities, as the history of the case goes, and, through these pagan deities, had sought deliverance from a prevailing pestilence. When they had supplicated all the gods they knew, and obtained no relief, one of their wise men suggested, that there might be a god some place, with them they were not acquainted, and of whom they knew nothing, and that it might be well to make an offering to the unknown god. It is said, that the suggestion was received and acted upon, and the much desired relief was obtained. This is supposed to have been the origin of the altar to the unknown god. When Paul appeared in their midst; he said: “Him declare I unto you; God who made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth; and dwelleth not in temples made with the hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things, and hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far
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from every one of us." Acts xvii. 24, 27.
The apostle was here among as highly en-
lightened and enlightened people as the
world ever produced, without divine reve-
lation, or without the revelation of God con-
tained in the Bible. With all the light of
science, nature and the book of nature they
had been, till a short time before, worship-
ning a plurality of gods. Nor were they di-
verted from the worship of a plurality of
gods, by the light of science, nature, or the
book of nature; but, as many would con-
clude, by a mere accident, but, as we think,
by the invisible hand of Providence. When
their attention was thus called to the wor-
ship of one god,—the unknown god—they
supposed him to be simply such a god as
those they knew—a pagan god—made by
hands of men. It was, therefore, left for
Paul to declare to them God who made the
world.

As we deem the matter in hand one of
much importance, we shall now proceed to
present a few items concerning the Deity,
clearly revealed in the Bible, and conse-
quently items of faith; which
and in poor feeble science—a vast chasm
and no means to get over it.

2. The idea of the infinite wisdom of God.
Men of intelligence, in exploring the works
of nature, discover a display of great wis-
dom—wisdom so vast as greatly to humble
them. Still, there is nothing in the entire
book of nature that points them to infinite
wisdom. They say, the wisdom that plan-
ed this stupendous universe is great, that it
is above their comprehension; but still, there
is nothing in nature that declares it infinite.
From anything they can see in nature to
the contrary, though they see no imperfec-
tions, or lack of wisdom; yet there might be
imperfection, or it might have been more
wisely planned. As far as they know it is
perfect, but they have seen but a mere speck
of it, and their own understanding is imper-
fect, so that, in the nature of the case, it is
impossible for them to know that the ma-
chinery of nature is perfect. They can not,
from any thing they can see in nature, with
imperfect and finite understandings, known
that the designs plans and arrangements, in
nature, are infinitely wise and perfect, and
consequently they can not know that the
wisdom of the designer, or designers, is in-
finite. As far as I can see, my watch may
be perfectly planned,designed and arranged;
but a man understanding more about it
might at a glance see imperfections that I
knew nothing about. The fact then, that a
wise man can detect no imperfections in the
designs and plans of the universe, does not
prove that there are none, but simply that
he does not know of any. But as he has seen,
and can see, buta mere speck of the vast uni-
verse, he must admit that he knows but lit-
tle about it. He cannot, therefore, know
the design, plan and arrangement to be in-
finity wise, and of course, cannot know
the intelligence that planned it to be infin-
ity. Here is another dark chapter in the
back of nature, and of science, even when
read by the tallest, most learned and highly
gifted. Neither Hugh Miller (if he were
living) nor any other of the most profound
of the sons of science, can find the words,
infinite wisdom, or the idea contained in
them, intelligibly written on a single page of the book of nature, in "The Testimony of the Rocks," among the heavenly bodies, or any other place in this universe, accessible to man, till first derived from the revelation contained in the Bible. Great wisdom, is the loftiest thought inscribed any place in the book of nature, accessible to man, but the chasm between great wisdom and infinite wisdom is immeasurable.

3. The idea of the infinite power of God. It is easy to see that it required great power to construct this stupendous universe, to put all its immense machinery in motion, and keep it running six thousand years. Still, from all we can know of the universe, without revelation, it might have been greater and required greater power to construct it and keep it in motion; yet there is nothing to teach us that the power would have been adequate in that case. We can only learn certainly, that the power was adequate to construct the universe as it is, and not that it would have been adequate had it been greater and required more power. The idea of great power, is written on the works of nature, but the idea of unlimited, or infinite power, is not legibly written on a single page of the book of nature. That book knows nothing of any such idea as infinite power.

Still, when we have the idea of the existence, not merely of superior intelligence, with knowing whether it is one being, or in thirty thousand, but of one God—the Jehovah of the Bible—the eternal Deity, the facts in nature, as adduced by Dr. Purdy, and numerous other facts of nature, are very conclusively and decisively against Atheism. He who can believe that this vast and stupendous universe, with all its wise, extended and harmonious arrangements, adaptations of means to certain ends, displaying designs, purposes, and plans, all tending to the accomplishment of certain objects, came into existence by a mere freak of chance—that it all merely happened so—is beyond the reach of all argument, all revelation and all reason. He is too credulous, gullible, and easily deluded to be Christian, or even a sound scientific gentleman. He rejects the highest order of of testimony, and then believes the most groundless, unreasonable and chimerical things ever heard of, without any evidence. The facts in nature when studied and understood, by such men as Dr. Purdy, are against the entire doctrine of chance, and point to wise designs, purposes, and plans, but do not center them in one person, but simply in superior intelligence, and the Bible, at this point, comes to their aid and brings to their view, Him who made all things—who made the universe and upholds all things by the word of his power—reveals to us his existence, his infinite wisdom and power, all of which is corroborated by all the work of his hands.

HANDSOMELY DECLINED.

The late Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, was strongly opposed to temperance, and his side-board and tables were loaded with brandy, wine, &c.

On one occasion Rev. Mr. Perkins, of the Sons of Temperance, dined with the Bishop, who, pouring out a glass of wine, desired him to drink with him.

"Can't do it, Bishop; 'Wine is a mocker.'"

"Take a glass of brandy, then."

"Can't do it, Bishop; 'Strong drink is raging.'"

By this time the Bishop, becoming somewhat restive and excited, remarked to Mr. Perkins—

"You'll pass the decanter to the gentleman next to you."

"No, Bishop, I can't do that, 'Wo unto him that putteth the bottle to his neighbor's lips.'"
THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

BY C. ANDERSON, OF ENGLAND.

The opening of the sixteenth century, a period so big with interest to all Europe, has been presented in very different lights, both by British and Continental authors,—some have very carefully brought into one focus a number of concurrent events, and then rested in this conclusion; that if there had never existed such men as those with whose names we have been long familiar, all that occurred, must have taken place. These are believers in what has been styled, the "force of circumstances," and though there be a power which governs the world independently of man, they rise no higher; our men of circumstances, can see nothing great in individual character. Other writers, from too fond partiality for their native land, and scarcely looking beyond it, have assigned exclusive renown to their own great men. An Italian, on behalf of his own Italy, assumes the undivided glory of the revival of literature, philosophy, and the fine arts; and then all the refinement or enlargement of the human mind which ensued, he traces to this one source. While a German author, in regard to the revival of Christianity, insists that his country led the van, and by that path in which others only followed. He will, perhaps, admit Wickliffe, rising in England a century and a half before, to be the morning star; but, after this, Luther is his sun, or great planet, and other countries have been regarded as stars, revolving in wider or narrower circles around it, like satellites drawn after it by its movement. The figure may be considered beautiful, and please the fancy, but it has the disadvantage of being incorrect. It not only violates the order, but obscures the peculiar character or glory of what actually took place.

"If," says an author, whose interesting work is not yet completed, "If we regard the dates, we must then confess that neither to Switzerland nor to Germany belongs the honor of having been first in the work, although, hitherto, only those countries have contended for it. That honor belongs to France. This is a fact that we are the more careful to establish, because it has possibly, till now, been overlooked." And at this crisis, or the opening of the sixteenth century, as far as these countries are concerned, he has proved his assertion. But, on the other hand, if Britain be included, we must be allowed to hold fast by the fourteenth century; the age of Wickliffe, or the translation of the Sacred Volume, entire, into the language of the people. From that period, to say nothing of the New Testament separately, or of various beautiful fragments; possessing, as we do still, about thirty copies of that Bible entire, seventeen of which are perfect, we trace the effects, from that early age down to the days of Tyndale. The reading of the Scriptures in manuscript, however obnoxious to the authorities, will, in the following history, link itself most distinctly with the more eager perusal of those first imported in print. Opposition to the latter, will bring out evidence as to both.

All questions, however, as to priority or dates, become of inferior moment when compared with another ascertained fact. If we look at the first quarter of the sixteenth century, Lefèvre in France, and Zuinglius in Switzerland, Luther in Germany, and Tyndale in England, appear before the world, and to the eye of man in this order; they were contemporaries, living in their respective countries; Lefèvre being by far the oldest of the four, and Zuinglius the youngest. But then it is no less evident, that the first impressions of these four men were altogether independent of each other. They were individually influenced by a power, though unseen, equally near to them all. From that moment they were already destined to the work assigned them, but not one of them had exchanged a single thought with another. "Germany," says the same author, "did not communicate the light of
of ignorance or error, and leading on to victory. Our man is abroad, and is pursued, but can not be taken, till his work is done; while the Almighty himself, appears as so much the more in immediate contact with this country. The work is, by way of eminence, His own. Divine truth, it is granted, is but an instrument, yet as an instrument, it was now shown to be perfect for its purpose; and the design goes on, till men of authority, and power, and wrath, are baffled, overcome, and overruled. Moreover, there has been ever since a providential superintendence of this work, an uninterrupted care, lest it should be confounded with any thing else in this Kingdom, all which we are more bound both to mark ourselves, and point out to other nations.

That the eyes of his countrymen have never been turned towards Tyndale, as they ought to have been long ago, but more especially to that work which God did by him in the midst of our land, is one of those mysteries, which, at this moment, we do not even attempt to explain; but it will be the object of the following pages, to trace the footsteps of our Translator, from his origin to his end; and especially the history of that Version which he first gave to his country.

Let any one now direct his attention to the first quarter of the sixteenth century; let but the state of our native land be surveyed, but more especially the counties of Gloucester and Worcester; and so far from there being any, even the slightest token of the Divine Word being about to be laid open to the common people; the political state of England, and the literary, such as it was, but, above all, her intimate and complicated connexion with Italy, decidedly forbade the idea of such a thing. Where, then, throughout all England, was any individual to be expected, sufficiently bold to cherish the noble design?

Now, it was such a time as this; it was in the midst of hostile circumstances, nay, it was in the very spot, or diocese, to which we have already pointed, that a man according to God's own heart had already been
found! It was in the centre of this diocese that he was born! From about the year 1484, this district, above all others, had fallen under the power of Italy, or, like a ripe fig, into the mouth of the eater; but it may now be added, "about which time William Tyndale was born."

Tyndale was brought up, from his earliest years, at Oxford, and as a scholar, where, after a lengthened residence, he proceeded in "degrees of the schools;" or, as Foxe has said—"By long continuance, he grew up and increased as well in the knowledge of tongues, and other liberal arts, as especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures; insomuch, that he read privily to certain students and fellows in Magdalen College some parcel of divinity, instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the Scriptures."

His education "in grammar, logic, and philosophy, he received," says Wood, "for the most part, in St. Mary Magdalen's Hall," immediately adjoining the College of that name. At this Hall, first called Grammar Hall, from the attention paid to classical learning, and where Grocyn, as well as W. Latimer and Linacre, had lectured, the members stood, as they do now, on the same footing with those of the other Colleges; their course of study, tuition, length of residence, examination, and degrees, being precisely the same as the rest of the University. In those early days, however, these Halls, having no exhibitions or endowments for scholarships, many of the students lived at their own charge; and since no man has ever once been mentioned as patronising Tyndale, throughout his whole life, the presumption is, that his expenses while at College must have been defrayed by his parents. Tyndale's zeal, however, had at last exceeded the endurance of his contemporaries, and exposed him to some danger. There is no ground for supposing that he was expelled; "but," says Foxe, "spying his time, he removed from Oxford to the University of Cambridge, where he likewise made his abode a certain space," and, it has been vaguely conjectured, took a degree. At all events, his residence in that city had terminated by the year 1519.

Possessed of such an education as he must have then acquired, as well as of such an ardor to improve, we can not here disturb the narrative by any discussion as to its merits or extent. Sufficient evidence of both will occur in the following pages. We only remark here, that the incontrovertible proof of Tyndale's erudition, whether as a Greek or Hebrew scholar, is to be found in the present version of our Bible, as read by millions. "The circumstance of its being a revision five times derived, is an advantage altogether peculiar to itself, and doubly valuable from that circumstance." While, notwithstanding this five-fold recension of the Greek and Hebrew original, large portions remain untouched, or verbally as the Translator first gave them to his country. It is, indeed, extraordinary that so many of Tyndale's correct and happy renderings should have been left to adorn our version, while the terms substituted, in other instances, still leave to him the palm of scholarship.

When the incorrect, not to say injurious, sense, in which certain terms had been long employed, is duly considered, the substitution of charity for love, as Tyndale translated, of grace for favor, and church for congregation, certainly can not be adduced as proofs of superior attainment in the original Greek.

In a historical point of view, however, and independently of his merits as a translator, it would be of some importance if we could ascertain what had been the state of his mind, even before leaving the University, in reference to that great system of impiety and oppression, which, single-handed, he was afterwards to assail with such decisive effect. Had he already seen through its character? Was he even already engaged in marking it, as he never afterwards ceased to do? If he was, this would go a great way in proving him to have been an instrument raised up by God, as independently of Luther, as were Lefevre and Zuingleus. His lectures at Oxford, which must have been about 1517, if not earlier,
and his being obliged to desist, certainly say as much as that he was in advance of the age, but how far, from this source, we have no intimation. If Tyndale himself would afterwards give us but one hint, we could not desire better evidence. By those, however, who are familiar with his writings, it must have been observed that he very seldom has introduced his own personal feelings, with any precision as to dates, not caring to establish himself, in point of priority, to any man: and yet there is one passage, with which he casually concludes his Exposition of the Epistle of John, which seems to glance as far back as the year 1518, if not to some time before it. He had been exposing the policy of the hierarchy, in raising the cry of sedition or insurrection, in the days of Wickliffe,—“And so,” he adds, “the hypocrites say now likewise, that God’s Word causeth insurrection; but ye shall see shortly that these hypocrites themselves, after their old wont and ensamples, in quenching the truth that uttereth their juggling, shall cause all realms Christian to rise one against another, and some against themselves. Ye shall see, then, run out, before the year come about, that which they have been in brewing, as I have marked, above this DOZEN years. This much have I said, because of them that deceive you, to give you an occasion to judge the spirits.”

Now this language was published in September, 1531; but “above dozen of years,” brings us back to 1518, if not to an earlier period. We leave the reader to form his own conclusion; but, at all events, such a state of mind was in perfect consonance with the course which Tyndale so immediately pursued, with all his characteristic vigor.

Returning to his native country, Tyndale was soon actively engaged, and so continued to be, from Stinchcombe-hill down to Bristol, to the close of 1522. As the place where he lived, only eight miles south from that of his birth, is well known; nay, and the house under whose roof he spent his best and zealous exertions, in discussing and defending the Word of God, is happily still in existence,—to all such as may take an interest in the following history, there is not a more heart-stirring spot in all England. The Halls of our Colleges, wherever they stand, have never given birth to a design, so vitally important in its origin, so fraught with untold benefit to millions, and now so extensive in its range, as that which ripened into a fixed and invincible purpose, in the Dining Hall of Little Sodbury Manor House.

**TE LAUDAMUS DOMINE.**

From the meadows and the plain,
From the fields of waving grain,
From the sacred leaf-strewn wood,
By the pine-tree solitude;
Where the streamlet meets the vale,
Watering delicate flowers and palm—
Comes this choral chant to me—
**Te laudamus Domine.**

When the morning’s waking sun
Marks the day but just begun;
Or from his high meridian height
Pours down the zenith’s blaze of light;
When appears the twilight hour
Or when midnight storm-clouds lower;
Comes in calm or storm to me—
**Te laudamus Domine.**

In the Springtime’s path of flowers,
In the golden Summer hours,
In the Autumn’s mellow glow,
In the Winter’s realm of snow;
Through the earth and through the sky,
Wherever grace and beauty lie,
A tribute voice speaks soft and free—
**Te laudamus Domine.**

Wherever God and Nature preach,
Wherever thought has dared to reach;
Wherever space and time can span,
Or things affect the fate of man;
In the heart and in the soul,
By affliction’s deep control,
Sounds the diapason free—
**Te laudamus Domine.**

* We praise Thee, O God.
POINTED THOUGHTS.

A gentleman of wealth, who had been much addicted to frolic and sports, was converted, and became a member of one of our congregations. This congregation had adopted the *ad valorem* principle, as a means of defraying its expenses. In a few months after this gentleman’s conversion, the deacons waited on him in order to make their assessments; and knowing that he was rich, and that his proportion of the expenses would amount to a pretty handsome sum, they feared that he would not be willing to bear it, and their demand might give him serious offense, and prove an injury to him. Hence, they approached their business with some trepidation and great caution. At first he was at a loss to ascertain the reasons of their apparent diffidence. The deacons perceiving this, became, of course, more explicit. The gentleman was surprised. “What on earth,” said he, “do you mean? Did you suppose that I would be unwilling to pay my full proportion? When I was a man of the world, and united with a company in any scheme of pleasure, I would have deemed myself a mean man had I not paid my full proportion of the expenses. Go to the assessor’s book, and put me down for my full proportion of the expenses of the church. Do you think that I intend to be a meaner man now, since I have become a servant of God, than I was when a servant of the devil?” The reader may make his own comments!

A preacher was sent for, by a man of the world, to preach his wife’s funeral. In order to perform this duty, the preacher had to ride fifty miles. The gentleman gave him a good dinner, and repeatedly expressed the warmest thanks for the great favor which he had conferred. Finally, the preacher mounted his horse, in order to return to his home; and the gentleman was so very much obliged that he could not refrain from tendering him his farewell thanks. But now comes a *poser.* “I should like,” said the preacher, “to know *how much* you are obliged!” The gentleman, taking the hint, replied, “how much do you say?” “I would say,” said the preacher, “that you are obliged about the amount of ten dollars.” The gentleman handed him the money, but perpetrated no more thanksgivings, at least on that occasion! The preacher served him right. I, however, did not act quite so well, in a case somewhat similar. An old gentleman, called a brother, importuned me during the space of three years, to go to his section of the country, about the distance of forty miles, to preach the funeral of his son. Finally I complied with his request, I was a day going, and a day coming, and a day in the neighborhood of the funeral. I dined with the gentleman, and after dinner he invited me around to the back of his house, and after no little palaver, presented me with a silver dollar. This was bad enough; but strange as it may appear, upon the reception of the dollar, I said, “I thank you, sir!” I, however, afterwards repented of this, and trust I received forgiveness! He lived in a good house, owned a pretty extensive farm, and a number of servants.

I sat by, and heard two ladies arguing as to the lawfulness of Christian parents sending their children to the dancing school. For some time it seemed to be about so good, and so good, on each side of the question. It was not long, however, until the Methodist lady, by one single quotation, vanquished her adversary. “Just as the twig is bent, the tree’s inclined,” said she, “as Solomon says.” The Baptist lady thought that it was, sure enough, Solomon, who said it, and hence in a short time subsided. But we must not laugh at the ladies; for I once heard a lawyer, who has been also a Senator, say, “Every tub stands on its own bottom, as the good book says!” —he also being a church member! How very few “have the word of God dwelling in them richly, in all wisdom, and spiritual understanding!”
Mr. Barnes, a Presbyterian, says of truth, (Heb. iv. 12,) "It is fitted to lay open the secret feelings of the soul. There is not an effect produced in awakening a sinner, or in his conviction, conversion, and sanctification, which the truth is not adapted to produce. The truth of God is not dead; nor fitted to make men worse; nor designed merely to show its own weakness, and to be a mere occasion on which the Holy Spirit acts on the mind; it is in its own nature fitted to produce just those effects which are produced when it awakens, convicts, converts, and sanctifies the soul."

Ans. This, if it be true, removes a huge obstruction out of the way of the seeker for salvation. Many speak and write as if they are of the opinion that the truth has no natural converting efficacy. The Spirit, by its own native and resistless power, does the whole work. Others seem to charge imbecility upon both the word and the Spirit. The word without the Spirit, and the Spirit without the word, cannot convert; but when they put their strength together—when they become co-workers, then, sometimes, conversion is effected. I should like to know how much of the work of conversion the unaided word is capable of doing! If it can perform the whole work, it is most highly exalted in my estimation. Nor would I detract from the work of the Spirit. The truth is by the Spirit, and has been confirmed by the Spirit. One thing, speculate as we may, is certain, "the word is living and powerful"—"the power of God unto salvation."

A pious Scotch minister being asked by a friend during his last illness, whether he thought himself dying? answered, "Really, friend, I care not whether I am or not; for, if I die, I shall be with God; if I live, he shall be with me." A dying sister once said to me, "Death was, not long since, a great terror to me; but it is a terror no longer. It might seem hard to die and leave my two little children behind, in this world of perils and snares; but I was left by my mother, a poor orphan; and God took care of me, and he will take care of them; I am ready to depart, and to be with Christ." How different this, from the death of an infidel! "I am afraid," said he, "that the Bible is true. If I could know for certain that death is an eternal sleep, I should be happy—my joy would be complete. But here is the thorn that stings me. This is the sword that pierces my very soul. If the Bible is true, I am lost forever. Every prospect is gone! and I am lost forever!"

When a gentleman who was in the habit of giving away some thousands was supposed to be at the point of death, his presumptive heir inquired where his fortune was to be found. To whom he answered, "that it was in the pockets of the poor." This reminds me of the wife of the philanthropist, Howard. Finding a balance in his favor, after the year's expenditures had been paid, he proposed to his wife to use it in a journey to London. "What a pretty cottage for a poor family it would build!" was her answer. The money was appropriated according to her wish.

A young gentleman, a church member, in an attempt to advocate dancing, said, "of two evils"—meaning dancing on the one hand, and the plays of the young folks, on the other—"we must choose the least." His preacher gave him a much better rule: "Of two evils, choose neither;" for Paul commands that "we shun all appearance of evil."

Nature," says Foster, "has no influences to transform the depraved mind. The benignant skies, the living verdure, the hues of flowers, the notes of birds have no power on selfish and malignant passions, on evil habits, on ingratitude and hostility to God. No; a transforming power is only found in the blood of Christ, which cleanses from sin, and the Holy Ghost, which renews and sanctifies."
great mistake, and intreats those persons to let no false teacher deceive them; for that "the day of the Lord shall not come, except there come a falling away first;"—that is, till a great spiritual apostacy appear in the church. And to those in the present day who talk about the end of the world being at hand, we would simply reply, that while the hour of each man's death is to him utterly uncertain, and may be sudden and unexpected, yet the dissolution of the world cannot take place till this apostacy be consumed by the brightness of Christ's coming, or till this Gospel be first preached in all the nations of the earth.

Without further introductory observations, we shall take a survey of the rise and progress of this "mystery of iniquity," that the reader may see the absolute necessity which existed for a thorough reformation of religion.

In the days of the apostle, every ordinance of the Gospel was marked with a simplicity and purity, that form a mournful contrast to the corrupt system of superstition that afterwards obscured the glory of Zion. And whether you consider the purity of her doctrines, the amazing zeal, and humility, and laboriousness of the apostles, or the success that attended them in their disinterested career, you are induced to exclaim in the beautiful words of Solomon, that she "looked forth as the morning, fair as the sun,灿烂 as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners." The religious intrepidity of the first Christians is evinced by the multitudes who suffered for the truth, under the reign of those bloody monsters, Nero, and Domitian, and Trajan. In that age, God raised up Polycarp and Ignatius, with a bright constellation of the early fathers; and by the exertions of these servants of Christ, his Gospel spread, so early as the second century, to the very extremity of Europe. In France, Christianity was professed by a large proportion of the population. The cities of Lyons and Vienne were distinguished by flourishing churches; but the persecution that burst forth against them has not been exceeded, for the savage ferocity...
of its promoters on the one hand, or the faithful endurance of suffering on the other. We learn from a letter preserved by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, that the Christians were prohibited from appearing in baths, in the market, or in any public place whatever. They were assaulted by the people at large—shouts, blows, the dragging of their bodies, the plundering of their goods, and the casting of stones, were meekly borne, with all the indignities that may be expected from a fierce and outrageous multitude. The fury of the governor and the soldiers was directed against those who were pre-eminent in piety. The most barbarous indignities were inflicted upon Sanctus, a deacon, to induce him to renounce the name of Jesus; and under very intense sufferings, he displayed the spirit of his crucified Master, by uniformly and calmly replying to every question put to him by his tormentors—"I am a Christian." Provoked by this meekness to a greater degree of cruelty, they applied red-hot plates of iron to the most tender parts of his body, till he was covered with sores, scarcely retaining the appearance of the human form. Blandina, a female, weak in body, but strong in faith, suffered unparalleled barbarities. She was fastened to a stake, and a wild beast was let loose upon her, but the animal, more merciful than her persecutor, it is said, was restrained from touching her. Suspended afterwards in the form of a cross, she was engaged in vehement supplication; and contrary to the expectations of the heathen, the sight reminded her fellow-sufferers of Him who hung on Calvary, and inspired them with the greatest fortitude, having been taken down, she was scourged, and placed in a hot iron chair—then put into a net and exposed to a bull; and after being tossed about for some time, she was dispatched with a sword!!

But in the midst of all this cruelty the word of the Lord had free course and was glorified. The bush was burning, and still was not consumed. It was then true of the Christian, as it had formerly been of the Jewish church—the more it was oppressed, the more exceedingly it multiplied. Men of all ranks joined the persecuted followers of the Lamb; till at last, about the year 313, Constantine the Great was numbered among the splendid and bloodless trophies of Christianity. The purity of his motives in embracing the Christian religion, has been frequently called in question. The cause assigned for the emperor's change, is, I acknowledge, too romantic for my implicit faith. Marching from France to Italy, on a warlike expedition, which filled him with much anxiety, it is said that he felt it necessary to have the protection of some god, and that for many reasons he preferred the God of the Christians. He wanted some sign, however, to convince him of the existence and favor of Immanuel; and after earnest prayer, he saw in a cloudless sky the luminous appearance of a cross, higher than the sun, marked with this inscription—"By this conquer!" It is no evidence of a sceptical mind to doubt the truth of such a relation, or that it was the cause of his embracing the Christian religion. His sincerity in doing so may be unquestionable, without resorting to this extraordinary exhibition as its cause; but it cannot be denied that it was his interest to countenance the Christians, and gain their assistance in the war he had undertaken: for at that time, in many provinces, they outnumbered the heathens and the temples of idolatry were deserted by immense masses of people, who had sufficient physical force to turn the fortune of war in favor of the emperor. This change in his religious views produced a thorough revolution in the ecclesiastical affairs of the whole Roman empire. He and his mother Helena, espoused the cause of the "new religion," with all the zeal of young proselytes. The temples dedicated to the heathen gods were converted into Christian churches—the wealth of heathenism was poured with an unsparing hand into the lap of Christianity—the bloody horrors of persecution were changed for the smiles of imperial favor—and instead of the sighs and sufferings of dying martyrs, the ministers of Christ mingled in the splendid processions of their royal convert.
In the midst of this brilliant scene, however, the religion of our Savior was retarded and obscured. The doctrines of Scripture were corrupted by an admixture of heathenish error; purity of Christian principle and conduct was polluted by the influence of courtly licentiousness; and the glory of apostolic Christianity was sullied by a carnal and ambitious spirit. Before this period the church and state had been completely separate; nay, the state had exerted all its energy to root the saints of God out of the land; and yet, when the civil power was at war with the church, and opposed all her interests, her doctrines were most pure, her ministers were most triumphantly successful, and the faith of her martyrs firm as the everlasting mountains. But now Constantine altered the framework of the church, changed her poverty into gorgeous magnificence; and from this period we may write Ichabod on her walls, for the glory was departing from Israel.

During the three first centuries, when poverty and persecution were attendants on the ministers of religion, and wealth and worldly honor were unknown to them, no one presumed to lord it over God's heritage; it was not yet forgotten that Jesus had reproved the ambitious spirit of Zebadæ's children, who thirsted for an exalted station in his kingdom—had designated his apostles brethren, equal in rank and authority; and in the entire compass of revelation had given no sanction to those semi-barbarous titles—Pope and Cardinal, that were substituted for the New Testament names of Bishop, Evangelist, Pastor, and Teacher.

In those early ages of the church, it is almost universally conceded that the laity took a prominent part in all her deliberations—that, as the whole body of the people elected Matthias successor to Judas (Acts i. 15, 23, 26)—and, as the whole multitude chose the seven deacons, (Acts vi. 5, 6,) whom they set before the apostles for ordination—so the people still chose their bishops as overseers, or ministers of the church; but, when those ministers were enriched by a misguided emperor, and became bloated with luxury, and giddy with courtly splendor and applause, they then, for the first time, invaded that independence which Christ had bequeathed to all the faithful members of Zion; and, with a haughty and tyrannical hand drove the laity from all share in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The reign of spiritual despotism then commenced in all its rigor; and a few facts in the history of succeeding centuries, will reveal with increasing clearness the "mystery of iniquity," which was then exhibited to the world.

To establish himself more firmly on the throne, Constantine made several changes in the form of the Roman government. He created four Praetorian Prefects, as deputies under him in the management of state affairs; and, as the ministers of religion had lost the inflexibility of principle that once signalized their predecessors, they allowed him to bend and mould them into a form exactly suited to the civil constitution. Hence he created four prelates, whom he invested with an unscriptural authority over all their brethren in the office of the ministry. These venial aspirants after mitred honors, he placed in the chief cities of the empire; and different creatures of his will be placed as exarchs and archbishops in regular gradations beneath them. In these appointments which issued not from Calvary, but from Rome—not from Jesus, but from Constantine—the prelate of the "imperial city" stood pre-eminent. Several causes contributed to clothe him with this superiority. He conducted the services of religion in a building that was exceedingly magnificent in its architectural proportions—his style of living became proverbially sumptuous; and a spring-tide of wealth poured in to him from every quarter. The whole Christian world, forgetful of the true nature of religious dignity, was dazzled with the splendor of the bishoprick of Rome. It became the object of attraction toavaricious ecclesiastics; and hence, at the death of Liberius in the fourth century, the most violent commotions took place, at the election of a successor to fill the golden emi-
nence. One party elected Damascus, and another faction chose Ursicinus, and by a bloody massacre, they sanctimoniously decided on a suitable candidate for the vacant seat. From that time till the present, the "chair of St. Peter" (as it is falsely styled,) surrounded as it is by wealth and regal distinction, and the slavish submission of a deluded multitude, has been sought after, with all the intrigue and ambition that such a tempting object could present, to a priesthood who had lost the humility and spirituality of the apostles of our Lord.

Between the four prelates appointed by Constantine, and placed in Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, there was violent competition for superiority; but in the race for preferment the two former gained the ascendancy; and then, between these two ecclesiastical combatants a deadly struggle took place for the impious distinction of visible head of the church, and vicar of Christ on earth. These contentions frequently convulsed the empire to its center; and though the bishop of Rome obtained the supreme object of his ambition, yet the dispute, at last, terminated in the schism which, to the present time, has separated the Greek and Latin, or the Eastern and Western churches. It is mournfully interesting to trace the steps by which he, whom I may now style the Roman pontiff, raised himself to his accursed elevation. Phocas, a Roman centurion, who, about the year 603 had inhumanly murdered Mauritius the emperor, with his five children, and waded through their blood to the imperial throne,—knowing that the influence of the bishop of Rome was necessary to support his pretensions to the sovereign authority, conferred upon Boniface III. the title of universal bishop. Degraded as were the churches of Christendom, even then, there was a general feeling of indignation at the blasphemous assumption. The Irish, English, and Scotch, resisted his authority with all their national energy—France and Spain only partially submitted to the spiritual tyrant—even in Italy his pretentions were despised—and against his lord-

ly ambition, universal dissatisfaction was murmured throughout all Europe.

About the year 751, another remarkable event was permitted to occur in the providence of God, which still more glaringly exhibits this personage as the Antichrist of Scripture. The circumstance is related by Roman Catholic, as well as Protestant historians. Childeric III., king of France, was not a man of strong intellect; and Pepin, the mayor of his palace, was virtually the ruler of the kingdom. Dissatisfied however, with discharging the duties, without enjoying the honors, of his royal master, he formed the ambitious design of usurping the supreme authority. To give a coloring of justice to this detestable project, the states of the realm were convoked; and they decided on consulting the bishop of Rome, to whom the ambassadors of Pepin presented the following question—"Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state?" Zachary then sat in the papal chair. He forgot the conduct of Christ, who, when requested to use his influence for the division of an inheritance between two brethren, replied, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" (Luke xii. 14,) that is, as the Head of the church, my business is not with temporal, but with spiritual concerns. To advance his own carnal views, however, the infallible oracle of Rome gave the unprincipled answer, that the reigning monarch might be dethroned. Childeric was, in consequence, stripped of his royal robes, and Pepin crowned in his stead; and to consecrate the wicked deed, two pretended vicegerents of a holy Savior successively anointed the usurper as the rightful possessor of the throne. The features of Antichrist are thus frightfully dissoloyed to your view; you see that ecclesiastical power, figuratively described by Daniel, in my text, as a horn that had eyes, and a month "speaking
very great things, and changing times and laws."

Pepin, feeling that he was in a great measure indebted to the influence of the Pope for his elevation to the throne, rewarded his corrupt venality by conferring on him the exarchate of Ravenna; having first wrested it from Aistulfus, one of the kings of the Lombards. And here observe the verification of Daniel vii. 8, when one of the three horns, or kingdoms, was plucked up by the roots, or torn from its real possessor, and given over to the "little horn," or the growing power of the Roman pontiff. One of the kings of Lombardy, whose predecessor had thus been robbed of his throne, attacked the pope to regain possession of his territories. Charlemagne, the son of Pepin, who was superstitiously attached to the pope, entered Italy with a formidable army —overturned the power of the Lombards—and either as an act of policy, or to atone for the sins of his past life, gave Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and other districts to Adrian I.; and thus, the second of the three horns, or kingdoms, spoken of by Daniel, was plucked up by the roots, and added to what is falsely styled the patrimony of St. Peter.

But the civil power of the Roman metropolis, and its adjacent territories, was still in the hands of the emperor, and the pope was merely a deputy in the management of political affairs. Besides, the emperor had a veto on the appointment of the pontiff, till about the year 876. Charles the Bald ceded this imperial right; and either he, or his predecessor Louis, vested in the Pope authority over the Roman state, not only in spiritual, but temporal affairs. By this act, the last of the three horns was plucked up; and the bishop of Rome stood forth to the world, in the double and monstrous character of a temporal prince, and pretended vicar of Christ on the earth.

Notwithstanding this full revelation of the "mystery of iniquity"—this literal fulfilment of the prophecies in the text—this palpable proof that the Roman pontiff is the Antichrist of Scripture—yet the nations were too besotted to resist his spiritual despotism.

Robbed universally of the word of God, living under a reign of darkness that might be felt, these arbitrary tyrants wielded an unlimited sway over prostrate Europe. During the dark ages the government of every European kingdom lay at their feet, and exalted rulers trembled before them. They then usurped the very place of God himself—they raised up one "from the dunghill, and set him on the throne of princes," and cast the rightful monarch down, and absolved his subjects from all allegiance. And if there were no other ground for a reformation in religion, this carnal power and lordly domination of the popedom is amply sufficient. Its character, as a civil and ecclesiastical power in unchristian combination, is diametrically opposed to the conduct of the lowly Jesus, who, when an ignorant multitude would force him to become their king, instead of receiving the honor like the ambitious pontiffs, "departed into a mountain by himself alone," John vi. 15.

POINTED THOUGHTS.

Dreams.—Spurgeon, speaking of dreams, says, "Dreams are the disordered fabrics of a wild imagination; the totterings of the fair pillars of a grand conception; how can they be the means of salvation? You know Rowland Hill's good answer. I must quote it in default of a better. When a woman pleaded that she was saved because she dreamed, he said, 'Well, my good woman, it is very nice to have good dreams when you are asleep, but I want to see how you act when you are awake; for if your conduct is not consistent with religion when you are awake, I will not give the snap of the finger for your dreams.' Ah, I do marvel that ever any person should go such a depth of ignorance as to tell me the stories that I have heard myself about dreams. Poor dear creatures, when they were sound asleep, they saw the gates of heaven opened,
and a white angel came and washed their sins away; and then they saw that they were pardoned; and since then, they have never had a doubt or a fear. It is time that you should begin to doubt, then; very good time that you should; for if that is all the hope you have, it is a poor one."—*Gems*, p. 220.

Comment.—Rowland Hill was, and Spurgeon is, a Baptist. They set aside, unequivocally, dreams, as not any part of experimental religion. Will our Baptist friends, in this country, concur? Dreams, and voices, and sights, when I was a youth, seemed to be the stuff, of which, for the most part, experimental religion was composed! But light has increased in the land; and "a change has come over the spirit of our dream." Tell us; must we have a new revelation, to convince us that our sins are pardoned?

*Memento.*—Some of the significant sayings of old Brother Creath often pass through my mind, and I feel that it might be well to commit them to writing. One of them was, "never fling away a plate of salad, because of a withered leaf." Another was, "never practice yourself, what you think wrong, or disagreeable in others." Another: "family government, as it regards husband and wife, should be conducted in the spirit of compromise." When he doubted a man, especially a preacher, he expressed it by saying, "I would not like to put many goods on board his boat." Or if he suspected a lady of being high tempered, he would say, "she has very black eyes." Another saying, which much impressed me, was, "as I grow older, I the more feel the importance of cultivating the sunny side of my nature." His dying words were, "I am happy." These sentences, to the ingenuous, are a pretty good index to the admirable character of Father Creath. I had intended to write his biography, from his own mouth; but, having, through delay, failed in that, I have not been able, since, to do any thing in that line, that would at all satisfy me.

A Brother, either in reality or in imagination, has been badly treated by another Brother—both being members of the same congregation. Does the offended Brother go to the offender, according to the eighteenth chapter of Matt., and seek an adjustment? Instead of this, he takes the "sulks," and absents himself for weeks, or it may be months, from the worship of the congregation. In doing this, and in wantonly violating the law of Christ, which says, "For sake not the assembling of yourselves together." Does he think that *two wrongs* will make *one right*? Or that his sin, in violating the law just quoted, is any better than his Brother's sin, committed by the violation of some other law? Does he think it a *nice* thing to do evil that good may come? If he may forsake the congregation because his Brother has sinned, may not God forsake him because he has sinned? When a man becomes so embittered as to turn his back habitually upon the emblems of a Savior's death, may not that Savior turn his back upon him? Let this angry Brother stop and think, before he farther goes!

Want of punctuality is falsifying; you promise, and do not fulfill. It is dishonesty: I may lose largely by your want of punctuality. It is bad manners. What right have you to incommode and discommode me by your want of punctuality? It is a violation of the golden rule. As you would not like that others should disappoint you, so do you be punctual in the fulfillment of your engagements with them. It indicates a lassitude—a general moral relaxation of the "inner man," and being a violation of the golden rule, is against all "the law and the prophets!" "He who offends in one point, is guilty of all." Take care!

A preacher had two calls—one to a rich, united church, capable of paying a large salary; the other, to a poor, divided church, which could not pay much salary. The preacher was in a quandary. In this state
of the case, a negro tendered his advice. 

"Massa," said he, "do you go where there is least money, and most 'devil!'" I would have said, "I will consider the affair, and if—and if!"

John Newton was speaking of the death of a lady. "O sir," said a young lady, "how did she die?" "There is a more important question," said Newton, "which you should have asked first, "How did she live."

Why is a certain rich man represented by our Savior as being addressed, "Thou fool?" Because, 1. He preferred his body to his soul. 2. Because he preferred the world to God. 3. Because he preferred time to eternity. 4. Because he lived as if he should never die; and whilst presuming on many years, was exposed to all the horrors of sudden death, without repentance, without forgiveness, without preparation, and without hope.

Wisdom of Solomon.—"He that is surety for a stranger, shall smart for it." "He that hateth suretyship is sure." "A man void of understanding striketh hands, and becometh surety in the presence of his friends." "Be thou not of one of those that strike hands, or of them that are sureties for debts." Reader, are you wiser than Solomon? If not, ponder well his admonitions. How many thousands are ruined annually, by wild pecuniary speculations and securityship? Ah, sir; among those "who will be rich," mammon, a greater, a wiser than Solomon presides! Well, if they will not follow inspired counsel, they must take the consequences!

One says, "I am killing time!" Would it not be nearer the truth to say, "time is killing you?" How swiftly it flies! Can you not turn each precious moment to some good account? In a few months, or years at most, it will all have sped away. It is the seed time, eternity is the harvest. If you turn not to a good account these fleeting moments as they fly, you will be an unpitied orphan in eternity. "If we sow sparingly, we shall reap also sparingly;" and by parity of reasoning, if we sow not at all, there will be no golden harvest in reversion for us beyond the tomb. If we "sow to the flesh, we shall reap corruption." If we recognize the crushing obligations which are upon us, time would not hang heavily on our hands; we should rather ask, "How, within so small a span, "shall we do the much that God has given to do?" Killing time! The murdered moments will be swift witnesses against you in the coming day of solemn judgment!

A. Raines.

WHAT A REFUGE!

Various are the kinds of refuge for comfort, sought by the weary of earth. The gay lady of fashion seeks delight in the fascinations of giddy, bewildering society, but oh! how unsatisfying are its enjoyments! The man of pleasure drowns all care in the intoxication of the wine cup and card table, blindly, madly rushing on to that dreadful place "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." The poet and dreamer encircles himself with beautiful imagery and air-castles of his own creation, shutting out the substantiability of God's truth, and constituting for himself a flimsy, ethereal heaven, upon earth, where he may enjoy "trifles light as air." The miser and recluse finding contact with the world uncongenial to his taste, retires to his loved seclusion, and there gloats with childlike fondness over the shining treasures, his heart growing more contracted and selfish all the time. But oh! what a refuge has the Christian! Not only a lifetime refuge, but an eternal one—a refuge which is not only satisfying and peace giving, but which contains such boundless stores of consolation that we can scarcely conceive of all its blessedness. What a rest for the weary—to be met at the very seat by a kind and sympathizing heavenly Father who will unburden our hearts and strengthen us for the conflicts of life. By fleeing to that refuge we are enabled to enjoy life's prose as well as its poetry, to gather instruction from adversity and to be content with all things.
A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.
NUMBER TEN.

FAITH—NUMBER ONE.

At the time of the commencement of the Reformation of the nineteenth century, there were two errors in reference to faith of vital importance:

1. An error in reference to what faith is.
2. An error in reference to how faith comes.

The first of these points, or the question, what faith is, is the subject for consideration in the present essay. The most common or popular theory, thirty-five years ago, was, that faith is an inwrought principle, produced by the direct and supernatural power of the Holy Spirit. It is true, they had creeds, confessions of faith, formulas and disciplines, of one sort or other, that they required men to believe, even upon pain of excommunication, which they claimed, contained their doctrine, or their faith; but it never entered into their minds, that the belief of those creeds was the faith that saves the soul; or, as they expressed it, "the saving faith." Hence, they admitted, that a man might believe any one of all their human creeds, or believe all that is contained in it, and not have "saving faith." They admitted, that a man might believe the creed, and not be a Christian; or, be a Christian and not believe the creed. Or, with them, to believe their doctrine or creed was one thing, and have "saving faith," was another. Hence they admitted that a man might have the genuine, true and saving faith, be a Christian and an heir of God, and not believe their creed at all. The popular parties, even now, who have human creeds, containing their faith, admit that other parties, who do not believe their creed, or receive the faith contained in it, are Christians. This is virtually admitting that the faith of their creeds is not what the apostles called faith, for they admit that without their faith, as set forth in their creeds, men can please God; but without faith, as set forth by the apostles, men can not please God. In their sense of it, "he who comes to God must believe," and "without faith," or belief, "it is impossible to please him." More singular still, they maintained that a man might believe on Christ, believe the gospel, the New Testament, nay, the Bible, and not have faith, or that to believe the gospel was not faith; or that, on the other hand, by the direct power or influence of the Holy Spirit, a man might be, and frequently was made a believer, while utterly ignorant of the contents of the Bible.

No one point was more a question of debate, than the simple question whether faith is an act of the mind—an act of the creature at all—and in any degree connected with the will, or a direct gift of God, in no way dependent on the will. It was maintained, on the one hand, that faith was an inwrought principle, imparted by the direct power or influence of the Spirit, independent of the will, and as much a miracle as the creation of man from the dust of the ground. On the other hand, the Reformers maintained, that the gospel is presented to man, in an abbreviated form, in a clear, intelligible, and well attested proposition; and that the free, full and cordial assent of the mind, with all the heart, to that proposition and confidence in Him who is embraced in it, is faith. The act of the creature, in thus assenting to this proposition and confiding in Him who is embraced in it, the disciples maintained, was faith. The others denied this and denounced it as a most dangerous heresy. It was declared insufficient, a delusion and most dangerous deception. Thus a clear and tangible issue was made out; one side maintaining that the belief of the gospel, the act of the creature, was faith, and that those who did not believe the gospel, would be condemned; while the other side denied that faith is the act of the creature, but maintained that it was a direct gift, imparted by the Holy Spirit, without which a man could no more be...
lieve than he could make a world. There was no room for compromise here. If one side was right, the other was vitally wrong, calling that faith which was not faith at all, and repudiating that which is faith, as not faith at all.

Having thus stated the issue, the way is now clear for the discussion of the subject, and the next thing in order is the argument.

I. If faith is a direct gift from God, by miracle, and man has no volition in it; or if man is the mere involuntary subject of it, as he is of ague and fever, then there is an end to all accountability or responsibility connected with believing and disbelieving. If there is anything self-evident, it is that a man can not be morally accountable for that over which he has no control. He can not be reasonably required to do that which he can not do, or condemned for not doing that which is impossible. If a man has no volition in believing, his will or choice has nothing to do with believing, and can have nothing to do in it, it is self-evident that he can not be condemned for not believing. In that case, there can be no praise for believing and no blame for not believing. Thus he who maintains that man can not believe, no matter whether on the ground of depravity, or any other unavoidable inability, on the part of man, excuses the unbeliever, apologises for him and makes him as innocent in unbelief, as any man can be in belief. This contradicts some of the clearest statements of the Bible, such as that, "he who believes not shall be damned," and "he who believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." The sin of unbelief is so great, that it is mentioned by itself as the ground of condemnation. It evidently lies at the bottom of a vast amount of other disobedience.

II. Faith stands in the form of a requirement—a command. When the Philippian jailor said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" the apostle replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall be saved." Here the inquiry was in reference to what he himself was to do, and not what the Lord was to do in him, or for him. In telling him what to do, the apostle commanded him to believe. This was certainly something he was commanded to do himself. Again, the apostle says, "He who comes to God, must believe." When the Lord says, "he must believe," it is useless and wicked for men to say, "he can not believe."

When the Ethiopian officer said, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," he spoke of what he did himself—he believed. So in other cases, where it is said, they believed, it is clear that the believing was their own act. Hence, John says, "These things are written that you might believe," to give them the ability, or the privilege to believe.

III. It is true, however, that there must be something reported by credible witnesses to be believed, before a man can perform the act of believing. A jury can believe, but not without facts stated by credible witnesses. In order to the faith that saves man, the Lord presents the truth which must be believed—reports it to man by the most credible witnesses ever heard. This is the part which the Lord performs for all alike, both good and bad, without any condition. He reports the truth, by the most credible witnesses ever heard, which man must believe to save his soul. When the truth is thus reported to man, the ability is thus given him to believe. He can believe the truth thus presented to him, and is, therefore, censurable if he does not believe.

IV. In the very nature of the case, that which all must believe, or be lost, must be very plain, easy and accessible to all. All would feel that it was unjust, unmerciful, and cruel to require them to believe something profoundly mystical, metaphysical, and speculative, which only a few of the clearest intellects in the world could appreciate, on pain of eternal perdition. Suppose you were required to believe Calvinism, or be lost; the first thing that would strike the mind would be, what is Calvinism, that I may believe it? You procure the works of Calvin, and read them; you hear men, said to be Calvinists, preach; and puz-
They believed it so firmly that many of them died for it sooner than give it up.

VI. That which was to be believed, in order to salvation, was first couched in promise. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This embraced Christ, and the entire New Institution, in promise; or it was the faith in promise; or, as Paul styles it, the gospel preached before to Abraham; or the gospel in promise. All the holy men, from Abraham to Christ, believed this promise, and thus believed the gospel in promise.

VII. What was embraced in the promise was afterward more clearly and fully developed in prophecy. This was the gospel, or the faith, not only in promise, but in a more advanced state—in prophecy. Holy men not only believed the promise, but the more fully detailed and developed form of it in prophecy. They believed God and looked for the good things to come, which were not for themselves, but for generations to come.

VIII. When the Savior was immersed by John in Jordan and ascended from the water, the Almighty Father parted the heavens above him, while the Holy Spirit, in a visible form was seen descending and resting on him. In view of this, John says, "I knew him not; but he who sent me to immerse, said, He, upon whom you shall see the Holy Spirit descending and remaining, is the Son of God." While all present were gazing upon the transcendently sublime scene, the I Am, the Jehovah, the Infinite One, from the excellent glory, introduced His Son to Israel, in the following grandest, greatest, and most wonderful of all oracles: "This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased." This is the faith that was contained first in promise, then in prophecy, and here expressed in a single sentence, directly from the lips of the Almighty, embodied in the living and glorious person of our Lord—"the Word that was with God and was God"—that "became flesh and dwelt among us"—"took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham"—became bone of our bone.
and flesh of our flesh. Again, in the mountain of transfiguration, while the three witnesses, Peter, James, and John were present, beholding the scene; while the Lord changed so as to appear in his glorified form, in the throne, and crowned “Lord of all;” while Moses from paradise, and Elijah from the glorified state, were present, and holding a conversation with the Savior in reference to His sufferings which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem, the eternal Father spoke again, repeating the oracle uttered at the Jordan, with an important additional clause, “This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased; hear you him.” The command, to hear him, is here added to the previous oracle.

IX. In a conversation which the Lord had with the disciples, he inquired of them, “Who do you say that I the Son of Man am?” Peter answered, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” The Lord replied, “Happy are you, Simon son of Jonas, for flesh and blood have not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say also to you, that you are Peter; and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it.” Here is the rock of offense, the stone of stumbling, rejected by Jewish builders and many others; but the same is become the head of the corner; neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name given under heaven, or among men, whereby we can be saved. Here we have arrived at the point where anti-Christ stranded, split off and wandered from God. The controversy is in regard to the meaning of a supplement, as we have it in the common version. That supplement is the word “it.” It should be this, as is clear from what follows immediately after: “Flesh and blood have not revealed this, but my Father who is in heaven,” has revealed this. This what? This truth, just stated by Peter, that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and on this truth, he declares, I will build my church. This anti-Christ, or the man of sin, as the reader may please to style him, denies, and maintains that the meaning is as follows: You are Peter; and on you, Peter, I will build my church. The true church is built on the truth, stated by Peter, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; the apostacy is built on the lie, that the church is built on Peter. The true builders build upon Christ, or the truth that he is the Christ; the false builders build on Peter, or the lie, that he is the rock. Christ is our rock, or foundation. “Other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ.” That which a man is to believe then, in order to be saved, is the statement that Peter made, that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

X. Unquestionably that which the apostles preached was what the people believed. They did not always express the great proposition, embracing the faith, in the same words, though it always amounted to the same thing. It matters not whether they said, “he preached Jesus to them,” “preached Christ to them,” or “preached the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” It mattered not whether they affirmed that Christ rose from the dead, or that he was the Son of God; for if he rose from the dead, he is the Son of God. Paul says, he declared the gospel to the Corinthians, and when he states what it was, we find that it was, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures. That everything rests on these transcendant facts, is evident from his reasoning. He says, How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? He proceeds, If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is no raised; and if Christ is not raised, our preaching is false, for this was the foundation of it. If Christ is not risen, he proceeds to inform them, their faith was vain and they were yet in their sins. If Christ rose from the dead, he is divine, the Son of God and Savior of the world, for an imposter did not raise himself from the dead, and God would not have raised him and thus aided him in
posing an imposition on the world. The resurrection of Christ, therefore, from the dead, is the grand issue of all issues ever known among men. Upon it hangs our hope of a resurrection from the dead, of eternal life. Upon it hangs the fate of the Bible. If Jesus rose from the dead, the Bible is sealed, for he was divine and knew what was from God. His quoting all the principal parts of the Old Testament, as the word of God, or the language of the Spirit, is an endorsement. Hence Paul says, "If you shall confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved." In the same view, Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth and the life: no man comes to the Father but by me." The Lord is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and Omega of the faith, or, to the same amount, "the author and finisher of the faith."

THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

BY C. ANDERSON, OF LONDON.

A crisis was evidently approaching. The priests of the country, clustering together, began to storm at ale-houses and other places; and all with one consent, against one man. Whether the existing Chancellor of the diocese of Worcester had ever feasted at Little Sodbury, does not appear; but it can not be long before Tyndale will have to stand before him. Fortunately the tutor has left on record his own reflections as to this period of his life.

"A thousand books," says he, "had they ever (rather) to be put forth against their abominable doings and doctrines, than that the Scripture should come to light. For as long as they may keep that down, they will so darken the right way with the mist of their sophistry, and so tangle them that either rebuke or despise their abominations, with arguments of philosophy, and with worldly similitudes, and apparent reasons of natural wisdom; and with wresting the Scriptures unto their own purpose, clean contrary unto the process, order, and meaning of the text; and so delude them in descanting upon it with allegories; and amaze them, expounding it in many senses before the unlearned lay people, (when it hath but one simple literal sense, whose light the owls can not abide,) that though thou feil in thine heart, and art sure, how that all is false that they say, yet couldst thou not solve their subtle riddles.

"Which thing only moved me to translate the New Testament. Because I had perceived by experience, how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scriptures were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text: for else, whatsoever truth is taught them, these enemies of all truth quench it again—partly with the smoke of their bottomless pit, (whereof thou readest in Apocalypse, chap. ix.) that is with apparent reasons of sophistry, and traditions of their own making; and partly in juggling with the text, expounding it in such a sense as is impossible to gather of the text itself."

Accordingly, "not long after this," says John Foxe, "there was a sitting of the (Italian) Bishop's Chancellor appointed, and warning was given to the priests to appear, amongst whom Master Tyndale was also warned to be there. Whether he had any misdoubt by their threatenings, or knowledge given him that they would lay some things to his charge, is uncertain; but certain this is, as he himself declared, that he doubted their privy accusations; so that he, by the way, in going thitherward, cried in his mind heartily to God, to give him strength to stand fast in the truth of his word." But let us hear Tyndale's own expressions.

"When I was so turmoiled in the country where I was, that I could no longer dwell there, the process whereof were too
long here to rehearse, I thiswise thought in
myself,—this I suffer, because the priests of
the country be unlearned, as God knoweth,
there are a full ignorant sort, which have
seen no more Latin than that they read in
their Portesses and Missals, which yet many
of them can scarcely read. And, therefore,
because they are thus unlearned, thought I,
when they come together to the ale-house, which
is their preaching place, they affirm that my sayings are heresy. Be-
sides they add to, of their own heads, that
which I never spake, as the manner is, and
accused me secretly to the Chancellor, and
other the Bishop's Officers."

"When I came before the Chancellor, he
threatened me grievously, and reviled me, and
rated me as though I had been a dog; and
laid to my charge whereof there could
be none accuser brought forth, as their
manner is not to bring forth the accuser;
and yet, all the priests of the country were
there the same day."

Here then was Tyndale, in the year 1522,
brought to answer for himself; and having
already had so many discussions with dig-
nitaries on Sodbury Hill, as well as argu-
ments with the priests in other places, one
might have supposed that something deci-
sive was on the eve of accomplishment;
but it turned out an entire failure.

Tyndale's future footsteps will frequent-
ly discover him to have been a man, who,
in the history of his country stood lit-
trally alone; and here, it should seem,
this peculiar feature had already be-
gun to discover itself. As standing before
the Chancellor of any diocese, we read of
no second individual, in whose appearance
there were so many curious coincidences.
The reader will now recollect the thorough-
ly Italianised character of the district, as
formerly described, and the questions very
naturally present themselves—Who was
this Chancellor? Who the Cardinal that
had recently appointed him? Who was the
non-resident Italian Bishop? nay, and who
the reigning Pontiff himself, the fountain
of all this oppressive authority? The Pon-
tiff was Adrian VI., who, to appease Wol-
sey, had recently made him "Legate a la-
tere" for life; the bishop was Julio di Me-
deci, the future Clement VII., and who, with-
out even visiting England, had been made
bishop of Worcester by Leo X. The man
who had lately appointed the Chancellor to
the diocese was Wolsey himself, who farm-
ished the whole district for his Italian broth-
er; and the Chancellor who had raised him-
self to this unenviable notoriety by so treat-
ing the man destined by Divine Providence
to overcome all above him, as far as Rome
itself was concerned; was a creature of the
English cardinal, a Dr. Thomas Parker,
who lived to know more of Tyndale's power
and talents, than he then could comprehend.
Had such men only known who was then
within the Chancellor's grasp, with what
eager joy would they have put an end to all
his noble intentions?

It is some alleviation to find that every
man in the country was not of the same
opinion with the reigning, if not furious
Chancellor. "Not far off," continues Foxe,
"there dwelt a certain doctor, that had been
an old Chancellor before to a bishop, who
had been of old familiar acquaintance with
Master Tyndale, and also favored him well.
To him Tyndale went and opened his mind
in divers questions of the Scripture. For to
him the doctor said—Do you not
know that the Pope it very Anti-Christ,
whom the Scripture speakeh of? But be-
ware what you say; for if you shall be per-
ceived to be of that opinion, it will cost you
your life;" adding, "I have been an officer
of his; but I have given it up, and defy him
and all his works.""

It was not long after this that Tyndale,
happening to be in the company of a reputed
learned divine, and in conversation, having
brought him to a point, from which there
was no escape, he broke out with this ex-
clamation, "We were better to be without
God's laws, than the Pope's!" This was an
ebullition in perfect harmony with the state
of the country at the moment, but it was
more than the piety of Tyndale could bear.
"I defy the Pope," said he, in reply, "and
all his laws; and if God spare my life, ere many years, I will cause a boy that driveth the plough, to know more of the Scripture than you do!" It was one of those significant bursts of zeal, which will sometimes escape from a great and determined mind. It meant even more than met the ear, for, by this time, Tyndale might have said, with Jeremiah of old, and perhaps did so, "His word was in mine heart, as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing; and I could not stay."

Just so, th' Omnipotent, who turns—
The system of a world's concerns,
From mere minutiae can educe—
Events of most important use;—
But who can tell how vast the plan—
Which this day's incident began?

After this, as might have been anticipated, the murmuring of the priests increased more and more. Such language must have flown over the country, as on the wings of the wind. Tyndale, they insisted, was "a heretic in sophistry, a heretic in logic, and now also a heretic in divinity." To this they added that "he bare himself bold of the gentlemen there in that country, but that, notwithstanding, he should be otherwise spoken to."

It was now evident that Tyndale could no longer remain, with safety, in the county of Gloucester, or within the Italian diocese of Worcester. He has therefore been represented by Foxe, as thus addressing his Master: "Sir, I perceive that I shall not be suffered to tarry long here in this country, neither shall you be able, though you would, to keep me out of the hands of the spirituality; and also what displeasure might grow thereby to you by keeping me, God knoweth; for the which I should be specially sorry." Searching about, therefore, not so much for an avenue to escape, as for some convenient place to accomplish the determined purpose of his heart, by translating the Scriptures, he now actually first thought of Tunstal, Bishop of London, one of the future burners of his New Testament! From Sir John Walsh's intimate knowledge of the Court, there was no difficulty in procuring the best access to him; and so Tyndale must bid farewell forever to his interesting abode on Sodbury Hill. It was his first and last, or only attempt throughout life to procure a Patron, and he will, himself, now describe his own movements.

"The Bishop of London came to my remembrance, whom Erasmus (whose tongue maketh of little gnats great elephants, and lifteth up above the stars whoever giveth him a little exhibition,) praiseth exceedingly, among other, in his Annotations on the New Testament, for his great learning. Then, thought I, if I might come to this man's service I were happy." Such was his impression in Gloucestershire, when moved by the blind superstition of his country "to translate the New Testament;" and, till now, evidently unacquainted with the state of the metropolis; for "even," says he, "even in the Bishop of London's house I intended to have done it!"

"And so I went to London, and through the acquaintance of my master came to Sir Harry Gilford, the King's Grace's Comptroller, and brought him an oration of Isocrates, which I had translated out of Greek into English, to speak unto my Lord of London for me. This he also did, as he showed me, and willed me to write an epistle to my lord, and to go to him myself, which I also did, and delivered my epistle to a servant of his own, one William Hethwayte, a man of mine old acquaintance. But God, which knoweth what is within hypocrites, saw that I was beguiled, and that that counsel was not the next way to my purpose. And therefore he gave me no favor in my lord's sight. Whereupon my lord answered me—his house was full, he had more than he could well find, and advised me to seek in London, where, he said, I could not lack a service."

This memorable interview between these two individuals, happened about three or four months after Tunstal's consecration as Bishop of London; and before the reader has proceeded much farther in these pages, he will discover a singular propriety in Tyndale having first called upon this man, above all others, previous to his going abroad. All parties agree as to Tunstal's
attainments in learning—the specimen presented to him was a translation from the Greek of Isocrates into English; and, after receiving it, the Bishop replied,—"Seek in London, where you can not lack a service." If there was any meaning in the words employed, it was this,—"You are a competent translator from Greek into English." Tyndale, it is true, was now evidently led by a blind man, by a way that he knew not; but it certainly was something to have received such an answer or attestation to his scholarship from such a man, before he proceeded farther with his intended work. It was equal to the Bishop having said, Go forward—though, if Tunstal had only divined what was the main object in view, no such answer had been returned; nay, an authoritative stop would have been put to all farther progress.

Meanwhile, and on the contrary, by the advice, and therefore the authority, of the Bishop of London himself, Tyndale was now authorized to seek for some situation throughout the metropolis. No ecclesiastical, however, afforded him any permanent abode; but, in a little time, and for fully the last six months of this year, namely, 1523, he was most kindly entertained under the roof of Mr. Humphrie Monmouth, a wealthy citizen, and future Alderman of London, when he used to preach at St. Dunstan's in the West, Fleet street. Although he sought in vain for a situation, "almost a year," yet the residence itself was not without its value in future life. It had a similar effect upon him, which a visit to Rome had upon some others, and tended not only to ground him more firmly in his views of Divine truth, but to inflame his zeal for translating the Scriptures. He had opportunity for more closely observing many things which he had never seen before; and, in reference to the scene around him, witness his own language, in 1530:

"And so in London I abode almost a year, and marked the course of the world, and heard our preachers, how they boasted themselves and their high authority; and beheld the pomp of our prelates, and how busy they were, as they yet are, to set peace and unity in the world; though it be not possible for them that walk in darkness to continue long in peace; (for they can not but either stumble, or dash themselves at one thing or another, that shall clean unquiet altogether;) and saw things whereof I defer to speak at this time; and understood, at the last, not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also, that there was no place to do it, in all England, as experience doth now openly declare."

There is here not a little expressed, but far more implied, when coming from such a man as Tyndale. Had he been nothing more than a scholar, and merely the translator of the Scriptures, it would have been out of place to have noticed other affairs. But since all his other writings were so powerful at the moment, as to excite the dread of these very prelates, and thus enjoyed the honor of public denunciation; since he was the first, if not the only man, who gave such a masterly exposure of the whole policy of Wolsey, and now, without knowing it, was about to enter on a twelve years' war with the powers of darkness; we owe it not only to himself, but more especially to the Scriptures he translated, to watch the course of Divine Providence in the world. It may only be remarked here, once for all, that for seven years to come, while Henry VIII. had one object in view, his Prime Minister, Cardinal Wolsey, was frequently pursuing another. There was almost always an under-plot which may now be detected; and it is not difficult to do so, throughout this present year, or 1523.
THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF POPERY.

A TRACT,

By the American Protestant Society.

But the moral character of the Romish clergy forms another overwhelming argument for an ecclesiastical change. Roman Catholic as well as Protestant historians, unanimously testify, that their lives were, before the Reformation, most dissolute and degraded. In Protestant churches there are, no doubt, cases of clerical immorality which are exceedingly to be deplored, because they give reason to the scoffer to speak reproachfully, and are amongst the greatest obstacles to the prosperity of Zion. But cases of unsullied morality among the clergy were nearly as remarkable then, as cases of profligacy now. Century after century their vices rose in disgusting accumulation; and the pages of history during the dark ages, are polluted by the shocking recital of their enormities. Living in the splendor of courts, and spending their time in the gratification of a luxurious indolence, they who should have promoted every virtue, became moral nuisances in the domestic intercourse of life. The country swarm'd with the spurious offsprings of ecclesiastics; and the daughters of cardinals were publicly and pompously united in marriage to the sons of noblemen. Hundreds of the most exalted personages, who had neither talent for the cabinet, nor courage for the field, entered into the church, which they prostituted to the acquisition of wealth, and the gratification of the sinful propensities of fallen nature: and their children in the days of infancy, were nominated to the richest bishopricks; while, during their minority, the parents reaped the fruit of an accursed simony. Iniquity seemed to have risen to the highest pitch in the papacy, during the pontificates of Julius II., and especially of Alexander VI., who has been termed a Nero amongst the popes, for cruelty and immorality. His crimes were of a very revolting description; he trampled on all decency, and justice, and religion, in providing for his numerous progeny; and he perished by unknowingly taking a draught of poison, which had been prepared for others, by his own infamous son, Caesar Borgia!

The ignorance of the clergy was then also as remarkable, as their profligacy was disgusting. When ecclesiastical benefices were openly put to sale, or bestowed on the illiterate and unworthy minions of courtiers, we do not wonder that the church was defiled by ignorant and degraded characters. Many dignified ecclesiastics could not subscribe the canons of those councils in which they sat as arbiters of the true faith; and learning must have sunk to the lowest ebb, when one of the questions put to candidates for holy orders was, "Whether they could read the Gospels and Epistles?" And the great Alfred complained that from the Humber to the Thames, there was scarcely a priest who understood the liturgy, or could translate the easiest piece of Latin into his mother tongue. When ignorance and profligacy thus went hand in hand, then were the words of the prophet Isaiah literally fulfilled: "We look for judgment, but there is none; for salvation, but it is far off from us. In transgression and lying against the Lord, and departing away from our God, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey." Isaiah lix. 11, 12. In the midst of the spiritual darkness that hung over the nation, any error might then be unblushingly promulgated: as the people, and even a great proportion of the clergy, were robbed of the book of God, the only infallible test of divine truth: nay, the laity were rigidly watched lest they should even get into their hands the catechisms that had been composed and approved by the church. The priests took away the key of knowledge, and buried it
under the rubbish of ages, having set a
seal to the entrance of the temple of truth:
and when a famished creature asked for
bread, they cast him a stone; when he ask-
ed a fish they gave him a serpent. The
gold, and silver, and precious stones, were
carried away from Jerusalem; and wood,
hay, and stubble, were piled in their stead.
Notwithstanding the boasted unity and pu-
rity of the Romish Church; yet from her
bosom came forth the heresy of Arius, who
denied the divinity and atonement of the
Lord Jesus, and held that the Son was es-
sentially inferior to God the Father; and in
the sixth century this error was lamentably
prevalent in Europe, and Africa, and Asia.
In the eighth century, the worship of
images was carried to the greatest excess;
and the controversy concerning it, not only
rent the church asunder, but spread abroad
civil dissension; producing devastation and
death in several quarters of the Roman em-
prise. The members of the falsely termed
infallible and united church were ranged
into two fierce parties, under leaders deter-
mmed to push the controversy to the most
violent extremities. The valiant Leo head-
ed those who opposed image worship, and
who were styled Iconoclastæ, because they
considered it a sacred duty to destroy sta-
tues and pictures, that were the occasion of
idolatry. The ringleaders of the other fac-
tion were Popes Gregory II. and III., who
taught the multitude to fall prostrate before
the dumb idols; and were hence called
Iconoduli, or Iconolatræ. When the haugh-
ty pontiffs failed in argument, they resorted
to heartless and cold-blooded assassination.
By a sentence of papal excommunication
fulminated against Leo, he was cut off from
the rites of Christianity; his subjects, un-
der the pain of eternal torment, were com-
manded to resist his imperial authority,
and multitudes of exalted and enlightened
persons in his dominions were massacred for
their attachment to scriptural truth. But
such was the overwhelming influence of su-
perstition, that Leo, for his opposition to
idolatry, and his defence of the rational
service of God, had a cup of poison given
to him by his own wife, the bigoted Irene;
who, of course, according to the doctrine of
the times, believed that under such circum-
stances, the murder of her husband was an
acceptable service.
In the midnight of the dark ages, the
monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation was
established in the Church of Rome. At
the fourth Lateran Council, assembled by
Innocent III., in the the year 1215, the seal
of infallibility was set to the revolting
dogma, that a poor sinful creature could
transubstantiate a wafer into the body,
blood, soul and divinity of him who hung
on Calvary's cross. Thus a mock sacrifice
must be daily offered by the Romish priest,
which virtually imputes imperfection to the
one perfect sacrifice of our Redeemer. Thus
the laity are deluded by an unbloody sacri-
fice, contrary to the words of the apostle:
"Without the shedding of blood there is
no remission." (Heb. ix. 22,) and if it be
so infallibly right to adhere to the letter
of scripture with regard to the eating of
the bread, must it not be infallibly wrong
to reject to the drinking of the cup, in this
solemn ordinance? Previous to the thir-
teenth century, the barbarous epithet,
transubstantiation, was unknown in the ecclesias-
tical world; but Innocent, a bold innova-
tor, attacked the liberty of the Christian
in his sweetest communion with his Lord—
substituted carnal sense for enlightened
faith—and was too blind to understand that
the words of Jesus were "spirit and life."
And when such a tenet was submitted to by
a degraded people, it is not a matter of sur-
prise, that the same pontiff, about the same
time, could also successfully introduce the
novel and spurious ordinance of auricular
confession to a priest. Before this period,
the Romish clergy had fleeced the country,
not of a tenth, but of nearly one half, its
riches; but by this enactment they entered
into the arcana of conscience, extorted the
secrets of men in all the relations of life;
and not contented with remitting merely
ecclesiastical offences according to the com-
mand of Christ, they impiously raised their
hands, to drag from his throne the Prince
of Life, who only can give "repentance to Israel, and remission of sins."

But space would fail us to describe the rapid progress of error in the dark ages. Like a downward torrent it dashed over every obstacle, and barrenness and death marked its desolating course. The tower of this Popish Babel was raised to the clouds of heaven; and the indignation of the Almighty was ready to burst upon its builders. The nations lost all sense of the true knowledge of God—rites and ceremonies, the most revolting, were substituted for the doctrines and duties of Christianity—the iron yoke of spiritual despotism was galling the inmost souls of men—and the moral wretchedness of a ruined church called for a great spiritual change.

We shall now endeavor, in the second place, to delineate that extraordinary change, the Protestant Reformation.

The former darkness and superstition were not more manifestly from beneath than this blessed Reformation was, in its grand outline, the design and doing of the Lord. Let it not be supposed, however, that there were no witnesses for the truth of God—none to oppose the man of sin in his diabolical career, till the sixteenth century. In the darkest period of ecclesiastical history, there were many valiant soldiers of the cross raised up to testify against the prevailing corruptions. And when you are insultingly and ignorantly asked, "Where was your religion before Luther?"—you may reply: not merely in the word of God and amongst the fathers of the three first centuries; but it lived amidst the persecutions that raged in after ages, and it was borne up by the groans and the shrieks, or the deathless fortitude of dying martyrs. Their ministers were all classed with Leo the Isaurian, and the splendid forms of superstition, they entirely rejected; and they acknowledged no mediators but the Lord Jesus Christ. But the spirituality of their doctrines, and the puri-
ty of their lives, excited the hatred of the supporters of idolatry; and we may judge that they had taken deep root in the land, when for an hundred and fifty years they stood all the horrors of persecution; till at last the inquisitors of the cruel Theodora, like blood-hounds, hunted them through Asia Minor; and by gibbet and fire, and sword, about a hundred thousand of these devoted servants of God were elevated to a martyr's crown.

THOUGHTS AS THEY CAME UP.

Bro. Franklin:—This world, in which we live, is full of wonders and mysteries. That things are, we know; but the how and the why are often deeply involved in mystery. In what endless mazes should we be lost, did not faith come in to illumine our darkness, and to teach us that in the wisdom and goodness of our great Father, all things were created and arranged, and that as respects the works of the Creator, we may say,

"In spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever is, is right."

Not so, however, the works of man. This world, it seems to me, is sadly out of joint. I do not accustom myself to dwell longer than might be profitable on the dark side of questions; but still there is much, not only in heathendom, but also in our self-styled Christendom, to discourage the philanthropist. "Truth," we say, "is mighty and will prevail;" but falsehood also prevails; and in how many instances are the votarists of error exceedingly more zealous than are the advocates of truth! "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation," but let a man of eloquence put a human gospel in opposition to it, well interlarded and adorned with thrilling anecdotes, and having the prestige of fashion and prejudice, and what becomes, in multiplied instances of the gospel of the grace of God, in the comparison? Hence, it often comes to pass, that a bawling enthusiast will make more converts, than the sedate, enlightened, elegant, and godly teacher of divine truth; and the converts, whether made by the one class of teachers or the other—how many of them are but little improved by conversion—still as ignorant as ever—still as worldly!—days it may be for the flesh, and only hours or minutes for the spirit—dimes for Christ, and it may be not even dimes: but dollars by tens, often by hundreds, for "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life." If things were, in Paul's day, as they are now, I wonder not that he said, "For all seek their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's," nor that David should have said, "I have seen an end of all perfection."

It is strange to me that men should recognize, in theory, the divine authenticity and authority of the scriptures, and at the same time be practically and experimentally, so little influenced by them. For example: I can go into almost any section, with which I am acquainted, and read Peter's discourse, delivered on the day of Pentecost, and tell the people that Peter shall be their only preacher on that occasion, and that I will act the part of an exhorter only, and that God requires them to believe all that this apostle testifies, and to do all that he commands without note or comment, and such a meeting as it will produce is astonishing! To your tents, O sectarians! They who have turned the world upside down have come hither also! I have experimented in this way frequently, and many have been the wrathful excitments which I have seen produced among the professed people of the Lord, by a presentation of the terms of pardon, as propounded by the apostle Peter, without addition or diminution, in this Christian country, in the full blaze of the light of the nineteenth century. Is not this a little strange? Is it not somewhat discouraging? Indeed, there can be no reasonable doubt, that if the old apostle were in this country now, and a member of any one of the self-styled orthodox churches, and were to preach
as he did on the day of Pentecost, and was not known to be the apostle Peter, they would promptly and indigantly excommunicate him.

But are we, who style ourselves Christians, better than they? We have, I doubt not, a better knowledge of the terms of pardon than they; and in all respects, a more scriptural theory of religion. In regard to practice, however, do we not come exceedingly short? Do we read the scriptures more than do the people of the sects? In the day of small things we did, when we were poor and persecuted? But how is it now, since we have become numerous, and "rich and increased in goods?" And do we find no non-essential commands in the inspired code of Him whom we denominate our sovereign Lord and Lawgiver? A happy thing it is if we are not treating the commandments of Christ, which enjoin Christian practice, as others are treating the terms of pardon preponderated in the gospel. The practice which "the perfect law" enjoins requires self denial—the mortification of the flesh—a following of Jesus through evil as well as through good report. The way of reformation is a pathway that leads up hill—a voyage against the current. It is comparatively easy to enlist in the army of the faith; but, "to fight the good fight of faith" afterwards, requires that we "give all diligence, to add to our faith courage"—and all the Christian graces and virtues. It is in this department that many who have berated the sects for making baptism a non-essential, find a score or more of non-essentials, such as, "Let every man speak truth with his neighbor;" "Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" "Let your conversation be without covetousness;" "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is;" "Exhort one another daily, while it is called to day;" "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath." Let these for the present suffice. Are these commands—I mean obedience to them—essential to salvation? If not, why should obedience to any commands by not go to heaven on the footing of good feelings, good wishes, and good intentions, mixed with a portion of imperfect sincerity, without this excessive strenuousness in regard to being "doers of the word?"

Many do not seem to have arrived at the knowledge that "the word of God is living and powerful"—that "the truth as it is in Jesus," has life heat in it, and hence, they mistake the animal heat, and stentor voice, and frantic rant of the orator, for the living energies of the divine word, if not the Holy Spirit! The result is, that their minds, with respect to the means of salvation, are like the fool's eye in the ends of the earth, or wherever else it ought not to be, if they would receive the full saving influence of the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

But from the past, we may hope in regard to the future. A great work has been done, within the last thirty years, in causing the scales of sin and sectarianism to fall from the eyes of hundreds of thousands of our fellow travelers to eternity; and only eternity can reveal the fruits of the labors of those who faithfully sought a restoration of the apostolic order of things. We must not "fret ourselves because of evil doers," nor become discouraged on account of the imperfection of Christians. "Every one shall receive his own reward according to his own labor," and in due time we shall reap if we faint not." Having respect to the recompense of the reward, as did the ancient men of faith, will buoy us up, amid this world's perils and afflictions, as it did them; and when the spirits of just men shall be made perfect, we with them, shall meet in the full fruition of an eternal weight of glory.

In conclusion, I was quite surprised, and much pleased to receive, not long since, the first number of your "Quarterly." It is gotten up in very becoming style, and is certainly very cheap. It ought to be extensively patronized; and will be, I doubt not, unless the war excitement destroys, in the multitude, all taste for religious reading. I wish you great success in every scriptural enterprise. Grace, mercy and peace.

A. RAINES.
TRANSLATION—IMMERSION.

Those who sprinkle or pour, for baptism, have never maintained that baptizo ought to be translated sprinkle, or pour, though they have a thousand times argued that it so means. Nor do they ever, in administering, say "I sprinkle you in the name of the Father," &c. Immersionists show that they believe what they preach, for, without hesitation, they translate baptizo, immerse. This is right. Baptizo, or baptize, as we have it transferred in the common version, means immerse. The only difference is, that one is English and the other is Greek. If an apostle would rather speak five words in his own tongue, that his meaning might be understood, than ten thousand in an unknown tongue, why should we not give our own tongue the preference? We have long since advocated translating every word into modern English. This is right. There is now another item to advocate, and that is, that in our private conversation, preaching, writing and administering the sacred rite, we adopt the practice of using the English word immerse. It may be argued, that baptize is also an English word. It is true. It is now canonized and defined as an English word; but the meaning has changed, so that it does not mean what it did originally. It meant immerse, in the time of the apostles, and nothing else. The people so understood it and so practiced. Then, as we have an English word that means the same thing, and as we practice the same, let us use that English word, in conversation, in preaching, writing and administering the rite, and thus show that we can talk precisely what we practice.

Our opponents can not translate baptizo, sprinkle, or pour. They are ashamed to attempt it. Yet, no man can give a reason why it can not be done if it means sprinkle or pour. They can not when they administer, say "I sprinkle you in the name of the Father," &c. We can say, and should, "I immerse you into the name of the Father," &c. Let us, who maintain the ancient practice, use English precisely expressing what we practice, and not immerse, and yet he ashamed to say "I immerse you," &c. The man who sprinkles, is ashamed to say, "I sprinkle you," &c., though sprinkling is precisely what he does.

POINTED THOUGHTS.

An old man one day taking a child on his knee, entreated him to seek God now—to pray to him—and to love him. The child looking up to him, asked, "But why do not you seek God?" The old man, deeply affected, answered, "I would, child; but my heart is hard—my heart is hard." Yes, sinner, and your heart is being daily, more and more, hardened by "the deceitfulness of sin." How near may be the hour when you will say, too late, too late!—when your heart will have become too hard to be penetrated by the truth, or softened by the love of God? How few of those who have lived in sin till old age has overtaken them, ever make a profession of religion! and, it is worthy of remark, that if they make a profession, they can then accomplish but little, either for God or their fellow men.

A preacher of my acquaintance was sent for, by a dying man, who wished to see him, ere he departed to his final account. The preacher complied with the request, and was introduced into the presence of the dying man; but, how must he have been surprised and overwhelmed to meet with the following address: "Mr. M.," said he, "I have not sent for you for the purpose for which you are often summoned to the bed of sickness, to administer consolation to the dying; for you can give me no consolation. I am an old man, and, against light and knowledge, have spent my life in the service of Satan; and I would deem it an act of meanness, of which, wicked as I am, I
am not capable now, when I can serve the devil no longer, to offer my filthy self to God! I wish you to use my case as a warning to sinners. Tell them of my awful death; and warn them, as they would shun perdition, to shun the pathway that leads down into that pit, wherein is no water, and where there is weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth!"

Comment.—There was at least a semblance of a high sense of honor in this case, which but rarely manifests itself in connection with the death of the wicked. Spend your life in the service of sin—repent on a deathbed—go to heaven—receive the plaudit, "well done, good and faithful servant."—most detestable! No, sir! no, sir! It is infinitely dishonorable. Calculations such as these are the result of strong Satanic delusion; the way to hell, leading down by the chambers of death!

THE CHURCH.—John Wesley, speaking of the death of Ananias and Sapphira, says, "This is the first time (Acts v. 10) it is mentioned, and here is a native specimen of a New Testament church: which is a company of men, called by the gospel, grafted into Christ by baptism, animated by love, united by all kinds of fellowship, and disciplined by the death of Ananias and Sapphira."

Remarks.—1. The first act of discipline, in the first church, had respect to a money transaction. 2. These persons, by insincerity and lying, in regard to a pecuniary transaction, and committed a crime worthy of death. 3. Is it not just as criminal now as then, to set up false pretenses, for not doing our duty, in a pecuniary point of view, to the church? 4. The age of miracles being gone, we need not expect the merited punishment to be suddenly inflicted now; but will it not be inflicted in God's own good time, upon all who hypocritically excuse themselves, through covetousness, for not discharging their pecuniary obligations to the church? 5. "Great fear," we are told, "fell on all the church, and upon as many as heard these things." "And of the rest [hypocrites] durst no man join himself unto them." This infliction of punishment, therefore, had the most salutary effect. 6. Hypocrites of every grade may shield themselves from the execution of the law of Christ, as administered by the church here, but cannot escape the infliction of the penalty, as it will be inflicted by the inexorably righteous Judge, hereafter.

Dr. Rush was a great enemy of theatrical amusements. He was once in conversation with a lady, a professor of religion, who was speaking of the pleasure she anticipated at the theater in the evening; and she invited the doctor also to attend. He replied, "I never will publish to the world that I think Jesus Christ a hard master, and religion an unsatisfying portion, which should do if I went on to the devil's ground in quest of happiness." The doctor's reason will hold good with respect to all worldly amusements. Those who have at heart the faith, hope, and love, with which the gospel inspires the genuine Christian, receive a fund of happiness, as a fruit of their religion, which elevates them above all dependence, for happiness, on the sickly, frothy, evanescent fountains of carnal enjoyment.

The United States Congress, shortly after the declaration of independence, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas, True religion and good morals are the only foundation of public liberty and happiness;

Resolved, That it be, and hereby is, earnestly recommended to the several states to take the most effectual measure for the encouragement thereof, and for the suppression of theatrical entertainments, horse-racing, and such other diversions as are productive of idleness, dissipation, and a general depravity of principles and manners."

Comment.—If true religion and good morals are the only foundation of public liberty and happiness, is he either a patriot or a philanthropist, who has neither true religion nor good morals? The answer must
be in the negative. If Christians are either patriots or philanthropists, it would be well, therefore, that they should seek to fill our political and civil offices with men who will act in harmony with the above resolution; with patriots and philanthropists, who have within themselves the foundation of public liberty and happiness. Acting in opposition to the spirit of this resolution, has filled our country with the terrible implements of war, and with "confused noises, and garments rolled in blood!"

"Is it sinful," said a young lady to a minister of the gospel, "to dress fashionably?"

"That will depend," said he, "on circumstances. If there be nothing immodest in the fashion, and if you do not expend money, in a chase after the ever variable fashions, which might be better appropriated in some other way; and if a love of fine dressing does not cause you to waste time before the mirror, which might be occupied in the improvement of your mind, or in other beneficial pursuits; and if it does not make you proud, and cause you to think yourself above worthy persons, who cannot dress so fashionably as you, it may all be very well. I have found it, said he, difficult to be finely dressed, without thinking ourselves better than our plainly dressd neighbors, who, in many instances, are better than we. 'But,' added the preacher, "if we would take a wise view of the subject, there is nothing in fine dressing of which we should be proud. The material of the finest hat is the production of a homely animal. The finest coat was once the coat of a sheep. The beautiful silken fabric, in which the beauty rustles, and which may be her chief adorning and glory, is the production of a loathsome worm. Our dwellings are composed of dead stone, or of dead clay, or of dead wood. We dwell in houses of clay, and our foundations are in the dust. Our mortal body is a body of sin and death; and our souls, if unpardoned, are doomed to death eternal!" Ah, thought I, why should mortal, sinful man be proud? How many, alas! how very many are proud of their exterior, whose inner man is clothed with the ragged habiliments of shame and sin! A. Raines.

MENTAL CAPABILITIES.

Love of music, love of the beauties of nature, a poetical temperament, lively imagination, active conscience, love of reading and knowledge and various other faculties and acquirements are so many avenues through which to 'glorify God and enjoy him forever.' We may devote all the fruits of our attainments to him and then fail to render what is due for his great mercy and goodness.

Christianity dignifies and exalts every thing which will come under its influence; and is the only thing worth the absorption of all our energies. In the prosecution of this work, the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, not only more than compensates, but encourages and stimulates to still greater exertions, and instead of the mental resources becoming exhausted, they are by God's grace and help expanded. The capacity of the heart for enjoying religion is kept in activity by conflicts, besetments, temptations, and by being continually impressed with the unsatisfying nature of earthly things compared with heavenly. Dispensations of providence, which at first appear grievous, are to create desires for larger draughts from the fountain of eternal truth and love. If our hearts are properly engaged in this high calling, we may expect to be so abundantly blessed as not to rely on earthly sources, for that abiding contentment which is found only in the path of unflinching duty. But with all man's glorious gifts and capabilities of efficiency how abject and utterly dependent upon the all powerful hand of God to uphold and sustain in weakness. If left to our own weak and wandering resources we could never hope to regain Adam's lost estate, and if that desirable end is ever consummated it will be owing to the compassionate and undeserved mercy of that being who gives strength to our feeble endeavors.

M. B.
REVOLUTION AND REFORMATION.

BY JOHN F. ROWE.

No reformation can be carried on without revolution. In fact, the word reformation itself implies revolution. As a people, we largely boast of being identified with a great reformation—one involving more issues, and counting on more results, than even the antecedent re formations of the 16th and 17th centuries. In so far as the identification of the church of Christ is concerned, and the dislodging of tradition and church despotism, our plea for reformation indicates the ultimatum. No people can go beyond what we propose. We have taken high ground. We have a mighty foe to combat. A revolutionary people are unpopular with the leaders of parties—with nabobs and aristocrats, hypocrites, time-servers and conservatives. Revolutionists are agitators—disturbers of society. Wicked men don't like to be agitated—jostled. Errorists don't like to be shaken. Consequently, when reformers begin to agitate the world, they incur the displeasure of that party whose crookedness they want to make straight, and whose roughness they try to make smooth. They incur the malice and vindictiveness of every religious party, and court the anger and spite of every ungodly man. For there is not a religious party in the world, whose body is not morally deformed in some part, and not a wicked man under the sun but what needs correction and chastisement.

We profess to stand where the apostles stood. There is where we ought to stand. What was the attitude of the apostles? They were the most uncompromising men the world ever saw. Every citadel of error was besieged by them. Pharisaic bigotry and priestly intolerance were constantly rebuked by Christ and his apostles. The insidious Sadducee was transfixed by the barbed arrows of the keen satire of the invincible Paul. The fatalistic Essene was obliged to run the gauntlet of the flaming sword of almighty truth. The unfeeling and unsocial stoic danced high under the fiery denunciations of God's natural and positive laws. The libidinous epicure decamped from the tents of foul fasting and death dealing debauchery, under the raking fire of God's warnings and threatenings. The wise man of the world was bearded in his own den; the rich man was commanded to become rich toward God; the learned man must sit at the feet of Jesus; the proud man must humble himself under the mighty hand of God; the murderer must be told there is a hell; the thief must be told there is a judgment day; the extortioner must be pronounced guilty before God; the hypocrite must be told that broad is the way that leads to death. Contrasted with the apostles, what is now our attitude? If our mission as a people means anything, it means that we must dissolve the alliance.
that exists between state politics and church politics, and that we must precipitate all combinations of priestly craft, ignore dogmatic theology and traditional error, disintegrate good and wise men—heroes of the truth—and from the facts of the gospel, and from the beauty and glory of the gospel, eliminate all that is noxious and degrading, and all works of human device. It requires strong hearts to initiate such a reform, and men of iron nerve to sustain it, and men of indomitable courage to hold it fast.

But in view of all this, there seems to be a tendency on the part of some of our speakers and writers to settle down on a kind of let-alone policy—as if the battle had been fought and won, and the trophies gathered, and that now all we have to do is to lovingly and gently and sweetly nestle down on a fragrant bed of crushed roses, draw up our feet a la Turk, and complacently smoke the pipe of peace to all the world. But as certain as there is a God, if we prove recreant to our grand and glorious mission, and loll over into the Spadan chair of luxurious ease, (otium cum dignitate,) God will raise up to himself a more royal priesthood, a more peculiar and better people, more zealous, more aggressive upon the domains of Satan, and more destructive to sin and sinners. Let the past be our warning. True, we want and must have the esthetics of Christianity—the true, the beautiful and sublime. Nor have we any abjection to the esoteric doctrine—of a particular few plunging into the profundities of religion, and of surveying the transporting scenes and delights of God's ideal world. If the few can scale hights inaccessible to the uncultured mass, and can penetrate depths unfathomable to the timid adventurer, let them do it, but in a circle by themselves. As man is endowed with reason before he receives God's revelation, so the concrete precedes the abstract, and the ideal grows out of the tangible. But reformers must deal with things concrete and tangible—that which is apprehensible to the common mind of the world. The labor of building up the church and perfecting men in the graces and refinements of the church, belongs, as we conceive, to another class of workmen. And these Christian artisans—amateurs in religion—must be found in the constituted churches themselves. But our preachers of to-day, like our heroic preachers of thirty years ago, are the radical and legitimate revolutionists of this eventful and mighty age.

We are radicals—revolutionists—deny it as we may. Some of our quasi representative men are afraid of the word radical or revolutionist, as if it were odious in the sight of God and man. They act and argue as if conservatism were a pretty thing to play with, and just the thing. In its proper application it is a handsome word, for the word conservative means, "one who aims to preserve from ruin, innovation, injury, or radical change; one who wishes to maintain an institution, or form of government, in its present state." We are therefore the conservators of what we have already attained; but in the religious world, and among sectarian corporations, and in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, we are progressives—radicals—innovators—agitators—as much so as were the heroic apostles themselves. This strong tendency toward conservatism—yes, I should rather say, this mawkish proneness toward conciliation, is manifesting itself in a manner we little expected of an independent and representative people. It robs us of half our prestige. The word radical, I know full well, is unpopular. The Latin term, radix, means root. Hence, reformers are supposed to take things up by the roots, and in doing so, somebody is hurt, is offended, scandalized, outraged! Modern conservatives—conciliators—both in church and state, love to deal in generalities, and make commerce of abstractions, while the radical reformer deals in specifics, and says to the transgressor, 'Thou art the man. Conservatives take care of what we have. They never can make representative men. Conservatives keep pace with the people—reformers lead the way, and say to the multitude, come on! Conservatives are content
to enjoy what we have in the present—reformers sacrifice in the present to obtain something better in the future. Conservatives are men of smooth faces, of tender hands, of delicate nerve, and all their plans, like their ideas, oval-shaped; while revolutionists are men of angularity, of penetration, of decision, and the world moves at their approach. Who builds your railroads? who moves your commerce? who builds your institutions? who rears your towns and cities? who fights your battles? men of angularity—men that jostle the world. Luther, Cromwell, Whitefield, Knox, and all the reformers, were men of angularity. The world was polarized by them.

It is very true, we know, that reformers are liable to fly off on tangents—to rush to extremes, and sometimes frustrate the very thing designed to be accomplished. Many an abuse grows out of a radical reform. Still the fact remains just as palpable that revolutions are just as necessary to the regulation and purity of society as storms are to the renovation of the incumbent atmosphere, although many apparent evils attend the storms. When God moves the foundations of the earth by an earthquake, or prostrates the forest by a raging storm, or swells the bounding river by a sudden inundation, wreck and ruin follow in the train, and the faint hearted think that all is lost; and yet these mighty agents are the fixed and immutable conservators of our existence on earth. We have now too many cramped-toed, taper-fingered, smooth-haired, silver-toned reformers, who would overturn the world by the art of finesse, sentimentality, platitudes and beatitudes. Some suppose that because the power of the pope is broken, and the bulls of the Vatican have ceased to thunder, and churches have ceased to dogmatize, and ecclesiastic courts are despised, and creeds can no longer bind the liberated conscience, and clerical despotism is paralyzed, that therefore we have filled our mission, and the great day of deliverance is inaugurated. Because God in his providence is loosing the bands of the captives, and opening the prison doors of them that are bound, and because there seems to be a consentaneous as well as spontaneous rise of God's elect throughout the world, they jump to the conclusion that we are about to become passive in the hands of the potter, must hold our hands upon our mouths, and be silent witnesses of a startling evolution in the moral government of God. That is the very time when our caution and prudence will be brought into requisition—just the time when a more insidious foe shall be found lurking in our path—just the time when the weakness of our defenses will be most exposed, and the very time to invite the enemies of the church of Christ to invade our territory and lay waste our city of refuge. No, the Christian warrior must ever fight—fight on—persistently fight. To him there is no furlough this side the grave. But the Christian hero can only fight with the burnished armor of heaven, tempered and polished in the armory of the skies, and made life proof against all the fiery darts of satanic assault. Our fight is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in high places. In this combat there is no armistice. Whether we preach affirmatively or negatively, it matters not. Every inch of ground we gain is by dint of hard fighting in hotly contested fields. We are opposed singly and unitedly by the drilled forces of sectarianism, whether we preach what the gospel is, or what it is not. We must debate, but we are not a debating people from choice, for in not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God, some partisan somewhere is ever ready to bristle up against us. It was ever so with Christ and his apostles. The very attitude we assume makes us a debating people. So that whenever we make an assault upon the existing institutions of the age, we expose ourselves to an immediate attack of the enemy, and therefore we must be prepared to entertain any challenge the belligerents may be provoked to institute. True, representative men are always debaters. Luther was a representative man,
Melancthon was not; Zwingle was a representative man, Erasmus was not. Carlstadt, Ecolampadius, Wickliffe, and Tyndale, and Knox, were representative men. And like the apostles before them, they "turned the world up side down." It was the disputations of Luther in Germany, and of Zwingle in Switzerland, that renovated those States, and that laid the foundation for all successive Bible reformations. Never in the world's history did controversy run so high as in the days of Queen Elizabeth—so high that the abuses of it furnished Butler with wit, and sarcasm, and irony, and spleen enough to fill his Hudibras bloating full. And yet we have a class of weak-jointed Christian gentlemen, who, by some fortunate concourse of circumstances, have found a place among us, and who would proceed to palliate all the ills of life, and arrange all the discordant elements of society, and soothingly appease the wrath of all men, by a preparation of mint julip, or by painless laxatives, or by temperately-toned tonics, or by gently balanced caressing.

Our representative men—debaters—have made us chiefly what we are. They have given to us a name and a conspicuity we never could have attained by ulterior means. Small men in small debates we also deprecate, and conceit empyrics, growing prematurely smart, should everywhere be snubbed. But every well instructed man knows that every stronghold we now possess, was taken by the pointed sword and by charge of the bayonet. Remove our debates out of the way, and where would have been the boundary lines of our progress? What a mighty impulsion Campbell's debate with Owen gave us! Alexander Campbell dared to meet the cajoling lion of infidelity. The marches and movements of that earth monster have been clandestine ever since, and her intrigues have been in complicity with wicked spirits in high places. Campbell's debates with McCalla, Walker, and Dr. Rice have made an innovation upon sectarianism and upon the assumed prerogatives of the starched clergy that will tell with cumulative power in ages to come. His debate on Romanism with Bishop Purcell forever in this country has paralyzed the rising power of the great usurper of human rights. Alexander Hall's debates on Universalism stabbed that black and bear-eyed beast, and stretched her body on the ground at full length. Benjamin Franklin's debates on Episcopal Methodism, and against her spiritual despotism and clerical arrogance, have crippled that leopard body in every limb, until her wail of woe is heard from a thousand tongues. Isaac Errett's debate on spiritualism proved a signal overthrow in this western country, of that voluptuous daughter of licentiousness—the stench of whose putrefied carcass has now well nigh passed away. We have had other equally valuable debates, and quite a number of a lesser magnitude that have won great victories for the truth. In fact, nearly all of our preachers, who at all are worth any thing to the cause, debate on the pulpit, and if they have not a real antagonist, they dispute with an imaginary one.

When we teach the doctrine of justification, but not by faith alone, some body gets mad; for the opposite doctrine is foisted upon the people; if we preach that faith precedes repentance, and prove it to be so scripturally, logically, and according to the undeviating process of the mind, some body gets mad, for they teach the contrary opinion; if we declare that the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit is exerted only through God's word—and we may do it ever so kindly and wooingly,—some body gets mad, because this comes in conflict with the theology of the day; when we positively allege that there is but one baptism taught in the Scriptures, some body gets mad, because this is antagonism to others who think one way just as good as another; and when we plead for Christian union, upon the basis of the Savior's prayer and apostolic precept, some body gets mad, because this project carried out would spoil the craft of theological doctors, and sour the bread and rancidize the butter of their rich and racy church living. All this we must do, as above designated, to entitle us to the name reformers,
before Luther?" direct the inquirer to the Waldenses, those renowned heralds of the Reformation, who flourished in the eleventh and two following centuries. Point to the mountains and valleys of Switzerland, where Nature seemed to have built her mighty fortresses for the defence of civil and religious freedom, and to protect these sainted worthies from the murderous attacks of Rome. Their history forms one of the most interesting periods in the church of Christ. Peter Waldo, who signalized himself as their leader, was a rich merchant of Lyons, and filled with horror at the corruption of the Papal hierarchy, and with love for the souls of his fellow men; like the early Christians, he sold his property, divided his wealth amongst the poor, and went forth as an apostle, preaching the gospel to great multitudes. Such a general commotion excited the fury of the reigning pontiff; and Alexander III. anathematized him and his disciples, and commanded them to be exterminated by fire and sword. In consequence of this, they fled in all directions; but, though their enemies "meant it for evil," yet their dispersion, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, like that which occurred at the death of Stephen, tended to the dissemination of their principles. The whole artillery of Popish fury was opened against them; and men, women, and even innocent children, were exposed to indiscriminate destruction. And what was the crime that called for papal vengeance? The defenders of Romanism charged them with disgusting criminality, and branded them with the most odious names; but all unprejudiced historians eulogize them for singular purity and simplicity of moral as well as elevated experience in spiritual religion. And, though several centuries have rolled away since their confessions of faith were published, to us it is peculiarly interesting to refer to them, in

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF POPERY.

A TRACT,

By the American Protestant Society.

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, God raised up several eminent men, who boldly testified against the doctrine of the real presence, purgatory, the consecration of churches, and the adoration of the images of Christ and the saints. The Cathari, whose character and tenets are violently assailed by Roman Catholic historians, spread at this period over Germany, France, Italy, and the greater part of Europe; and, though all their theological tenets may not have been purely evangelical; yet, even their enemies confess they had a deep veneration for the sacred Scriptures, which supported them under the barbarous treatment they endured for years; and if the rejection of priestly absolution, and the complicated peculiarities of the popish ritual, the love of God and our neighbor, and faith in the sufferings of the Lamb of God alone for salvation, constitute the features of true Protestantism: then, the Cathari are peculiarly entitled to that appellation.

When asked—"Where was your religion although the buzzing consequent upon it, and around our ears, become world wide. At the mention of these things conciliators draw in their attennae (horns) and squamishly wheeze out,—touch the ground tenderly—walk on tip-toe—don't rustle a leaf—speak whisperingly—and before you fire, withdraw the bullet from your gun! A faint hissing noise is the result.

Our work is to overturn the world if we are the true and loyal representatives of the King of kings. Says the Lord, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him?"
consequence of the exact coincidence between them, and the doctrinal articles for which our church is distinguished. They believed in one God—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; they acknowledged, as canonical, the same books of the Old and New Testament, which we receive as the inspired revelation of God—that there is no other mediator or advocate with God the Father, but the Lord Jesus Christ,—"that, after this life, there are but two places, one for those that are saved, the other for the damned, which two we call paradise and hell, wholly denying that imaginary purgatory of Antichrist, invented in opposition to the truth. That the sacraments are signs of holy things, or visible emblems of invisible blessing,—and that there are no sacraments of divine appointment but Baptism and the Lord’s Supper: masses are impious, and it is madness to say masses for the dead; the invoking and worshipping of dead saints is idolatry; so many orders of the clergy are so many marks of the beast; and the Church of Rome is the whore of Babylon. That is the church of Christ, which hears the pure doctrine of Christ, and observes the ordinances instituted by him, in whatsoever place it exists."

Such were the sentiments of these persecuted people of God, that spread like lightning through Europe in the midst of the surrounding gloom; and, though not distinguished by the name of Protestants, yet they were patterns of purity for all the churches of the Reformation.

About the same time, Wicliffe was raised up in England by the great Head of Zion, to witness against the abominations of the "Man of Sin." He has been justly styled the "Morning Star" of the Reformation; and is celebrated for his extensive learning as well as his genuine piety. His talents raised him to the Chair of Theology in the University of Oxford. During the week he was employed in opening the great truths of revelation to his students, while on the Sabbath he preached with extraordinary energy and success on the principal errors of the Church of Rome. He attacked the vices of the clergy and the degradation of their character imparted peculiar force to his declaration. The doctrine of Transubstantiation he expounded, with a simplicity and clearness that has not been exceeded by any Protestant divine; and it is said, that even then one third of the English priesthood considered the bread and wine as mere representations of the body and blood of Christ. Commissioned by his sovereign Edward III. to proceed to Rome on an important embassy, like Luther, he was increasingly disgusted by his visit, with the gorgeous splendor and superstitious rites of Popery; and on his return he inveighed against it with still greater vehemence. This called forth the thunders of the Vatican against him; and according to the Christian method of silencing an opponent, to which Popery in that age invariably resorted, Gregory XI. commanded him to be seized, imprisoned, and brought to trial for his damnable heresies. Edward, his royal patron, and the enlightened nobles of the land, felt that he maintained truth, in opposition to the profiligacy and spiritual despotism that abounded; and they threw over him the shield of their protection. In the controversy that raged between him and the abettors of idolatry, it is amusing to observe the harsh epithets they sometimes substituted for argument. Wicliffe was called by his adversaries "a limb of the devil, an enemy of the church, deceiver of the people, idol of heretics, mirror of hypocrites, author of schisms, and inventor of lies." But in the midst of this calumny, he proceeded in his work and labor of love; and his translation of the Scriptures into the English tongue, for a people who had been cruelly robbed of them, is a standing monument of his perseverance and zeal. And one of the most remarkable things concerning him is, that after a life of such reforming activity, and in the midst of so many infuriated ecclesiastical persecutors, he should have died in peace under his own roof. Yet even this, perhaps, was intended to show the bloody spirit which then reigned in Babylon,—his soul was in the bosom of Abraham, beyond the rage and impotence of man; but his bones
were dug out of his grave, and with two hundred volumes of his works, were burnt in the flames.

At the same time, the Lord raised up John Huss and Jerome of Prague, to testify against the errors of Popery. They were both men of superior mental endowments, and full of zeal for the cause of truth and holiness. The writings of Wickliffe found their way into Bohemia, and were the means of drawing these worthies from spiritual delusion. But in the mysterious providence of God, they were not long engaged in his service, till the Popish inquisitors were permitted to seize them; they were cast into prison, and loaded with irons: and after they had enlightened a great part of Germany with scriptural knowledge, their purified spirits were wafted in the flames to the mansions of eternal bliss. Being urged to recant, a short time before his death, Huss, like a fearless martyr, said, "What I have written and taught, was in order to rescue souls from the devil, and to deliver them from the tyranny of sin; and I do gladly seal what I have written and taught with my blood." Jerome, at his death, displayed the most heroic courage. On his way to the place of execution, he sung the Apostles' Creed, and some hymns, with a cheerful countenance. The executioner approached the pile to kindle it behind his back; he exclaimed, "Home for ward, and put fire to it before my face!" When dreadfully scorched, he was heard to cry—"O, Lord, have mercy on me! have mercy on me!"—and the wind parting the flames, exhibited his body to the spectators, covered with large blisters, while his lips were moving in fervent supplication. But, though these valiant men died, the cause of God survived and prospered. In this, as in many similar cases, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church. Their followers were called Lollards. In England they amounted to nearly one-half the population; they numbered amongst them several persons of the highest rank; and continued for nearly two centuries to suffer in the Savior's cause.

Thus, according to the striking language of the prophet Daniel, (Daniel vii. 21, 22, 25,) and of John in the Revelation, (Rev. xi. 7, and xii. 7,) it was given to the beast, or the horn, or the Popish power, that was "more stout than his fellows to wear out the saints of the Most High—to make war with them, and to overcome them." Thousands, and tens of thousands, of holy men, with the arm of God as their only protection, and his eternal truth as their support and shield, had gone forth with undaunted courage, as "sheep in the midst of wolves." From the sixth to the sixteenth century, host after host had arisen, as followers of the Lamb, to oppose the mystical Babylon; but they were successively hewn down by the fury of their persecutors; and rivers of the most precious blood were shed in every kingdom of Europe, "until the Ancient of days arose, and gave judgment unto the saints of the Most High;" till, what is peculiarly termed, the period of the Protestant Reformation had arrived, when "the saints possessed the kingdom."

Before this period, the witnesses for the truth had been scattered over the earth, without any point of concentration—the rays of Scriptural light that shone forth, were partially obscured by surrounding darkness—and means were not yet prepared by Providence for giving the "wound to the beast that should never be healed." But in the sixteenth century God's time had come—the river of divine truth broke over the embankments that had long impeded its progress, and carried life and salvation as it rolled along. Clusters of stars had twinkled during the long and dreary night of Popish darkness; but then, the Sun of Righteousness came forth in celestial effulgence, and the cry was heard over all Christendom, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, for the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."

It is a most interesting study for the true Christian, to trace the causes that immediately produced this mighty event—the Protestant Reformation. In the preceding ages, many reformers as enlightened and fearless as Luther had arisen, but they succeeded in effecting only a partial and
transitory change; because that combination of circumstances had not yet taken place, which, under the guiding hand of Providence, terminated in this amazing revolution. It cannot be questioned that one of the chief means of promoting the Reformation, was the degeneracy of the Church of Rome; the cup of its iniquity was filled to the very brim; and by the disputes which arose about the papal chair, the contending pontiffs, with their own hands, tore off the veil of pretended infallibility, and exposed themselves to the nations in all their anti-christian tyranny. In 1159, two parties, one elected Urban VI., while the other chose Clement VII., as the true vicar of Christ. Rome was the residence of Urban, and Avignon of Clement; where they spent their time in sanctimoniously fulminating anathemas against one another. The same factions shortly afterwards elected Benedict XIII. and Boniface IX. to the Papal chair, at the same time; and thus that church was rent asunder, that falsely boasts of UNITY as her distinguishing characteristic; thus the ‘great western schism’ that separated the Greek and Latin church, was produced by the ambitions struggles of these contending pontiffs; and for about fifty years, the nations beheld two infallible successors of St. Peter, not preaching peace and brotherly love—not the vicars of a holy and humble Savior—but the agents of him who “goeth about as a roaring lion,” endeavoring to destroy the church of God. The mind of the most credulous was excited to enquire, whether such characters were not “wolves in sheep’s clothing;” and the eyes of the blind were opened to see in these ecclesiastical combatants, the Antichrist of Scripture.

But, as if to rouse to the highest pitch the indignation of men who were longing for a spiritual change, they carried, at this very time, the sale of indulgences to a scandalous accent. The person who made the most singular figure in this affair was a Dominican monk named Tetzel. By the indulgences which he sold under the papal commission, he administered the pardon of all sins, past, present, and to come, no matter how aggravated, if money were forthcoming to strike the infernal bargain. By this soul-destroying traffic, the mind was turned from the finished work of Jesus, to purchase the remission of sin by the glittering dust of the earth, contrary to the express words of Scripture—“Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb, without blemish and without spot.” 1 Pet. i. 18.

The soul shudders at the bare recital of some statements respecting these indulgences. One of their advocates declared, that "one drop of Christ’s blood was sufficient to redeem the world; the remaining quantity shed in the garden and on the cross was left as a legacy to the church; in addition to all the good works of the saints, over and above those which were necessary for their own justification, were deposited in an inexhaustible treasury, whence indulgences were to be drawn by the Roman Pontiffs.” And to such extravagant lengths was this device of Satan carried, that they not only pardoned the sins of the living, but stretched their authority over the invisible and eternal world; for they taught, that the souls confined in purgatory, for whose redemption indulgences were purchased, as soon as the money tinkles in the chest, instantly escape from the place of torment, and ascend to glory.”

Such was the state of monstrous degeneracy into which the Romish church had sunk, when God raised up Martin Luther, to burst the chains by which the nations were enthralled. He was the son of a poor man, as were almost all of the Reformers; for in carrying on this mighty work, as at the first propagation of Christianity by the apostles, God chose “base things of the world, and things that are despised, yea, and things
that are not, to bring to nought the things that are." 1 Cor. i. 28. Luther having become an Augustinian friar, retired into a convent, where he found in the library a neglected copy of the Holy Scriptures. All other pursuits were abandoned; and he studied the Word of God with unquenchable ardor. The fame of his sanctity and learning raised him to a Chair of Philosophy, and afterwards to that of Theology, in the University of Wittemberg. From this commanding situation he saw the whole church prostrate, under the despotism of Rome. His soul was especially agonized by the ruinous consequences of the sale of indulgences; and having the great God his director and his shield he attacked the blasphemous imposture, and kindled against it a flame of indignation throughout all Germany and a great part of Europe.

But all his efforts, like those of former Christian worthies, would have proved abortive, and left the Papal edifice standing in all its strength, had he not been aided by two powerful elements in the work of reformation—the revival of literature, and the invention of the Art of Printing. Before this period the human mind had long slept in profound lethargy, but the ancient Greek and Roman authors were then brought forth and studied with ardor. Men began to think with freedom on every topic, civil and sacred; the claims of the Roman hierarchy were tried with great boldness, by the infallible test of Scripture; and they who, in a former age, would at once have hunted Luther down, without examining his arguments, now embraced him as the advocate of reason, and the friend of truth and righteousness. Besides, his writings and those of the other reformers, which, in preceding centuries, would have been totally unknown or confined only to a few, were then, by the invention of the Art of Printing, circulated in various languages, and in distant countries: they were greedily perused, not merely by the rich, but by the poorest of the people; and produced a sudden and general impression in favor of the "new doctrines." By these two causes, in conjunction with other concurrent circumstances, the slaves of papal tyranny and delusion acquired an independence they had not felt before—the reign of ghostly terror began to decline—the form of man became erect—his soul waxed warm—and the general stirring of the nations betokened a speedy resurrection of the church of the living God, from the sepulchre of superstition in which it had been buried for ages.

We break off here, and must refer our readers to the working of the Holy Spirit on the children of men, until the completion of the Lutheran Reformation.

OLD HUNDRED.

In a rustic old church opposite, while we write, a company of worshipers are singing the old, old hymn:

"Be thou, O God, exalted high!"

The air is old, also—the immortal "Old Hundred." If it be true that Luther composed that tune, and if the worship of mortals is carried on the wings of angels to heaven, how often be heard the declaration, "They are singing 'Old Hundred' now."

The solemn strain carries us back to the times of the Reformers—Luther and his devoted band. He doubtless was the first to strike the grand old chords in the public sanctuary of his own Germany. From his own stentorian lungs they rolled, vibrating not through vaulted cathedral roof, but along a grander arch, the eternal heavens. He wrought into each note his own sublime faith, and stamped it with that faith’s immortality. Hence, it cannot die! Neither man nor angels will let it pass into oblivion. Can you find a tomb in the land where sealed lips lie that have not sung that tune? If they were gray old men, they had heard or sung "Old Hundred." If they were babes, they smiled as their mothers rock them to sleep, singing "Old Hundred." Sinner and
SAINTS have joined with the endless congregation where it has, with and without the pealing organ, sounded on sacred air. The dear little children, looking with wondering eyes on this strange world, have lisped it—the stern, the timid, the gentle, the brave, the beautiful, their rapt faces all beaming with the inspiration of the heavenly sounds! “Old Hundred!” king of the sacred band of ancient airs, never shall our ears grow weary of hearing; or our tongues of singing thee! And when we get to heaven, who knows but what the first triumphal strain that welcomes us may be—

Be thou, O God, exalted high!”

WHAT IS A VALID IMMERSION?

It sometimes, though rarely, becomes a serious question with a person immersed under peculiar circumstances by one of our own brethren, whether he should not be re-immersed. It very frequently happens, that persons immersed by sectarian preachers apply for membership in our churches. In both cases, the validity of the immersion is a practical question to be settled by preachers or congregations, and there is a necessity for some well defined standard by which to decide it. Some developments made in the course of a recent controversy have admonished us that we need to make this a subject of special inquiry. I therefore open the question, with the hope that a satisfactory conclusion may be reached.

The question, What is a valid immersion? implies that there may be immersions which are not valid. And this, again, implies that something more than a mere immersion is necessary to the religious ordinance which bears this name. The question, then, has reference to those antecedents or adjuncts, which constitute the difference between the ordinance, and a mere immersion in water.

There are certain things appointed in the New Testament to precede, attend, and follow the immersion in water, each one of which must be regarded as necessary to its own special purpose. We have no right to
divide these appointments into essentials and non-essentials, seeing that God never appoints anything for nothing. Yet we must be careful not to confound their purposes, so as to make one necessary to the purpose of another.

The ordinance contemplates an agent and a subject. There are some things appointed for the agent, and others for the subject. The duties enjoined upon the immerser, we cannot transfer to the person to be immersed, nor vice versa. Whatever is commanded to each, is essential to the discharge of his duty in the premises, though it may not be so that of the other. And so, when either has performed all that is enjoined upon him, all the essentials of the ordinance, as it concerns him, are complied with, and its design in reference to him is accomplished.

If these positions be correct, when the party immersed has complied with all that is required of him, his immersion is valid so far as he is concerned. And in as much as the benefit of the institution is intended for him alone, we are bound to conclude that he reaches it, whatever failure the immerser may have made in the discharge of his duty. In this case, it is clear that the immersion should not be repeated. But on the other hand, the duty enjoined upon the immerser is designed for the benefit of the immersed, and therefore, if the latter, for any cause, fail of the benefit, there can be no impropriety in a repetition of the ordinance, though the former may have done his whole duty.

We have now but to properly classify the various appointments pertaining to the institution, by referring each to the party for whom it is intended, and we will be prepared for a practical application of our conclusions to all individual cases.

In one point, the act of immersion, the duties of the two parties unite. The agent is commanded to immerse, and the subject is commanded to be immersed. Neither party, therefore, can be excused for neglect of this action. But antecedent to this, the subject is commanded to believe the gospel, and to repent. His immersion cannot be valid unless it is preceded by obedience to both these commands. A failure, however, to obey either or both of them, does not necessarily invalidate the action of the immerser, or involve a failure in the discharge of his duty.

It is also made the duty of the agent to require a confession of faith in the Lord Jesus, preparatory to the immersion. This necessarily renders it the duty of the subject to make the confession when called upon. But if the confession is not made because it was not called for, the fault is in the agent and not in the subject. Such an omission, therefore, does not invalidate the obedience of the subject. This conclusion is further evident from the obvious design of the confession. Being a declaration to the immerser, who is restricted to the immersion of believers, that the party does believe, it is clearly designed for his satisfaction, and that of others who may be interested witnesses, and not for the candidate. If the immerser proceed without this scriptural method of ascertaining whether the candidate is or is not a believer, he commits a fault; but clearly this fault cannot attach to the believer, who stood ready to give any assurance of his faith which might be required.

The penitent believer is commanded to be immersed “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” His immersion is not valid, therefore, unless he is led to it by the authority of the son of God. It must be an act of obedience rendered to him, and not to any other being.

Again, each candidate is to be immersed “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” But the duty indicated by these words is enjoined upon the immerser, not upon the candidate. When Jesus says, “Disciple all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” he points out the duty of the immerser, and designates, so far as the candidate is concerned, only the effect of his immersion. That effect is, a complete subjection to the authority of the Father,
the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If the immersion, so far as it affects the subject, is valid, such is its effect in every case. If these words of the Savior were intended also to give the apostles a *formula* by which to immerse, a failure to pronounce that formula would not prevent this effect of the immersion. If the immersion of a proper candidate brings him into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, my failure to declare that fact in the act of immersing, certainly cannot prevent it from occurring. Yet, my failure to do so would be a defect in the discharge of my own duty.

As for the design of immersion, which expression means merely the blessing promised to those who are immersed, it involves no duty either of the immerser or of the immersed. It belongs to God and not to man. Having promised it on certain conditions, when the conditions are complied with he will be as good as his word, and it would be most unreasonable to suppose that he would withhold the blessing, simply because I do not know that I am entitled to it. A man, therefore, cannot forfeit the blessing by mere ignorance of the promise, unless a knowledge of the promise is found to be a condition of its fulfillment, which certainly will not be assumed by any reader of the New Testament.

We must qualify this last remark by the further observation, that while a knowledge of the design of the institution is not made a condition of the fulfillment of that design, it is made the duty of the administrator to inform the candidate of the blessing which is promised him as a sequence of his immersion. A failure to discharge this duty is a sin on his part, but for his sin we cannot suppose that the innocent candidate shall suffer the forfeiture of the promised remission of sins. We conclude, then, that the sins of the immersed may be remitted, notwithstanding his ignorance of the fact.

A man in possession of any blessing, and ignorant of the fact, necessarily fails of the enjoyment which a knowledge of the fact would afford him; as one to whom a fortune has been deeded, must remain unaffected by it until the fact is made known to him. In the present case, the ignorance of the pardoned man prevents him from being so happy as he should be, and to this extent he suffers through the fault of the immerser; but that he is really forgiven cannot admit of a doubt, and all that is necessary to complete his happiness, is to inform him of the blessing which God has given him.

We are now prepared to classify the appointments in question, as follows. It is the duty of the agent to satisfy himself that the candidate is a believer, by taking his confession. He must then *immerse* him into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching him that the penitent believer, when immersed, will receive the remission of sins. It is the duty of the subject to believe in Jesus Christ, to repent of his sins, to make the confession when required, and to be immersed.

That we may have a practical application of our conclusions, let us now suppose that a Baptist presents himself for membership with us, and we attempt to decide upon the validity of his immersion. We find that he was a believer, and a penitent, before he was immersed. He did not make the confession, in express terms, but it was because he was not required to do so, the preacher having become satisfied of his faith through other evidence. He believed that his sins were pardoned before he was immersed, and said so; but this was a mistake, not an omission of any duty, unless it be the duty of understanding the scripture. But this duty is not peculiarly connected with immersion, and we have seen that its omission cannot invalidate the immersion. Now, then, the man had performed every duty appointed for him in the scripture, and, as we have argued above, it is most unreasonable to suppose that his sins are still unforgiven. The Baptist preacher who immersed him, did wrong in not taking his confession, and in deceiving him as to the time at which he was pardoned. He also induced him to weep and pray at the mourning bench, which was not required of him. But grievously as he may have failed of his duty in
these particulars, his failure cannot attach to the immersed who did his whole duty. I conclude, therefore, that the supposed Baptist brother is a pardoned man, though he is mistaken as to the time of his pardon, and should be instructed upon this point.

The case of a man immersed by a Pedobaptist preacher differs from this, only in the fact that the immerser, in addition to the faults committed by the Baptist preacher, has neglected to be immersed himself. These faults, however, it is out of my power to amend. If I were to attempt it, by re-immersing the candidate, I would be making him repeat a duty which he had already fully performed, in order that I might amend the faulty performance of the preacher. The case would be the same, if the preacher should repent of his former faults, and, having been himself immersed with an understanding of the design, should attempt to amend his former immersion of the supposed subject. The immersion being valid to the subject, may not be repeated.

We conclude, with all confidence, that the brethren have been doing right, to receive into fellowship all, who, with faith and repentance, have been immersed, and have since led a reputable Christian life. In doing so, however, they are not to be understood as endorsing the action of the preachers who immersed them, or admitting that scriptural appointments which they omitted, may be omitted with impunity. We simply place the responsibility of these omissions upon the preachers who are really the guilty party, relieving the subject who has done his whole duty, from all censure. We are still under obligation to teach preachers the way of the Lord more perfectly, and warn them of the reckoning that awaits them in eternity.

We also conclude, from these premises, that there is no inconsistency in admitting the right of such immersed persons to the ordinances of the Lord's house, though we deny it to the unimmersed preachers who immersed them. J. W. McGarvey.

June, 1862.

NOW I LAY ME DOWN TO SLEEP.

"Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take."

Who are you, man or woman, for whom this prayer has not old, sweet associations; who, hearing its words, hear not, too, the "memory bells" ringing up from the golden plains of your childhood, and feel not the soft gales from the morning land of your life, sweeping over your soul?

You may be a man now, in the pride and strength of your years; you may have carved out for yourself an honorable name and destiny in this world—mayhap you are the owner of broad lands and proud homes, and your heart has grown hard in its battle with the world.

But stop a moment, and listen to this little verse, so simple that the merest babe who learns to lisp the words can comprehend them, and so grand in its sublime significance and faith that the wisest shall only have learned fully the true lessons of life when the soul utters them as it did in its infancy.

Let us see! how many years ago was it? twenty, thirty; no matter, at the old sound of "Now I lay me," they have rolled back their massive doors, and you go down through them to the old red one-story house, where your life first took its morning. You see the little window on the right side, close under the rafter; ah! you slept a sounder slumber, and dreamed sweeter dreams in that old garret than you ever did in your lofty chambers, with the gilded coiling and snowy draperies; and what matter if your bed was a straw one, and your coverlet made of red and yellow "patches of calico," you never snuggled down so contentedly on your spring mattresses and under Marseilles counterpanes.

"Now I lay me," how softly sleep would come and weigh down your eyelids, as you repeated the words after her; ah! you may
hear her very tones now stealing across your heart though it is so many years since death silenced them; you feel the soft touch of her head on your pillow, and the tender lingering of her kiss upon your lips—you break down here, proud man as you are—this memory of your mother is more than you can bear. If she had only lived, you would not have been what you are now; but thanks be to God, she left you something holy and beyond all meaning; something that can not grow old and dim, not even in the "unspeakable brightness" beyond the shining gates; the memory of a loving, praying, Christian mother.

Reader, it may be many years since you repeated this prayer, or, alas! it may be that in the din and struggle of life, you may have forgotten to pray at all, and that night after night, you have lain down on your pillow, never thinking of the shining ranks of angels that God's mercy stationed around, or thanking Him for the day, or for the night.

But come back, we beseech you, to the old prayer of your childhood. You can have outgrown that—no matter if your hair is frosted with the snow of life's December, and if your years are three-score and ten. Kneel down by your bedside, and uttering these words, see if something of the old peace and faith of your childhood does not come back to you; if something of its dew and blessing fall not upon your slumber.

And remember that, sooner or later, you must "lie down to sleep," when this prayer will be all your soul can take—all that will avail of your rank, or wealth, or fame, whatsoever you most prize in this world, which is but the shadow of eternity. Ah! we shall soon pass the "Green threshold of our common graves;"

but the little prayer, the first, it may be, that we took upon our childish lips, shall follow us as we sail out under the solemn arches of the "River of Death," follow us a sweet, faint, tender air, from the shores, and when we shall cast anchor,

"The Lord our soul shall take."

LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE BIBLE.

God made the present earth as the home of man; but had he meant it as a mere lodging, a world less beautiful would have served the purpose. There was no need for the carpet of verdure or the ceiling of blue—no need for the mountains, and cataracts, and forests—no need for the rainbow—no need for the flowers. A big, round island, half of it arable, and half of it pasture, with a clump of trees in one corner, and magazine of fuel in another, might have held and fed ten millions of people; and a hundred islands, all made on the same pattern, big and round, might have held and fed the population of the globe. But man is something more than the animal which wants lodging and food. He has a spiritual nature full of keen perceptions and deep sympathies. He has an eye for the sublime and the beautiful, and his kind Creator has provided man's abode with affluent materials for these nobler tastes. He has built Mount Blanc, and molten the lakes in which its shadow sleeps. He has intoned Niagara's thunder, and has breathed the sephyr which sweeps its spray. He has shagged the steep with its cedars, and spread the meadow with its king cups and daisies. He has made it a world of fragrance and music—a world of brightness and symmetry—a world where the grand and the graceful, the awful and the lovely, rejoice together. In fashioning the home of man the Creator had an eye to something more than convenience, and built not a barrack, but a palace—not a work house, but an Alhambra; something which should not only be very comfortable, but very splendid and very fair—something which should inspire the soul of its inhabitant, and even draw forth the "very good" of complacent Deity.

God also made the Bible as the guide and oracle of man; but had he meant it as a lesson book of duty, a volume less various and less attractive would have answered every end.
A few plain paragraphs, announcing God's own character and his disposition towards us sinners here on earth, mentioning the provision which he has made for our future happiness, and indicating the different duties which he would have us perform—a few simple sentences would have sufficed to tell what God is, and what he would have us do. There was no need for the picturesque narrative and the majestic poem—no need for the proverb, the story and the psalm. A chapter of theology, and another of morals—a short account of the incarnation and the great atonement and a few pages of rules and directions for the Christian life, might have contained the main truths of Scripture, and have supplied us with a Bible of simplest meaning and smallest size. And in that case the Bible would have been consulted only by those rare and wistful spirits to whom the great hereafter is a subject of anxiety, who are really anxious to know who God is, and how themselves may please him. But in giving that Bible its Divine Author had regard to the mind of man. He knew that man was more curiosity than piety, more taste than sanctity; and that more persons are anxious to hear some new, or read some beauteous thing than to read or hear about God and the great salvation. He knew that few would ever ask, What must I do to be saved, till they came in contact with the Bible itself, and, therefore, He made the Bible not only an instructive book, but an attractive one—not only true, but enticing. He filled it with marvelous incident and engaging history—with sunny pictures from the old world scenery, and affecting anecdotes from the patriarch times. He replenished it with stately argument and thrilling verse, and sprinkled it over with sententious wisdom and proverbial pungency. He made it a book of lofty thoughts and noble images—a book of heavenly doctrine, but withal of earthly adaptation. In preparing a guide to immortality Infinite Wisdom gave not a dictionary nor a grammar, but a Bible—a book which, in trying to catch the heart of man, should captivate his taste; and which, in transforming his affections, should also expand his intellect.

The pearl is of great price; but even the casket is of exquisite beauty. The sword is of ethereal temper, and nothing cuts so keen as its double edge; but there are jewels on the hilt, and fine tracery on the scabbard. The shekels are of the purest ore; but even the scrip which contains them is of a texture more curious than that the artists of earth could fashion it. The apples are of gold, but even the kasket is of silver.

And here we would only add one remark which it is important to bear in memory. The rhetorical and poetical beauties of Scripture are merely incidental. Its authors wrote, not for glory nor display—not to astonish or amaze their brethren, but to instruct them and make them better. They wrote for God's glory, not their own; they wrote for the world's advantage, not to aggrandize themselves. Demosthenes composed his most splendid oration in order to win the crown of eloquence; and the most elaborate effort of ancient oratory—the panegyric to which Isocrates devoted fifteen years—was just an essay written for a prize. How different the circumstances in which the speech on Mars hill was spoken, and the farewell sermon in the upper chamber at Troas. Herodotus and Thucydides composed their histories with a view to popular applause; and Pindar's fiery pulse beat faster in prospect of the great Olympic gathering and the praises of assembled Greece. How opposite the circumstances in which the seer of Horeb penned his faithful story, and Isaiah and Jeremiah poured forth their fearless denunciations of popular sins. The most superb of modern historians confesses the flutter which he felt when the last line of his task was written, and he thought that perhaps his fame was established. A more important history concludes: "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Remembering, then, that the Bible contains no ornamental passages, nothing for mere display—that its steadfast purpose is,
"Glory to God in the highest," and the truest blessedness of man—I repeat, that that Bible abounds in passages of the purest beauty and stateliest grandeur, all the grander and all. the more beautiful because they are casual and unsought. The fire that flashes from the iron hoof of the Tartar steed as he scours the midnight path is grander than the artificial firework; for it is the casual effect, of speed and power. The clang of ocean as he booms his billows on the rock, and the echoing caves give chorus, is more soul-filling and sublime than all the music of the orchestra; for it is the music of that main so mighty that there is grandeur in all it does, in its sleep a melody, and in its march a stately psalm. And in the bow which paints the melting cloud there is a beauty which the stained glass or gorgeous drapery emulates in vain; for it is the glory which gilds beneficence, the brightness which bespeaks a double boon, the flush which cannot but come forth when both the sun and shower are there. The style of Scripture has all this glory. It has the gracefulness of a high utility; it has the majesty of intrinsic power; it has the charm of its own sanctity; it never labors, never strives, but instinct with great realities, and bent on blessed ends, has all the transient beauty and unstudied power which you might expect from its lofty object and allwise Author.—Extract from a lecture by James Hamilton, London.

THE CONTRAST.
Between the Spirit of the Friends and Enemies of Christ, as Illustrated in the History of Stephen, the first Christian Martyr.
A practical, matter-of-fact Argument in favor of Christianity.

NO. 1.
According to prophecy and the apostolic commission, the gospel was first preached, after the death of Christ, at Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the place of beginning; Pentecost, the time. Christ died at the Passover, a feast of the Jews, which was celebrated in the spring of the year. The feast of Pentecost was kept fifty days thereafter, at wheat harvest. On that memorable day the Holy Spirit descended, and the apostles were endowed with power from on high, to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. The first sermon preached by Peter, under the new commission, resulted in the conversion of three thousand Jews. Then and there the kingdom of Christ was established—the reign of heaven commenced—the church of Christ was founded. This church was made up of Jews, foreign and native. The Jews of Palestine were called Hebrews, because they spoke what was called the Hebrew language; the foreign Jews were called Hellenists or Greeks, because they spoke the Greek language.

The truth had made mighty triumphs and multitudes both of native and foreign Jews had been brought into the church. In the 6th chapter of Acts, it is said, "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring among the Grecians or Hellenists, against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration."

In the equal distribution of the common stock into which they had voluntarily thrown their property for the common good, as a mere temporary expedient suggested by Christian benevolence and the character of the times, but certainly founded upon no

PLEASURE.—There is not a little generalship and stratagem required in the managing marshalling of our pleasures, so that each shall not mutually encroach to the destruction of all. For pleasures are very voracious, too apt to worry one another, and each, like Aaron's serpent, is prone to swallow up the rest.
divine injunction. To secure a proper distribution of the common provision for the benefit of all, the apostles called the disciples together, and directed them to select seven men "of honest report and full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom," whom they might appoint to attend to this business. "The saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit," and six others, "whom they set before the apostles." And the apostles prayed for them and laid their hands on them, and thus set them apart to the work to which they were called. This is our introduction, in the sacred history, to Stephen. But we shall soon hear more of him. In the 8th verse of this 6th chapter of Acts, we learn that "Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders by the wisdom and spirit of Stephen. And the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples was multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." This was too much to be endured by the enemies of the cross. It was mortifying enough to see the common people, "the vulgar herd," even such as they said "knew not the law, and were accursed"—coming to Christ, and renouncing Judaism. But to hear of multitudes of the Priests, the leaders of the people, forsaking their cause, and embracing Christianity; this was more than they could bear. And as Stephen was very prominent in this work of turning away the people and the priests from the religion of their fathers, he was fiercely assailed. "Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." These persons spoken of here, who disputed with Stephen, were foreign Jews, who had come up to Jerusalem to worship, and were sojourning in Jerusalem. They seem to have had a synagogue of their own, in which they met to worship. Confident of their ability to overwhelm Stephen, they concluded to meet him in the field of honorable discussion. But here they were foiled; utterly defeated. "And they were not able to resist the wisdom and spirit by which he spake." What then, ought they to have done? Certainly they should have acknowledged their defeat, and like honest men, have carefully examined the arguments of Stephen, and received the truth in the love of it, that they might have been saved. But, no! They had no ear to hear the truth; no heart to love it. "They loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." They had a party to support; an end to gain; and right or wrong, it must be gained.

They have tried fair means, and have been utterly confounded and overwhelmed by the wisdom and spirit of Stephen. What is to be done! Men who have a bad cause to sustain, and who are determined to sustain it, the more clearly you show them the absurdity of their position, the more bitterly they will hate and persecute you. It was so in this case. Stephen was their enemy because he told them the truth; truth which they hated and were determined to reject. And to get clear of the offensive truth, Stephen who spoke it must be put down; put down too, by means the most vile and wicked, "Then they suborned men, who said, we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God." What blasphemy was this against this man of God and the God whom he adored! What! Stephen, that man of God, full of faith and the Holy Spirit, speak blasphemous words against Moses, the great law-giver and prophet of Israel, and the meekest and best of men? Never, certainly never! A baser slander was never uttered. But base and wicked as is this charge, even this is not the worst. They say he speaks blasphemy words against God! O, horrible! What! this son of Abraham, this believer in the divine legation of Moses; this Christian evangelist, full of faith in God, and in the Savior whom he sent; this man who "did great wonders and miracles among the people;" who so successfully preached Christ.
and him crucified, turning many from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the living God! This man blaspheme the name of God!! And yet these wicked men, because they could not meet Stephen in argument—could not resist the wisdom by which he spoke, gave men money to make these false and wicked charges against him, and to swear to them!! These enemies of Stephen and the truth, who were foiled by him in argument, were not disposed to make these reckless charges against him themselves, but they could give their money to induce others to swear to these lies, which they put into their mouths, and thus perjure themselves? They were therefore, doubly guilty—guilty in originating the lies, and guilty in giving men money to swear to them. There was method in their meanness. They wanted Stephen put out of the way, and they used means adapted to that end. They knew the devotion of the Jews to Moses, and to the Temple, and to their law, and the God of Israel who gave it. Hence the character of the charges they prove, by their false witnesses, carefully blending truth with falsehood, yet in such a manner as to make a false impression, and thus designedly mislead. Their can be no lying without an intention to deceive—to mislead, to carry a point. However much truth, therefore, may be mixed up with falsehood, if the whole is so stated as to make a false impression, and is so designed, that is lying. Let us look at these charges in their various phases. The witnesses suborned at first say, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God." That was sufficient to excite the mob. "And they stirred up the people," by these false charges, "and the elders came upon Stephen, and the scribes, and caught him and brought him to the council, and set up false witnesses, who said this man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law: for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." Here was some truth, but truth introduced to prove falsehood. It was true that Stephen and all the teachers of Christianity taught, that Christ would change the customs which Moses delivered to the Jews—that the Temple would be destroyed. But this was not speaking blasphemous words against God, or Moses, the Law or the Temple. Certainly not.

Before we note the defense of Stephen before the council, and the final catastrophe, let us contemplate the scene before us. Stephen has been taken by a mob, and brought before a Jewish council little better than a mob, as the sequel discloses. What a scene for a painter! The high priest as the president of the council, in his priestly robes takes his throne, in the exterior semi-circle, in the Temple with his deputies on the right and left, and the grave elders or senators of Israel ranged in order on each hand. With compressed lips and stern, lowering countenances, which ill disguise their prejudices and bitter hate, they scowl upon their helpless victim. In the interior semi-circle of the Temple, appointed for spectators and witnesses, the gaping, excited mob, with the accusers of Stephen, and the perjured witnesses, assemble. The accusers, or prosecutors of this holy man look on with countenances which indicate a deep interest in the result of the trial about to come off, while through the windows of the souls of the perjured rascals, who testify against Stephen, their meanness is manifest. But look at Stephen! What a contrast between the appearance of the accused and his judges and prosecutors! While they look daggers, and vengeance and death—are full almost to bursting with rage, Stephen is calm as a summer's evening, and happy in the consciousness of the divine favor—in the assurance that all things work for good to them that love God. Happy in the enjoyment of a conscience void of offense towards God and men—in the assurance that he is falsely accused—that as a Christian evangelist he has labored to serve and honor God, and do good to his fellows—to save them. Hence, though he has nothing to expect from his judges
and accusers but violence and death, he has everything to expect from the divine favor; and therefore, he is calm and happy. "And all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly upon him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." —John Rogers.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

NUMBER XI.

FAITH—NO. II.

In a previous article, on faith, an effort was made to develop what a man must believe to be a Christian, or what the faith is—the "one faith." As justification is by faith, and no man can be justified, please God or come to him without faith, too much pains cannot well be taken to determine what faith is, or what a man must believe to be saved. There is one faith that is divine, the faith by which men are justified, or saved from their sins, and but one. All others are deceptions, delusions and impostions, and should be repudiated as soon as possible by all good men. Everything in Christ depends on the faith. The question then, what is the faith? is to be farther considered in the present paper.

1. In Paul's address, in the Athenian court, alluding to the ignorance before the gospel, he says, "In the times of this ignorance God winked at," or did not hold men strictly accountable, "but now"—since the light of the gospel has come—"he commands all men everywhere to repent." A command like this, for "all men everywhere," must have some foundation, or it must be backed up by authority. It must have a reason. The apostle, therefore, assigns the following reason: "Because he has appointed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained." This is a good reason why all men everywhere should repent, if Christ is the Son of God, for if he is the Son of God, he will judge the world? What assurance has God given that Christ is the Son of God, or that he will judge the world? Paul answers: "Whereof he has given assurance to all men in that he has raised him from the dead." The logic of the apostle stands thus: God has raised Christ from the dead. This is an assurance to all men that he is divine, or the Son of God, and consequently that he will judge the world in righteousness. This is the reason why God commands all men everywhere to repent. This makes the faith, that Jesus the Christ the Son of God, the foundation, or the basis on which every thing rests. The man who received this received everything else in it. The man who rejected this, rejected everything else in it.

II. It would be well for us to inquire of Paul what men must confess, in coming to God. He says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." This confession embraces everything. It embraces Old Testament and New, the prophets and the apostles. It is, therefore, emphatically, the confession of faith, embracing what every man must believe.

III. It may be that an example would be more satisfactory. Let the reader then, imagine himself back to the time of the apostles, and to be standing at a convenient point and see the Ethiopian with the evangelist Philip sitting by his side in the chariot, as he comes to "a certain water." The officer says, "Sec here is water, what doth hinder me to be immersed?" The preacher replies, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." The officer proceeds to tell him what he believes, in the following words: "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." The belief that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, was the faith on which this man was received, and
is now the faith on which the Lord is willing to receive every accountable human being in this world. What apology can any man make for requiring any person to believe more than this? Less than this, all admit will not save any man.

IV. What is it that constitutes a man a sceptic? It is not that he does not believe Calvinism, for Arminians do not believe this, and nobody styles them sceptics. Nobody believes Calvinism but Calvinists themselves. It is not that he does not believe Arminianism, for Calvinists do not believe this, and no one styles them sceptics. Nobody believes Arminianism but Arminians themselves. What is it that constitutes a man a sceptic? It is not that he does not believe the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, for Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians do not believe this, and no one styles them infidels. Nobody believes the Confession of Faith but Presbyterians. It is not the Methodist Discipline, for Presbyterians, Baptists and Episcopalians do not believe the Discipline. Nobody believes the Discipline but Methodists. When the Lord says, "but he that believeth not shall be damned;" he does not mean, "he that believeth not the Methodist Discipline shall be damned." Methodists themselves do not believe this. He does not mean, "he that believeth not the Presbyterian Confession of Faith shall be damned." If he does, then all but Presbyterians will be damned, for none but them believe the Confession of Faith. What then, does he mean? He means, that "he who believes not the gospel shall be damned. This we all believe. "Go," says he, "into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He who believes and is immersed shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be damned." What were the apostles commanded to preach? They were commanded to preach the gospel. What were the hearers to believe in order to be saved? That which was preached—the gospel. He who believes not shall be damned. Believes not what? Believes not that which was preached evidently—the gospel. Does any Presbyterian preacher say, "He who believes not Presbyterianism shall be damned?" He does not, neither does he so think. Why not? Because he knows that Presbyterianism is not the gospel. While he admits that he who believes not the gospel will be damned, he does not for one moment allow himself to think that he who believes not Presbyterianism will be damned. Why not? Because it is not the gospel.

What then, we demand, is it that constitutes a man an infidel, or sceptic? It is not that he does not believe Calvinism, Arminianism, Unitarianism or Trinitarianism, Universalism or Shakerism. It is not that he does not believe the Augsburg, Westminster or Philadelphia Confession. It is not that he does not believe Presbyterianism, Methodism, Baptistism, Episcopalianism, for none of these are the gospel, and the Lord never required any man to believe any one of these, or threatened to condemn any man for not believing any one of them. What then, is it that constitutes a man a sceptic? It is to refuse to believe the gospel. The man who believes the gospel and is immersed, the Lord says shall be saved, and the man who believes not the gospel shall be damned.

V. What then, is the gospel? Paul says, "I declare to you the gospel." What is the gospel? He answers, "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." How do you make this equivalent to the statement, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God? It is equivalent only in this way. If it be true that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures, he is the Christ the Son of the living God. The one proposition involves the other; or the former statement can not be true, and the latter not be true. The proposition then, that Christ rose from the dead, or that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, is what a man must believe to be a Christian. To refuse to believe this proposition, is to be a sceptic. This is the foundation of the king-
dom, of the new institution, of our hope, of all piety and all obedience. When sceptics would strike down Christianity, they must strike out this rock from under it. This is what the entire superstructure rests upon.

VI. Here a grand item is claimed for the Reformation—that it has developed the faith—the common-ground faith—which all admit a man must have or be lost—and at the same time rid it of the theories, speculations and philosophies of men, so that honest and sincere persons can receive the true faith, in all its fullness, enjoy it and be saved by it, and not be compelled to receive with it any of the traditions of men. Here is an important issue the Reformation has from the beginning made with its opponents. It has maintained from the start, that a man may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, be justified by the belief that Jesus is the Christ and obedience to him, without receiving anything in addition, in the form of Calvinism, Armenianism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism—that upon the belief that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God—with all the heart—a man may come to the Lord, in his own appointed acts of obedience and be accepted of him. These their opponents have contested at every advance at the point of the sword. They have maintained that this is not sufficient—that a man must have something more than the belief with all the heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God.

VII. We are certain that we are right in this, for we have followed the inductive plan of investigation. We have followed the apostles and evangelists through all their labors, as found in the sacred record, and observed what they preached, what they required men to believe and what they did believe, in every case, and put it all together. We have found the preachers avowing, that they determined to know nothing but Christ and him crucified—to glory in nothing but the cross of Christ—declaring that the preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God. We find the historian telling what the first ministers of Christ preached—that they "preached Jesus," "preached Christ." When all is collected together and summed up, the preaching was to convince men that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God; and when we sum up and put together all the expressions in reference to what they believed and confessed, the amount of it was, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. This was what they believed, were persecuted for, and what thousands of them died for. This is the faith, and in view of it, the Lord said, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me." And, again, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me."

VIII. Some years ago the Trinitarians was fearful that we would not sufficiently honor the Savior; but how much do they honor him, when they deny that to believe on him with all the heart is a sufficient faith to justify the sinner? The scripture says, he was before all things, and by him all things consist—that the Father has committed all things into his hands—that all authority in heaven and on earth is given to him—that he is the express image of the invisible God and the brightness of the Father's glory—that in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily—that he who sees him sees the Father; and now these same Trinitarians deny that to believe with all the heart that he is the Christ the Son of God—that to believe on him in whom all fullness dwells, with all the heart, is not sufficient faith: Who is it now that honors our glorious Lord Jesus the Christ, those who look to him as the grand center of attraction, the foundation of the faith, the soul of the Bible; the living and glorious embodiment and personification of all that is divine—the hope of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, and tribes, and peoples of the whole earth, and believe on him to the salvation of their souls and are determined to obey him; or those who maintain, that to believe on him with all the heart, is not a sufficient faith—that you must believe something more? Who honor him most, those who rally around him, as their head and leader, devote
themselves to him, will receive what he teaches from first to last and no more; make him the great center of attraction, union and fraternity; or those who make not him the center at all, but confederate around a new center of attraction—a mere peculiarity in church government—as the Presbyterian form, the congregational form, or the Episcopal form of church government? These latter are entirely outside of the orbit, so to speak, and have formed an orbit of their own, a new center of attraction, around which they are revolving, not a divine but a human center.

III. We are compelled to examine the speculations and metaphysics of the times, if not absolutely to refute them, to show their inutility, impracticable nature, and injurious tendency in religion. The popular pulpit is filled with this kind of preaching, and while the people do not understand it, and can not, they think there is something deep and profound in it, from the very circumstance that they can not understand it. There are thousands of men who would rather have something mystical, speculative, and metaphysical, which they can not understand, concerning which they can do nothing, or which they can turn to no practical account, than something clear and intelligible.

IV. We take this as a good opportunity to clear up and explain some matters that could not otherwise be turned to so good an account.

THE RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH

We have lying before us a pamphlet of sixty-four pages, entitled "Metanoia et Pia- tis, or Essays on the Relations of Repen tance and Faith, By H. St. John Van Dake." We promised a few days since to give this pamphlet a careful perusal and lay before our readers the result of our examinations. We have now progressed far enough to come to the conclusion to lay the entire contents of the pamphlet before the readers of the Weekly Review. We do this for the following reasons:

I. We desire to maintain a tolerably wide and free range of investigation, and risk the popular mind in coming to the right conclusion.

II. Bro. Van Dake has thought himself treated badly for many years past, that he has not had a full and fair hearing on this subject. We desire to give him the full benefit of a hearing, and if he can convince any body that he is right, let him do it. We have all confidence in letting the people hear and judge for themselves, and if we cannot convince the people that we are right, we are willing that they shall think we are wrong.

I. The first objection here made to the pamphlet, as a whole, is, that it is not intelligible to the masses of the people. Nine out of every ten who will read it, will be impressed with nothing so much as the fact, that they can not understand it. Their constant inquiry will be, what does he mean? or what is he aiming at? Repentance is not intended merely for a few, but for "all men everywhere," and must be intelligible to all; and any thing about it that can not be appreciated, by the masses, to say the least of it, can not be profitable to them. "All men everywhere" are commanded to repent, because God "has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained." Nothing in reference to repentance, or any other subject, intended for the people at large, can be of any value to them, that they can not understand. That they can not understand his essays, they will generally admit, when they read them. Whether his theory be true or false, one
thing is certain, and that is, that it can do no man any good who cannot understand it. Whether we are right or wrong, we have one comfort, viz.: that the people can understand us. They can tell what we mean, or what we are aiming at.

II. The second objection here made to the theory advocated in these essays, is that it is of no practical value if true. Preaching that repentance precedes faith, or that the sinner repents before he believes, in turning to the Lord, can have no tendency to lead any man to repentance either before or after faith. Theorizing on the question, which takes place first, repentance or faith, or which a man does first, in turning to the Lord, believe or repent, no matter whether the theory advocated be true or false, never did and never can lead one sinner to repentance. A man can not have the two laid before him and be induced to repent by the conviction that faith comes before repentance or after. There is no inducement in such a consideration to lead any man to repent. Theorizing about which comes first, faith or repentance, has nothing in it to lead any man either to believe or repent. Suppose a man were convinced that repentance takes place before faith, what is there in that to lead any man to repent? The reason Paul placed before men to lead them to repent, and the reason why God commanded all men every where to repent, is that God has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained, and not that repentance is before faith, or after faith. Peter commanded men to repent and be immersed for the remission of sins, and not because repentance is before or after faith. Jesus says, “Except you repent you shall all likewise perish.” Men repent that they may not perish, and not because repentance is before faith or after.

III. It is objected in the third place, that the essays are of no use, as theorizing on the question which comes first, cannot invert the order. If one stands in the relation of cause to the other as the effect, no theorizing can invert them, and cause them to occur in a different order. If it be true that the chopping causes the tree to fall, no theorizing can invert the order, cause the tree to fall first and the chopping to follow. If it be true, that faith, in fact, precedes repentance, and causes men to repent, no theorizing can invert the order, cause repentance, in one instance, to precede faith and lead men to repent before they believe. If faith is that which causes men to repent, in fact, as we believe it is, then no theorizing can invert the order, placing the repentance, in fact, before the faith, and make it the cause and faith the effect. If the Lord has ordained repentance as the means to lead men to believe, or the cause to induce them to believe, then the repentance must as certainly go before faith as the cause must go before the effect. In turning men to the Lord, then, there is no danger of doing the work wrong, or there is no danger of inverting the order of faith and repentance and doing the wrong thing first. If faith is the cause of repentance, and repentance a result of faith, repentance can not exist before faith. If, on the other hand, faith is a result of repentance, faith can not exist before repentance. A result or effect cannot exist before the cause, or without the cause. If we can find repentance where there was no faith, men may repent before they believe. If, on the other hand, we can find faith where there was no repentance, men may believe before they repent. Men may get the order wrong in their confused minds, and preach that the effect is before the cause, but in reality, the cause must go before the effect, whether preached right or wrong. They never can induce the two acts, of believing and repenting, to occur in the wrong order, or the wrong one to occur first. Some things cannot be done wrong, no matter how wrong men may have them in their minds, or how wrong they may theorize in reference to them. The cause must always go before the effect. If a man should not only preach that what is known to be really the effect, goes before the cause, but that it is in reality the cause
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II. A kind of indignant thrust is made in the very first paragraph, at "Reformers who suppose themselves reformed from orthodoxy," that it ill comports with the calm and deliberate investigation necessary to the ascertainment of truth. The brotherhood are as willing a people as can be found in this world to hear argument, or to be convinced by Scripture, or argument; but they are not to be convinced by any unpleasant slings at "Reformers," the "ancient order of things," &c.

III. Bro. V. starts out with the following: "A complete restoration of the ancient order of things," demands a return to the "form of sound words." This he follows with the words, from the Savior, "Repent and believe the gospel," and to the language of Paul, to both Jews and Greeks, where he testified "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Has any man, called a reformer, changed, or proposed a change in the order of the words as they occur in these expressions? Certainly not, so far as we know. We are perfectly satisfied with the words as they occur in these expressions, as they stand, and have no need of any return to the form of sound words, for we have never departed from it. We take these expressions, as they stand, at their full value, and then find as proof in them that repentance comes before faith. The order in which words occur is not invariably the order in which the events take place, and, therefore, the mere circumstance that "confess with the mouth," in Paul's language, occurs before "believe in the heart," does not prove that the confessing with the mouth actually takes place before the believing in the heart. The fact, if it be a fact, that repentance really occurs, before believing, must be proved by some other evidence than the mere circumstance, that in a few expressions it stands first. The circumstance that, in the expression, "he will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," salvation comes before the knowledge of the truth, does not by any means prove that a man is saved first, and that he then comes to the

IV. It is objected, that the theory advocated in these essays is not only useless if true, but really not true. We find where the holy historian says, of certain persons, that they "believed on him." In the same connection, we are informed that "they did not confess him for fear of the Jews," and it is added of them, that they "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." These certainly did not repent, yet, it is said, they "believed on him." This belief on him was certainly before repentance, for there is clear evidence that they did not repent. It is not only faith before repentance, but faith without any repentance at all, either before or after faith. Can any one produce a case of repentance where there was no faith? Let the believers in repentance before, try it. We have produced a case of faith where there was no repentance at all, either before or after faith. This is unequivocally faith before repentance.

We shall now proceed to the review of the essays, contained in the pamphlet before us.

I. The charge of "special ignorance," in the first paragraph, to say the least of it, is in bad taste, on the part of one who would correct so many whom he considered in error. Such charges have never been received as convincing argument, and sometimes account for a man's failure to be heard when otherwise he might receive respectful consideration. We shall leave it for the reader to decide where "special ignorance" is exhibited, after we shall have given the subject a pretty full examination.
knowledge of the truth. In argument, the thing to be proved is not to be inferred or assumed, but should be proved.

IV. Did the apostles, or first preachers, so far as reported to us in Scripture, ever command any one to repent first and then believe? They certainly did not. If any person says, they did, let him produce the instance. On the other hand, when three thousand persons heard an apostle, were pierced in their hearts, by the truth uttered, they inquired, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" These persons believed what they heard, or believed the gospel, as preached by Peter, or they would not have been pierced in their hearts, or inquired what they should do. Yet they had not repented, for the apostle commanded them to repent. Here we find, from the lips of the apostle, addressed to persons who believed, a command to repent, which shows that the believing was before the repenting.

When Paul addressed the Philipian jailor, who had neither believed or repented, he commanded him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." Had repentance been first in order he could not have failed to have commanded him to repent. This shows, that so far as apostolic commandments are concerned, the evidence is that faith precedes repentance.

V. Can a case be found under apostolic practice, where it is clear that repentance existed before faith? Such a case can not be found. Let him who thinks different produce one. On Pentecost, faith did exist before repentance, and when pierced in the heart by the truth believed, and thus induced to inquire what they should do, they were commanded to repent. The facts in the case, show that the faith existed before the repentance. This is a standing refutation of the repentance before faith doctrine.

VI. Bro. V. has learned to affirm backwards. He says, that "We affirm, 1st. That Christian faith does not precede evangelic repentance." Why does he affirm a negative? Is it easier to reason backwards than forwards? Why does he not walk up to the work, and say, "We affirm that Christian repentance precedes evangelic faith, in point of time?" Why the prefix, "Christian," to the word, "faith?" Why the prefix, "evangelic," to the word, "repentance?" Why these qualifying terms? Let us understand each other. We are speaking of the faith and repentance, then, required in turning to God, or required in order to justification. Why then, does he not affirm that the repentance required, in order to justification, is, in point of time, before the faith required in order to justification? He would then have clear work in proving a clear proposition, and one too, which we think no one ever did, or ever can prove. But his "Christian faith," and "evangelic repentance," puts one on the look out, for fear there is a dodge in the matter.

VII. Bro. Van Dake says, "In point of time, faith begins when we repent, and neither before nor after. The beginning of an effect is coeval with its cause. "That is a pretty fair start for a compromise, after starting with such a flourish of trumpets about "sound speech," and the erring reformers! "In point of time, faith is neither before nor after repentance! Still, he has the cart before the horse. He will have it that repentance is the cause and faith the effect, but the cause and the effect are coeval! That is a new idea. No matter how little difference there may be, in point of time, the cause goes before and the effect follows most unequivocally. In order to give repentance, the precedence, he says a man must repent of the sin of unbeliev before he can believe. This is literally a mistake in metaphysics. A man must believe there is such a sin as unbelief before he can repent of it. He cannot believe this, till he believes the gospel or believes on Christ. He must be convinced of sin, before he can resolve to abandon it. It is faith to be convinced of sin, for nothing but faith in Christ can convince men of sin.
LIVE AND LET LIVE.

I have frequently thought that it would be profitable to call the attention of the brethren to certain lessons taught by Paul in the 12th chapter of Romans and the 2 of 1st Corinthians. Selfishness, one of the chief sins of our frail nature, often obtrudes itself, like Satan among the sons of God, into the very midst of our religious services. Paul discovered its brazen front even among the brethren in Rome and Corinth who were possessed of spiritual gifts. It was causing some to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think, and some to think much less of others than they deserved. Some that had the gift of teaching were not content to exercise it, but constantly aimed at exhortation; some that could prophesy were much discontented because they could not work miracles; and some that could speak in tongues, because they had not the gift of interpretation of tongues. Sometimes the eye would say to the hand, I have no need of you; and sometimes the foot, through the same inordinate self-consequence would say, Because I am not the hand I am no part of the body.

The lapse of ages has not witnessed the death of this feeling, nor its banishment from the place it had usurped among holy things. We see some manifestations of it at the present day, and I trust that if I take the liberty to point out some of them, I will not be considered too censorious, especially as I have the example of Paul to sustain me.

When this Reformation was in its infancy, it was glory enough for a speaker or writer to be able to teach the most elementary things of the gospel effectively. But as time advanced, and brethren studied the word of God more profoundly, finding in the meantime, a vast number of congregations gathered together who needed to be built up nearer the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, they saw the necessity of making some advance upon the subject matter of their former teaching. It was easy to see, that such preaching as was merely suited to filling up the congregations, was not well suited to building them up; that the youth would starve upon the milk that had nourished the child. Various efforts were made to supply this defect. Some of the brethren entirely abandoned the preaching of what had been styled "first principles," and sought for entirely different themes. Others, shrinking back from the bold advance made by the reformation, began to seek, in a partial return to the old forms of orthodoxy, the means of edifying the churches. Both these parties united in the most contemptuous denunciation of a third class, who were content still to hammer away upon first principles: and it became a common thing to hear brethren express themselves as entirely disgusted with preaching "faith, repentance, and baptism." Even to this day preachers and writers, who, either through preference, or through want of information, still cling to the old themes, are sneered at by these classes of brethren, as though they would silence them altogether if they could. Like the dog in the manger, they will neither preach first principles themselves, nor permit others to do so.

Such brethren seem not to be aware that they are pursuing the very course condemned by the apostle in the passages above referred to. Admit, if you please, that the preachers who know nothing more than first principles, hold the humble position in the body represented by the feet: yet the eye cannot say to the foot, "I have no need of thee." They are doing a good work, a necessary work; and it is certainly both foolish and wicked to discourage them from doing this, simply because this is all they can do.

The folly of these denunciations is still further manifest, from the fact that the laborers denounced are the very men who plant the cause in new places, and gather together the congregations upon which the more skillful laborer may employ his talents. Without them, the progress of the
truth would have been checked long ago, and the churches might have sunk back into the dignified coldness and deadness of Presbyterianism. A frozen corpse seated upright in an easy chair, is a fit emblem of the churches and preachers we would soon have, if the zeal and fervor of those who love to propagate the elements of the gospel were expelled from our pulpits and presses.

The denunciations of which we speak are not only wrong in spirit and policy, but they betray a very contracted and entirely mistaken view of the whole subject. The man who expects to go on to perfection in the edification of a church, by abandoning entirely the preaching of first principles, is like the teacher who would expect to have no further use for the alphabet after his classes had commenced learning to read, or for addition and subtraction when they had reached equations. The elements of any science constitute the skeleton upon which all the parts are adjusted and all its movements depend. When you have exhausted the combinations of which the English alphabet is capable, you have exhausted the thoughts and sentiments which the language can express. Not less true is it, that when you have exhausted the themes, faith, repentance, and baptism, you have exhausted the whole gospel, the whole Bible. The specific objects of faith include all the facts and promises of the whole Bible; and the examples of faith, all the personal narratives of its holy men and women. All the goodness and severity of God displayed in the entire volume, are means of inducing repentance; and the obedience which begins with immersion, when extended to its full limit, reaches all the duties of a godly life. The preacher, therefore, and the writer, who would perfect the disciples in the knowledge of the truth, so far from abandoning these themes, will find them growing up before him as he studies more deeply the word of God, until they reach out to every department of religious duty, and link themselves to all the enjoyments and all the hopes of the Christian’s heart. The trouble with those who have grown weary of thinking and speaking upon them, is really that they have studied them so superficially, and followed so parrot-like the utterances of other men, that they have never learned how to think of them and speak of them as they deserve. Let such men bend their minds down to a closer and more detailed investigation of all the connections of thought that cling to these simple elements, and they will begin to learn the secret which enabled the apostles and primitive evangelists to dwell upon them with unwearying interest. Among the latest of all the epistles of Paul, he gives us his most elaborate dissertation upon faith, and in all his letters to well grown congregations, his allusions to immersion, to repentance, and to the good confession, are frequent. The very best writers and speakers among us have as yet only skimmed the surface of these deep themes, and he will prove himself most successful both in the edification of the church, and in the propagation of the truth, who studies them the most profoundly.

I must add to these suggestions, that the dogmas of sectarianism will never be supplanted by scriptural truths, without a vigorous and persistent discussion of the issues involved. No truth ever was or ever will be propagated by saying nothing about it, nor will silence ever uproot any error. If the friends of truth say nothing about immersion, the people will be sprinkled forever. And if you say nothing against the erroneous teaching and practice of your neighbors, they will conclude that you consider the difference between you and them one of mere preference, not of principle. All the advantage that the Reformation has gained over the opposing sects, has been by discussion; and whenever we begin to ignore the questions at issue, our progress will be checked. There was a series of years within the decade that terminated with 1860, in which it had become quite unusual to preach first principles, and brethren were becoming restless, and looking around for every kind of invention to cure the prevalent evil. Some
were for going back towards orthodoxy; some for a more Presbyterian organization of the churches; some for abolishing the Eldership and substituting a Pastorship; and some pronounced the Reformation a failure. Most fortunately, at this juncture Bro. Lard’s caustic and brilliant review of Jeter made its appearance, filled with original and happy thrusts at the idols of orthodoxy which some brethren had begun to worship, and with a most triumphant defense of those “first principles” which others had learned to despise. It immediately started a new pulse thrilling through the veins of the brethren. A strong reaction in favor of the primitive doctrine and practice was almost immediately apparent, and the course pursued by several of our periodicals has steadily sustained it to the present time. The result has been a degree of progress, both in the increase of numbers and the spiritual growth of the churches, unprecedented. in our history.

The disparagement of brethren who know nothing but first principles, is not less objectionable than the disparagement of writers of inferior literary attainments. Brethren sometimes complain bitterly that our periodicals are filled up by authors who cannot write grammatical English, and whose ideas are frequently as uncoch as their style. Now a man of generous spirit, not disposed to be a pestilent fault finder, upon observing such a state of things, would be likely to reason upon it somewhat in this way. Certainly our editors are not disposed to prefer ungrammatical essays to those that are written in better style; and it cannot be that brethren who buy the papers prefer an inferior literature. Why then is it that both the editor and the reader are compelled to put up with that which they do not prefer. Clearly, it is from one single reason, that the better class of writers will not do the writing that is required. The columns of all the papers are open to them, and their contributions are solicited, yet they refuse to write, and still grumble at the incapacity of those who do write. Thus again do we see the dog in the manger. If we are to have a better literature, it will never be secured by snorting at the papers and periodicals we have, but by taking hold of them and making them what they ought to be. We could have a periodical literature which would be an ornament to us, if the talent which we have for writing would only take hold and work. There is an almost boundless field of usefulness open here, and the Lord calls for laborers to enter the field. “To him who knows to do good and does it not, to him it is sin.”

But upon this subject, as well as upon the preaching of first principles, many brethren commit a very serious mistake. To decry a writer and try to cripple his influence merely because he writes ungrammatically, is like denouncing the general who wins a battle because he did not do it according to the maxims of military science. It very often happens that the most powerful writers are men of little education or literary taste, whilst the very men who would criticise them most severely, if for a moment put in their places, would be found the perfection of weakness. Some of us can recollect such events as the starting of new papers for the avowed purpose of introducing a higher order of literature, soon proved not only sickly and short lived, but positively inferior in literary merits to the papers which they were designed to supplant. After all, the true test of excellence in either a writer or speaker is the degree of influence for good which he can exert. I recollect once holding a meeting with a brother whose method of reading the scriptures and hymns before the congregation was so decidedly objectionable to me, that I resolved to take some favorable moment to give him some advice upon the subject. But about the conclusion of the meeting, quite an intelligent brother, in conversation about our sermons etc., remarked to me: “Bro. McGarvey, I see that Bro. E. beats you badly in one thing, and that is in reading.” I was considerably taken back, and felt very glad that I had not yet made my criticism to the brother. The truth is, it takes all kinds of people to fill up a world, and it takes all
kinds of preachers and writers to suit the peculiarities of these different kinds of men. God has made us all, with all our peculiarities, and has adapted each one of us to a particular work that no one else can do so well. We are not, therefore, to make the excellences of any one a standard for all; but, demanding of each only that he shall be honest and speak the truth, bid him work on industriously with the tools that God has given him.

J. W. McGarvey.

Lexington, Ky., April 30, 1862.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

The above is from the "Pioneer," edited and published by brethren Howard and Wright, in Lindley, Mo. We have seen nothing more appropriate and opportune for a long time. That which adds to its importance, is the fact that it comes from one of the clearest-headed, finely educated and best informed men in the ranks. Education, extended information and natural ability are of immense value, when consecrated to God through Jesus Christ our Lord; but for a man to assume that he is educated, and that, because he is educated, he is worthy of great consideration, while the uneducated should be frowned from his presence, when he has never succeeded in any great undertaking, nor achieved anything valuable, is an utter absurdity. What does education amount to, if it does not adapt a man to the world in which he is placed, and show itself in the accomplishment of anything great and good? Some men are mad with the church and the world, because assumed learning, knowledge and ability that have never achieved anything valuable, are not appreciated, and they fall into angry, ill-natured and bad tempered criticisms upon the men actually doing what is done in the great and good work of the Lord. But were it not arrogant for one to attempt to teach their superiors, or even make a suggestion to them, we would suggest to the class alluded to, that there is an open door before them; the Lord has spread out the great field—the world—to their view, and bids them come and occupy. He has use for all the learning, the knowledge and talent they possess. He has use for all the labor they can perform, and invites them to come and labor. Let them, then, enter this great field of the Lord, and do this higher order of work of which they are so frequently talking—do it in the superior style of which they speak, and thus, by actual service, usefulness, and work done to the honor and glory of God, convince the world of their superior ability. If a man's learning, knowledge and ability, will not gain for him position, put him in advance of the ignorant, the uncouth and uneducated, and make his usefulness known, in moving the world toward God and spreading righteousness among men, no matter what the cause may be, unequivocally there must be a screw loose some place—incapacity of some sort is at the bottom of it. If the educated, well informed and most exalted in talent cannot surpass, excel and get in advance of the uneducated, ignorant and unrefined, then indeed education, information and talent are not as potent as we have been accustomed to think. Such, however, is not the fact. Real education, knowledge and talent will be appreciated by the people, and will succeed; real worth will be acknowledged and rewarded; but mere assumed education, will not be appreciated, acknowledged or rewarded, especially where the people cannot see that anything valuable is achieved.

The people have a simple way of their own of reasoning on these subjects. When they hear any man criticising an illiterate preacher, who is very successful, they inquire why does not the critic go into the field and do better work? Why does he not supercede the preacher whom he criticises, and show his superiority by doing better work and more of it? When the people hear a man criticising writers and editors, they inquire, why does he not write something better? or why does he not edit, publish and give us better publications? Any man may criticise work done, and show imperfections in it, but we have a right all the time to demand of him, to come and do
better work. The learning, knowledge and talent never displayed except in criticising the work done by others, or never displayed in doing better work, will never be valued highly by the people, and never should be. Men who possess real learning, knowledge and talent, and consecrate all to the Lord, find abundant scope for all their learning and talent in works of righteousness, labors of love, in a united effort with the people of God to push the cause onward, and they have no time to carp upon humble, sincere, good and working men, who are constantly pushing the cause onward. Nothing is more injurious to the cause of righteousness than for the few more favored men among us, to throw discouragement upon the vast number of humble, devoted and laborious men, who work for small pay and achieve such a vast amount. We rejoice that we have men of talent, learning and extended information, who are humble, unassuming and pious. These are doing great service for our adorable King, and richly deserve the position the Lord has given them. We also thank the Lord for all those faithful, true and devoted servants of God, who, with but little learning, limited knowledge and talent, in spite of derision, mocking and ridicule, from within and without, have gone forth, knowing nothing but Jesus and him crucified, and brought thousands to the kingdom of God. The Lord has use for all, and let all labor to honor and glorify his name. Let the brother of high degree, rejoice in that he is made high, and the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is lifted up. No man will be honored for learning, knowledge and talent that accomplish nothing, no matter how often assumed. They will conclude that it is either assumed, and not really learning at all, or that if it is learning, unwieldy, unavailing and useless, and in either case will not admire it. But if a man will launch out into the world, and do good service, he will get full credit for all his earning and ability.

ADDRESS BY J. W. McGARVEY:

Intellectual Subordinate to Moral Culture.

The object of what is commonly called an education, is not gained in acquiring the thing itself. It is itself a means; not an end. The only value that it possesses is its utility in assisting to attain an object beyond itself. It is true, there is some gratification, a slight recompense in the way of enjoyment, attendant upon the very acquisition of knowledge. When the mind has struggled through some laborious problem, there is frequently a beauty in the process, and a triumph in the accomplishment, which afford some pleasure, and a degree of self gratification. But this is only a momentary and incidental gratification, afforded the student to give some relish to the discharge of his onerous duties. Like the pleasure which eating and drinking afford, though it does not fully compensate for the labor of providing food and drink, it renders a pleasant task of that process by which a necessary object is attained.

Education, then, being the means of obtaining an end, whether it is desirable that one be educated or not, depends entirely upon the nature of the end to be attained. If the end be a good one, then education is desirable, et vice versa.

Education is the acquisition of knowledge, accompanied by a cultivation of the mental faculties. It is neither the one of these, nor the other, exclusively; for they cannot be separated. The very acquisition of knowledge involves, by necessity some mental culture; whilst it is impossible for the mind to be cultivated at all, without some knowledge.

But this knowledge, like every other means placed in man's possession, may be used either for good or for evil.

If its use is to result in good, then it is good to possess it; if it is to result in evil, it were better to be without it.
Knowledge is power. It is desirable to possess power over other men, if you use it for their good; but if not, you had better never possess it. Whether, however, you will use it for good or for evil, depends upon the further question, whether you yourself be good or bad. The utility of an education, then, depends entirely upon the character of its possessor. If he is a good man, he will use it for the good of himself and his fellow men. If he is a bad man, he will use it for the injury, if not of himself, at least of his fellow men; so that just in the ratio of his goodness is it at all desirable that any man should be educated.

You are ready to say, that according to this proposition, I should select the good men and women of the community and educate them, but abandon the vicious to ignorance and superstition. By no means. I would endeavor to make all good, and educate them as I made them good; and my effort to educate should not advance one step further than my efforts to moralize. Thus I would keep that power which knowledge imparts, confined to the hands of those who would use it aright, and each individual's portion thereof should correspond precisely with his own share of goodness.

An objection to these positions, might be suggested by the following inquiry: Does not the enlightening and refining influence of education, in itself impart that amount of moral culture which will lead the possessor to use it aright? To decide this question we must inquire whether pure intellectual culture, or the acquisition of purely scientific knowledge, has any direct influence upon the moral character of man. I assume that it has not: and in order to sustain this assumption, which is rather paradoxical, I must offer a few suggestive arguments.

I would ask, what is there in the nature of a proposition in Mathematics, the purest of the sciences, to awaken a sense of moral obligation? The proposition that the included angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, or that all the points in the circumference of a circle are equi-distant from the center, has no more connection with any one of the ten commandments, than it has with the light of the moon. It is a pure intellecction, in which the moral sense is not in the least degree interested. And just so with every other purely scientific truth. The fact that the earth revolves around the sun; that the atmosphere we breathe is composed of oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen; that there are fourteen tissues in the human frame; that the subject of a verb is in the nominative case; not one of these, nor all of them, could any more suggest the idea of love to God or man, than the sound of the violin could suggest the colors of the rainbow; or the odor of the cologne, the sensations of a shower bath. The reason is, that the conceptions are such in their very nature, that there is neither resemblance nor contrast between them by which one could suggest the other. This proves to a demonstration, that the acquisition of purely scientific knowledge is incapable of improving the moral nature of man. If any other proof were needed, we might find it to profusion, in the characters of many men whose intellects have been great by nature, and cultivated to the highest degree of art. To mention only the names of Hume, Gibbon, and Voltaire, is sufficient to recall a class of such men whose "name is legion." Or if you called for the living proof on a larger scale, you have but to glance at modern France in the days of her revolution, or at ancient Greece in the palmiest days of her philosophy. No two nations ever exhibited such intellectual activity and culture, yet at the same moment, not the most benighted savage tribe on earth ever exhibited moral pollution so deep-seated and so all-pervading.

We may add, that the devil, whose eye is undimmed, and his strength unabated by the study and activity of at least six thousand years, is himself with all his wickedness, a being of most gigantic and cultivated intellect.
May I not now safely conclude, that if we would have men good as we make them wise, we must have a department of education adapted to the culture of the moral nature? And when we remember that without such culture, scientific knowledge but imparts greater power to do evil, becoming a curse instead of a blessing, we at once perceive the superior importance which must attach to this department of study.

I am not forgetting to admit, that in the course of a scientific education as pursued at the present day, some moral influences are generally brought to bear upon the student. His teacher, while pointing him to the sublime visions of Astronomy, will sometimes direct his gaze still higher, to him who built the heavens.

In the study of Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and Physiology, the traces of God's wisdom and goodness are pointed out at every step by the faithful teacher; and even in Philology, while acquiring the languages in which ancient and modern sages have written, the moral truths to which they gave utterance find a ready entrance into the heart. But this is a mere accidental connection with the pursuit of knowledge, by which is brought to bear an adventitious influence not inherent in scientific truth itself.

The admission of its existence, therefore, does not invalidate my main proposition. At the same time, the fact that it is accidental renders it liable to be accidentally omitted, and still further establishes the necessity for an unfailing department of study, for the cultivation of the heart.

Perhaps you are ready to reply just here, that there is in every educational course, a department of moral science, whose special object is the one for which we are now contending. I have not forgotten this; neither have I forgotten the fact that all the light which shines from works on Moral Science and Natural Theology, is borrowed light. I would as soon rest contented with the light of the cold moon, and never have the sun to rise, as to walk by the light of such works, if a warmer light can be found. They teach much moral and religious truth, but they present it in a form so abstract that it possesses neither warmth nor authority. If you will add to them all the catechisms and creeds of Christendom, you will add but little to their utility. Metaphysical theology is almost as devoid of moral power as pure Mathematics. A man may study it to eternity without one warm emotion. Therefore the study of no scientific system of theology ever converted a single soul. The demons are as profound theologians, and perhaps as orthodox in all their opinions, as any living men. A system of abstract religious truth may be a splendid product of human study. It may glitter like a palace of ice under the beams of the midnight moon; but it will be as lifeless. We must not depend upon any, nor upon all such, if we would have the heart of the educated man as warm as his intellect is clear and sparkling. We must bring him away from the sickly light of the moon, and let the warm beams of the great Sun of Righteousness shine fairly upon the garden of his heart, ere the bloom of holy affections, and the fruits of a righteous life, shall adorn it.

You now perceive that the object of all these remarks is to show the importance of bringing the student, whilst acquiring an education, under the direct influence of the word of God. It is important that man's moral powers be strengthened with the strength of his intellect; it is equally important that the progressive steps in each should be commensurate with each other. I therefore hold, that in order to insure a moral, commensurate with the intellectual department of the rising generation, the Bible must be made a class book in every school, and kept in the hands of the student from the moment he learns to read, until he finishes his collegiate course. I am happy to congratulate you, young ladies and gentlemen, that such is the course pursued in this institution; and I congratulate myself that your experience here will enable you to fully attest some further remarks, on the
superiority of the Bible to all other systems
of moral instruction.

God's method of teaching the great
truths of religion is quite different from the
methods most popular among men. Men
love to collect these truths into systems,
and express them in abstract terms, that
the mind may take them all into view, in
all their relations, at a single glance.

Such is not the wisdom of God. He
scatters the same truths broadcast over the
pages of a large volume; and interweaves
them with the lives and fortunes of living
men; substituting for the coldness of meta-
physical proposition, all the warmth and en-
ergy of real narrative. This gives the Bi-
ble, as an instrument for the moral renova-
tion of man, its great and peculiar power.
Instead of leading you through a series of
abstract propositions, which you might pur-
sue with as much indifference as you would
solve a problem in Mathematics, it brings
you into immediate company with a host of
living beings assembled from heaven, from
earth, and hell; and in a moment your soul
is kindled into the liveliest sympathy. An
innumerable company of men and women
of every age, climate, country and condi-
tion, throng before you, intermingled with an-
gels from Heaven and demons from the
Spirit land, while God and Satan alternate-
ly cast light or darkness over the passing
scene. You have here, no system of The-
ology; but you see the Spirit of God mov-
 ing upon the waters of old chaos, speaking
through the mouths of prophets and priests,
descending from heaven in the manner of a
dove, and appearing in demonstrations of
almighty power and infinite wisdom by the
hands and lips of humble fishermen. You
hear the great Jehovah speak the heavens
and earth into being; you see him descend
in a tempest of fire and smoke, to thunder
forth the fiery law to Israel; making bare,
at times, his strong right arm to deliver his
people, or to crush an empire; at times
dwelling in inapproachable light, and again
enthroned in blackness of darkness. We
have no dissertation upon the mysterious
union of the Father and the Son; but you
bend in wonder over the helpless babe that
lies in a manger; you follow him with a
throbbing heart, through a life whose every
step is marked with mingled sorrow, majesty
and love; you groan with him in Gethse-
mane, and on the cross; you weep with Mary
Magdalene and the other Mary over his si-
 lent tomb; you run with Peter and John on
the third morning to see if that tomb is re-
ally empty; you rise with him to the heaven
of heavens, and see him seated on the
throne of God,

"With countless angels round him throng,
And swell the chorus of his praise."

Borne upon the current of the lofty theme,
you despise the emptiness of all human
systems, and feel, in the very dimness or
the mighty outline, in the very heavings
of the infinite ocean on which you are tossed,
a thousand-fold more of God, than all the
systems of earth could express.

Amid the throng of human beings who
move before you, seduced by devils or en-
couraged by angels, you see the wicked
and the righteous intermingled for a time, till a
burning city, a desolate country; or a lonely
grave, tells of bitter separations, and whispers
of that eternal night whose darkness is
made more hideous by weeping and gnash-
ing of teeth; or a hymn of praise interrupt-
ed by weeping, makes you lift your tearful
eyes away to where "the wicked cease from
troubling and the weary are at rest." You
tremble with the dying wretch who has sin-
need away his life; you weep with the pub-
lican in the temple or with the harlot at the
feet of Jesus, over the guilt of your own
souls; you climb the mountain side with
faithful Abraham, and as the wood is laid
upon the altar, the only child bound with
 cords, and the bright blade lifted in the air
for the fatal stroke, you feel your own faith
in God grow stronger. With Daniel in the
lion's den, or Peter walking the waves of
Galilee, or Stephen, lifting his dying eyes
to heaven, and saying, "Lord Jesus, receive
my spirit," you catch the inspiration of that
heavenly hope, which enabled them to en-
dure such "a great fight of afflictions." In
going about to do good; with the Man of
sorrows, your heart expands to a large phi-
lanthropy, and you begin to feel that love
which greets a friend in every human being,
and quenches the rage of every human foe.
There all cords of the human heart are al-
ternately touched, and as the lessons of the
Great Teacher pass in review before us, the
hand of God wakes every note into harmo-
ny with the praises of men and angels.
You are happy, young ladies and gentle-
men, in that you have been introduced to
this great school book of the Living God.
Will those of you who are about to leave
these halls forever, bidding adieu to your
teachers and to one another, that you may
put to action in the world the power you
have here acquired, receive the advice of a
friend, and take that good book with you as
your vade mecum along the journey of life?
It will make you as good as you may be
wise and great; and thus your education
will be a blessing to the world, not a curse.
To those of you who expect to renew, ere
long, the sunny scenes of your school-day
life let me commend that blessed volume,
as the chief of all your studies. It is above
all others, as God is wiser than man, as eter-
nity is more lasting than time. I need
scarcely say to the President and the Fac-
ulty, the seed which you are sowing is living
seed which will abide forever. The reaper
will follow the sower, and the harvest of
your present labors will be rich and pre-
cious in the great day of God.

A SERMON—BY N. J. MITCHELL.

In the Review for March 4th, 1862 is a
sermon by Bro. N. J. Mitchell, on John 3:
5-8. In it are the following words: "Repen-
tance signifies amendment of life. There-
fore he that believes and is baptized has
amended his life. His faith led him to obe-
dience; and the very first act of obedience
in pursuance of his faith is the first act of
amendment of life, and precisely at this
point, and in this moment his sins are par-
doned."

Then repentance or amendment of life
consists in action, and as this amendment
of life cannot begin before "the very first
act" of amendment of life, it follows that
repentance does not begin before baptism.
The words "amendment of life" but feebly
expresses the idea of repentance. We had
as well retain the old, familiar term, and
teach too that repentance is a prerequisite
of baptism, instead of teaching that it does not
begin until baptism.

Bro. M. has nothing to say on the words
"That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and
that which is born of the spirit is spirit," al-
though he quotes them in his text. There
are many expositions of this verse. With-
out investigating any of them in this article,
the writer will attempt one which he has
not heard or read only as it may be gather-
ed from the Scriptures. The Savior was
conversing with a Jew, a child of Abraham
according to the flesh. He was a partici-
pant in the Covenant to give the land of the
Canaanites, etc., see Gen. xii: 7; xv. 18; xvii
7-8 and Neh. ix: 8; and in the Covenant of
Circumcision, see Gen. xvii: 9-14 and Acts
vii: 8; and in the "Covenant from mount the
Sinai, see Cal. iv: 21-31. He had a part in
these covenants because he was a child of
Abraham after the flesh. In the new cov-
enant or kingdom which was then at hand,
a fleshly birth would profit him nothing,
(see John vi: 63.) The promises in the
new covenant are to the children of Abraham.
or the children of Israel, as the promise was renewed to Isaac, Gen. xxvi: 4-5, and to Jacob, Gen. xxviii: 11. But in the new covenant the children of the flesh are not counted for the seed. Will the reader please to read the following scriptures, first without the words in the brackets, and then with them, as they may some of them be necessary to supply ellipses, and some only by way of comment. "For they are not all Israel [according to the promise] which are of Israel [after the flesh.] Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, [after the flesh] are they all children, [according to the promises,] but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. ix: 6-8. "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham," Gal. iii: 7. "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii: 29. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons; the one [Ishmael, the representative head, in this allegory, of the children of the Sinai covenant,] by a bond-maid [Hagar, the type of the Sinai covenant,] the other [Isaac, the representative head of the new covenant,] by a free-women [Sarah, the type of the new covenant. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh, but he of the free-women was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these [two women] are [the types of] the two covenants, the one [covenant] from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth [children] to bondage, which is [typified by] Agar. For this Agar is [the type of the covenant from] Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, [was, when Paul wrote,] and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above [as Sarah was above, or superior to Hagar, and as the anti-type is above the type as the new covenant is above the old,] is free which is the mother of us all [\(\epsilon, \epsilon, \) all the new covenant children.] For it is written, [in Isaiah liv.] Rejoice thou barren [woman, or new covenant,] that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate [women, or new covenant] hath many more children than she which hath an husband [the old covenant, see Jer. xxxii: 32.] Now wo, [Christians, children of the new covenant,] brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh, [Ishmael] persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. [How so? The Jews, the children of Abraham after the flesh, persecuted the Christians, the children of Abraham after the Spirit.] Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture, [Gen. xxii: 10] cast out the bond-woman [Hagar, or old covenant;] and her son, [or children, born after the flesh,] for the son [or children,] of the bond-woman [old covenant,] shall not be heir, [or heirs,] with the son [or children] of the free-woman, [or new Covenant.] So then, brethren, we [Christians, are not children of the bond-woman, [old covenant,] but we are children,] of the free [woman, or new covenant,] Gal. iv: 21-31. The children of the old covenant were born of, or after, the flesh, but the children of the new, "as Isaac was, are the children of promise." And "as Isaac" "was born of, or after the Spirit," then so are Christians born of, or after the Spirit. The words of the Savior are in harmony with these passages from Romans and Galatians. If we consider the expression elliptical the meaning will be plain "That which is born of the flesh [is flesh,] and that which is born of the Spirit is [Spirit.]" There is another passage, in John vi: 63, which cannot be understood without filling two ellipses. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are [the words of the] Spirit, and they are [the words of] life." See verse lxviii. Peter says, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." But without arguing any further as to whether the verse should be considered elliptical, and leaving the reader to judge for himself, let us supply the ellipses.
in the most natural manner, and in which no violence will be done to the meaning. When the subject is that of a begetting and a birth, what is it that is begotten and born? A child, is the answer at once, and by every one. Then, "that which is born of the flesh is [a child of, or after the] flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is [a child of, or after the] Spirit." That which is born of the flesh is a child of Abraham after the flesh, a child of the old covenant, or covenants, and that which is born of the Spirit is a child of Abraham, as Isaac was, born after the Spirit, a child of the new covenant.

3. In the sermon we read "Obj., 1. Does not the Savior himself say that the new birth is mysterious? Don't he say 'the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so (in this way) is every one (born, or begotten) that is born of the Spirit.' According to Bro. M., to be begotten or born of the Spirit, is to have faith produced in us by the Spirit, in which he is undoubtedly correct. Now without calling in question the translation, let us see whether there is any great mystery found in it, when we say that we find in it the manner, or an explanation of the manner, in which we are begotten by the Spirit. We may take the language just as it stands in the text and affirm of the Spirit, what is affirmed in it, of the wind. But first it may be observed that the advocates of mystery in this verse have never yet been able to find in it any thing about 'feeling' the wind, or 'seeing its effects.' Although we may feel the wind and see its effects, yet the Savior said nothing about either. Then have we any right to drag them in? There were two things which Nicodemus could not tell; the "whence" and the "whither." There was afterward more made know than the Lord told Nicodemus. The promise of sending the Spirit from the Father was afterward made and fulfilled. But the two things, mentioned in the conversation, which Nicodemus knew, were "the wind bloweth," and "thou hearest the sound thereof." So, let us pass the "feeling," and "seeing the effects" which are not mentioned, and also the "whence" and the "whither" and confine our investigation, as we should to the two things which Nicodemus knew, "the wind bloweth" and "thou hearest the sound thereof," and instead of the great sectarian mystery we have a clear statement, or explanation of the manner in which faith is produced by the Spirit. Are these two things applicable to the Spirit? The word "blow" is defined by Webster "verb transitive; to sound a wind instrument; as blow the trumpet. To spread by report." "Sound" is defined "noun, noise; report; object of hearing; that which stikes the ear, etc." The Spirit "spreads by report," gives a "sound" or "report" which we hear. Two questions,
How does the Spirit give a sound or report? And what is that sound or report? The Savior promised his apostles that he would send them the comforter, the Holy Spirit, which proceedeth from the Father. He told them that when the Spirit was come he would teach them all things, bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them, testify of him, convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, John xiv: 16, 17, 26-xv: 26-xvi: 7-15. "Howbeit when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I that he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you," 13-16. The spirit, according to the promise was to speak. This promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance," Acts ii: 4. Then the spirit began to give a report, or sound by speaking by the apostles. "Be this known unto you and hearken to my words," v. 14. "Ye men of Israel hear these words," v. 22. "Men and brethren let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David," 29. "This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," 32, 33. "Now when they heard this they were pricked in the heart," 37. "Then Peter said unto them repent," etc., 38. "With many other words did he testify and exhort saying save yourselves," etc., 40. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized," 41. In the epistles we read "Which things also we speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual," 1 Cor. ii: 13. The Apostles "preached the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven," 1 Peter i. 12. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord who hath believed our report. So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say have they not all heard? Yes verily their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world," Rom. x. 16. 19. Our two questions are answered. The spirit gives a sound or report by speaking by the apostles. And that sound or report is the gospel; and "faith comes by hearing" this sound. In this way is every one begotten, that is begotten of the spirit.

ALLEN HICKEY.

MODERN REVIVALS.

Our attention has recently been directed to an article, extending over some twenty-three pages, large double column, in the Westminster Review, for January, 1860, American Editor, vol. 4, No. 1, headed, Art. No. VI; Christian Revivals." The article, as would be reasonably expected, appearing, as it does, in a publication of such great notoriety, is well documented and written with great ability. On reading this article, we are more deeply than ever before impressed, with what we have to some extent felt and lamented for many years, viz: The continued and increasing tendency of the influences of these times to infidelity. In view of this article, and much more of a similar kind which has fallen under our eye, we are well satisfied that the following propositions are true:

I. That modern revivalism, as found in the various instances noticed in the quotations in the article alluded to above, and in numerous other instances, of which we have seen accounts, is not only not Christianity, but is injurious and detrimental to its highest interests.

II. That the Westminster Review has done...
great injustice to Christianity, in identifying these modern revivals with anything existing in apostolic practice, or in connection with the early propagation of Christianity.

III. That modern revivals furnish material covenant for infidels to employ, in their efforts to bring the religion of Christ into discredit.

IV. That the conclusion to which the writer for the Westminster Review comes, in ascribing jerks, falling, swooning, fainting, trances, spasms, &c., as found in some modern revival scenes, to hysteria, is certainly, to say the least of it, a most fanciful and imaginative speculation.

We do not profess to be able to explain the strange manifestations and developments, as found in the various revivals, accounts of which are found in the numerous extracts in the articles before us, nor do we feel under the least obligation to explain or defend them, for we cheerfully admit that they are no result of the influence of the Spirit of God, or the preaching of the gospel. We give three reasons for this conviction, as follows:

I. There is no account of any person being struck down, falling senseless, jerking, fainting, swooning, taking spasms, the "dancing exercise," the "barking exercise," or of anyone jumping, rolling, tumbling, or screaming, as we have seen in modern revivals, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, in all the accounts connected with the religion of Christ, during the first century. No such results followed even the miraculous displays of the power of the Holy Spirit of God, even during the period of the founding of the kingdom of God.

II. In all the accounts of apostolic preaching, there is not an instance of a person, from the influence of their preaching, or in any way connected with it, fainting, falling, jumping, jerking, taking spasms, dancing, barking, screaming, laughing, becoming speechless or senseless. One word, their preaching never deprived a man of his senses, or required him to do an uncomely thing. Every step taken was taken deliberately, with full purpose of heart and with a fair understanding. Never since the world was made, did people know better what they were doing, act with more settled determination of mind or fixedness of purpose; nor were human beings ever more steadfast in their purpose, than was the case on the part of those who became Christians under the preaching of the apostles. There was nothing wild, phrenzied or fanatical among them. They entered the profession deliberately and maintained it with self-possession and determination till the last.

III. No such extravagant, strange and unaccountable things accompany the preaching of the gospel now. Where the gospel is preached now, in its purity, as it was by the apostles, the same anxiety for salvation is produced and the same inquiries are elicited. The same answers are given, the same things are done. But under the pure and holy influence of the gospel, preached as it was at first by the apostles, there is no falling, rolling, tumbling, jerking, dancing, barking, swooning, fainting, &c. Everything is calm, meditative, and considerate. The solemnity and calmness of death prevail in those instances where the greatest success obtains.

We, therefore, maintain that the Westminster Reviewer has done the Christian religion great injustice, in identifying the strange phenomena found existing in modern religious revivals with Christianity, or anything in Christianity. Christianity is no more responsible for these strange and, as we think, deplorable things, than it is for the scepticism of the Westminster Reviewer. The religion of Christ produced no such results and is to be held responsible for none of them. However men may account for them, one thing is settled, and that is, they are no part, parcel, or result of Christianity. When persons, in modern revivals, fall, swoon away, faint away, become speechless, fall lifeless, in spasms, jerk, bark, scream, roll, tumble on the floor, &c., &c., call it hysteria, or what the reader may please, but do not call it Christianity, the influence of the Holy Spirit, or of the gos,
pel, and do not in any way hold the gospel, or its influence, responsible for it. We are willing that any thing found in the time of the apostles, resulting from their preaching, or anything resulting from preaching the same gospel now, shall be ascribed to it and identified with it. But that which was born centuries since, bearing no similitude to the gospel, or anything resulting from the gospel, is not now to be charged upon the gospel. Let modern revivalism take care of itself, but let not the gospel be held responsible for any of its extravagances.

Religions that need revivals every now and then, are not like that practiced by the apostles and first Christians. Their religion never died, and did not need any revivals. Hence there is not a word about a revival, or a revivalist, in the time of the apostles. Revivals and revivalists, in religion, belong exclusively to modern times. There were successful preachers in the first church who turned vast numbers to the Lord, but they were not revivalists of religion and were never styled such, and the work they did was not a revival of religion, in the modern sense, and never styled such. They addressed the understandings of the people, their reason, and demanded the belief of an intelligible proposition—that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God—and demanded a submission to his authority. The response made, was rational and the submission rendered was in accordance with what was demanded in the preaching. We have no account of any one falling, being struck down, jumping, rolling, tumbling, swooning, fainting, taking spasms, becoming speechless, senseless, screaming, clapping the hands, dancing, jerking, barking, &c., &c., under the apostles preaching and that of the first evangelists of Christ, nor have we any thing of the kind now, where the gospel is preached as it was at the beginning. That all such manifestations are of the flesh, and not of the Spirit of God at all, we have been just as well satisfied for years, as we have of any proposition. They are under the control of the people entirely. Where the preachers teach them to shout, and the people believe in shouting, there they shout. We have seen a whole company of shouting women and girls deliberately lay side their bonnets, combs, and other damageable articles, and enter the room, commence in the noise, engage in the rolling, tumbling, clapping the hands, jumping, &c., &c., as deliberately as a company ever entered upon the floor for a dance, and with about as little rational and intelligible view of the true worship of God. We saw in the town of Newcastle, Ind., now full 20 years ago, probably fifty men on one side and as many women on the other, in a Methodist watch-meeting, in one general mass on the floor, some prostrate, others sitting, some on their knees, and some standing, in the midst of every imaginable form of sound possible for the human voice to make, in one general rolling, tumbling, and squeezing conglomeration. This was regarded as "a work of grace," "the influence of the Spirit," a "great manifestation of power," &c., &c.

The time was, in this country, when a man risked being put down with the rankest infidels if he dared to doubt that all this was the direct power of the Holy Spirit. Yet it is true, and we take the responsibility of stating deliberately, that instead of all this being the influence, or work, of the Holy Spirit, nothing in this country, has contributed so much to the increase and perpetuation of infidelity. And while we are thus speaking, we may as well go farther, and say, what we have long been satisfied is the truth, that this "converting power," that is supposed to come directly from heaven and make so many converts in popular revivals, is not far from heaven—not the work of the Holy Spirit at all. Let it be understood what we say. We do not deny that there is, in these revivals, converting power, great power, and that many are "powerfully converted;" this we admit and believe; but we deny that it is from heaven—the influence or power of the Holy Spirit. The "converting power" prayed for, and received, in a Presbyterian meeting, converts all to Presbyterianism. It makes
Presbyterians and nothing else. It never, in a Presbyterian meeting, makes a Methodist, or a Baptist. The converting power is then, beyond all dispute, Presbyterian converting power. The converting power, or direct influence prayed for, and received, in a Methodist meeting converts all to Methodism and nothing else. It never makes a mistake and converts some to Presbyterianism. The converting power in a Baptist meeting, converts all to Baptism and nothing else. Now does the Holy Spirit do all this? Is all this to be considered the work of the grace of God? Does the Holy Spirit enter a Presbyterian meeting and make Presbyterians, then enter a Methodist meeting and make Methodists? Shall this work be ascribed to the Holy Spirit? Certainly not. Suppose we should go to a Presbyterian meeting, in the midst of a revival, join in with them, aid them and do everything in our power to make Presbyterians; then go to a Methodist meeting and do the same for them—do all in our power to make Methodists—and so on to a half dozen others; what would be said of us? It would be said, and justly too, that we were a man of no principles at all. Such a course would destroy the character of any man. Shall we believe then, that the Holy Spirit does that which would ruin the character of a man? Surely not. The converting power that converts men to Presbyterianism, Methodism, Baptism, &c., is not from heaven, not from the Holy Spirit at all. It is from men. It is human power, not divine power. Presbyterians put forth Presbyterian converting power, and all converted by it are converted to Presbyterianism. The Methodists put forth Methodist converting power, and all converted by it are converted to Methodism, and so on with all the others. These are different converting powers, or influences, as certainly as that the results are different, and as certainly human as that the isms to which they are converted are human and not to be ascribed to the Spirit of God at all. A man converted by any one of these human converting powers, to any one of these humanisms, needs converting to Christ just as much as a man of the world.

The gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one who believes. The preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God. When the gospel, the wisdom of God and the power of God to salvation to every one who believes, is preached by a man who is himself a Christian; has himself been turned to God by the preaching of the gospel, and men are converted, they are simply converted to Christ; to Christianity. They are the children of God; the people of God and nothing else. Christ is their leader and they aim to follow him.

The strange phenomena, such as jerks, barking, laughing, &c., had its origin in the Presbyterian church, as much the same phenomena did in the Episcopalian church in the time of the Wesleys, and seems to have been a kind of result of a reaction from the coldness, lifeless and utter dearth in devotion, in the Presbyterian church, in the one case, and of the Episcopalian in the other. In both cases the strange phenomena followed the reformers; but in the case in Kentucky those who rose among Presbyterians, soon advanced beyond the narrow limits of Presbyterianism, to the ancient gospel and primitive practice, when the strange phenomena entirely ceased to have any connection with them. They are now as good a people as we have in this country, have prospered and become strong, while the Presbyterians from whom they came have continued to dwindle away before them, till at present they do not number more than eight or nine thousand in the entire State. The Methodists, on the other hand, have never advanced any in light, and still, where they have any success, they have the same, or similar confusion and disorder as in the time of the Wesleys. At present Methodism appears to be enjoying a considerable slumber, or recess. How long it is to last, or whether the sleep is to be perpetual, is yet to be decided. It being a system of the world, is under the control of the world, and when any great movement or commotion of the world occurs, it
The Mission of John the Immerser.

Much has been written on this subject. I have not read a tithe of what has been written. Perhaps, if I had, I would not now add another page. Still, I think there is room for something to be said yet. What I may have to say may not be received, yet there may be some addition made to our stock of knowledge. But this depends on our present information. If no more, what may be said may serve a purpose in defining landmarks, which have not been very distinctly drawn in the minds of many readers of the divine record. What I propose to myself is to ascertain what was the design and purpose and limits of the mission on which John was sent. That he was a prophet sent by God, has been settled beyond all dispute by the Lord himself. His mission was a subject of prophecy by Isaiah and Malachi. The language of Isaiah, John himself quotes as applying to himself: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The language of Malachi, "I will send to you Elijah the prophet before that great and dreadful day of the Lord comes," was applied by Jesus to John the Baptist. The purpose of his mission the angel settles when quoting from Malachi: "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient by the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared (well disposed) for the Lord." Luke i. 17. When he appeared on the banks of the Jordan preaching and baptizing, thousands flocked to him to hear him preach, and to be baptized. The object in view, as stated, was to prepare a people for

The Lord, who should be made known to the nation through his baptism.

The first thing that strikes our attention in this mission, is the preparation of a people for the Lord. What does this mean? Evidently to make known to the people, the coming of one whose greatness and majesty John signified by saying, "One cometh after me mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry." A knowledge of the Jewish scriptures would have led them to suppose this person to be their Messiah. His character was well portrayed by John, when he said of him: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor; the wheat he will gather into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire. He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire."

This preparation of the people was to be effected by their repentance and baptism. Much has been written on this subject. I suppose this person to be their Messiah. His character was well portrayed by John, when he said of him: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor; the wheat he will gather into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire. He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire."

This preparation of the people was to be effected by their repentance and baptism, confessing their sins, through which they enjoyed the remission of their sins." This was a new proclamation to the Jewish people. They who had, for so many ages, offered on their altars the blood of animals as an atonement for their sins, now had the remission of sins preached to them through repentance and baptism. This proclamation by divine authority, virtually set aside the whole Jewish service—sacrifices and ordinances for sin, and introduced another method. The preaching, then, of John, although under the existing reign of Judaism, was no part of Judaism. As he was the harbinger of Christ, so was his mission the harbinger of Christianity.

But how was a people to be prepared for the Lord? Were they unprepared, and from what cause? They were unprepared because they had forsaken God, and gone away, following their own devices. They had left the word of God, and were following the traditions of the elders, and many were disbelievers of their own scriptures. The Sadducees had rejected all idea of a resurrection—disbelieved in the existence of spirit or angel; and the Pharisees, although still adhering to these truths, had 'made the word of God of none effect by
their traditions.” The terrible woes he pronounces against all the leading men of the nation, show to what an extent they had forsaken God, and were following their traditions and reason. They indeed needed to be converted again to God, that they might believe the scriptures he had given, and that they might recognize and believe in their Messiah when he should make his appearance. The Jew of the present day is laboring under the same blindness and unbelief, and so long as this is the case, they cannot be converted to Christ. If they disbelieve their own scriptures, which speak of their Messiah, how can they receive him, when he comes to them “attested by the law and the prophets?” Talk to a Jew now, and he will tell you he does not believe all that Moses wrote; nor any part of their writings which does not commend itself to their reason. They have thus become infidels, and must first be converted to Moses and their prophets before any hope can be entertained of their receiving Christ. In such a condition John found the Jewish people. They were puffed up by being regarded as the chosen people of God. But far otherwise was their estimate of God. He knew their hearts had gone away from him; and in this condition, that they would never receive his Son. He, therefore, before he sent his Son, sent his messenger John before his face to prepare the people to receive him. This preparation could be accomplished in no other way than by bringing the people back again to God, from whom they had wandered away in their hearts and lives. For if they had believed in God and in their sacred scriptures, in which was foretold to them the coming of their Messiah, and in which his character was so distinctly drawn as scarcely to allow of a mistake; had they examined their scriptures clearly, and the circumstances which should attend his birth, life, death and resurrection, which were so well defined, they would have been prepared in their minds and hearts, to have heard and examined the pretensions of any one claiming to be their promised Messiah. God, in his wisdom, saw that his son would be rejected by his people far more generally than he was, and he provided against this by sending a messenger before him, who would prepare the people for the coming of the Lord. To do this, John came preaching and saying, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” and “the axe lies at the root of the trees, and every tree which does not produce good fruit is to be cut down, and cast into the fire,” and no longer presume upon the favor of God because you are “the children of Abraham, for God is able to raise up children to Abraham of these stones.”

This announcement was calculated to startle the thoughtful and cause them to weigh the words of John with great care. There is no respect for persons; for all who do not produce fruits worthy of repentance are to be cut down and cast into the fire; for the axe now lies at the base of every tree, ready to execute the judgment of God. But what were the people to do? First, they are commanded to repent, as we have it in the common version, or reform, as in the manuscript, ἀριθμόνισμα. A vast deal has been written on the word, metanoia, here translated, repent; and on metamelomai, also translated repent, and by some regret. The decision appears to be as far off as ever. The difficulty arises from our own language, as we have no word which fully represents the meaning of metanoia. Our word, repent, by no means exhausts its meaning, and is therefore, an inadequate term to express all that was intended by the Greek. Its primary meaning (that is, of the Greek word,) is a change of mind. But our minds may be changed without a corresponding change in conduct. The word reform embraces the change in conduct. Now, as true repentance is always followed by a change of conduct, it would seem that this word would exactly meet the demands of the original. It would, if the original word embraced in its meaning a change of conduct, as well as a change of mind. Epistrepho expresses a
change of conduct; and as no change of
conduct takes place without a change of
mind, this ought to have been the word
used. But this could not have been done.
Neither the Greek nor the English would
have allowed it. Since the word reform em-
brates the idea of a change of conduct, it
cannot represent a word which has refer-
ence only to a change of mind. And
since our word repent does not exhaust the
Greek word, it cannot be a faithful repre-
sentative of the original. This difficulty
in the word has been felt by all who have
thought closely on the subject; and it has
been proposed to give a new or an additional
meaning to the word repent, in order that
it may meet this acknowledged want. It
has been proposed that we embrace in the
meaning of repent, a determination to do
better; and that, when we use the word, we
mean sorrow for past conduct, and a full
determination on our part to abandon such
course of life. In some places in the
scripture this is evidently the meaning of
the word. One instance may be sufficient.
Luke xvii. 3. “And if he trespass against
thee seven times in a day, and seven times
in a day turn again to thee and say I repent,
 thou shalt forgive him.”

But there are other passages in the scrip-
tures where this word occurs, which will
not allow this definition without obscuring
much of the force of the passage; and the
instance now under consideration is one of
them. It obscures because it does not ex-
haust the meaning of the original. Let us
paraphrase John’s proclamation by insert-
ing the definition for the word, and see how
far short it will fall from giving us the true
and full meaning of what he meant and in-
tended. “Repent of your sins and deter-
mine to live a better life; for the kingdom
of heaven is at hand.” The reason of this
change and determination of the mind
may be a hatred of our past life, or a
fear of its consequences. But I ask,
is this enough? Does this exhaust
John’s meaning? If we have been cor-
rect in what we have stated to have been
the object of his preaching, it is not. The
context has much to do in settling the
meaning of a word. But it is not the only
means we have of determining the use and
meaning of a word. There is another
source of light which ought not to be for-
gotten, that sheds more light frequently on
the meaning of words, than the connection
in which it may be used. Every science
and art has its technical words, which cannot
be understood by one unacquainted with
that science or art. Christianity has its
technicalities, and these cannot be fully ap-
prehended without a knowledge of Chris-
tianity as a system. The science or the
art, or the system, gives a shade of meaning
to a word which it has in no other connec-
tion. We must therefore expect the same
word to assume different shades of meaning
under different aspects of a subject, and
such a thing as uniformity of translation is
not possible in a book where the same great
system is presented under quite different as-
pects, and so diverse as to require a freer
use of the word than is warranted by its
primary signification. The general scope of
the subject also gives color to the meaning
of words, and this color cannot be seen unless
the general scope of the subject treated of
be grasped as a whole. Thus the mission
of John’s having certain great purposes in
view, which purposes stand in intimate con-
nection with others of a kindred nature
gives a meaning to the word metanoia, which
should harmonize with this object and pur-
pose; and a definition which does not har-
monize with the purpose of that mission,
must fail to be a correct representative of
the word used by the preacher.

As the object of the preacher was to turn
the people to God again, according to the
prophecy of Malachi and the words of the
angel to Zachariah, we would expect to find
some command in his preaching which em-
braced this object. This object, the word
translated repent, fully sets forth. If, then,
we paraphrase the proclamation in the light
of these facts, we have a fuller meaning for
the Greek than in our English repent.
Substituting the definition for the word, we
translate his proclamation thus: “Turn to
God, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.”

Now, the turning to God here meant reference to the state or condition of the soul—the mind and heart of man—which turns from its wanderings and alienation to God, in all the fervency of its energies, to love the Lord as the law commanded, “with all their heart, with all their soul, and mind and strength.” Thus turning to God in the mind and affections, confessing their sins and being baptized, they should enjoy the forgiveness of their sins, and thus be prepared to receive the Lord when he came, and to become his disciples. With this idea of turning to God, the rest of his preaching fully accords. For he says further to the multitude that came to his baptism, “the axe lies at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit is cut down”—every one who does not turn with his whole soul to God, confess his sins, be baptized, and produce fruits worthy of such a return to God, will be rejected by the Lord when he comes, and consumed by an “unquenchable fire,” for he will come with his “winnowing fan in his hand,” and he will gather such as produce good fruit around him to be his disciples, and those who will not, he will destroy with a terrible destruction.

For I indeed baptize you in order that you may turn to God and be accepted by him; but he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire; meaning by this, that those who would thus be ready to receive him, should, under Jesus’ reign, enjoy the fellowship of the Spirit, and those who would not, be destroyed; which happened at the overthrow of their city and temple and worship, and sent those wanderers a byword and hissing among all nations, who escaped the destruction that overtook that city, in the year 70, A. D. All this corroborates the idea intended to be conveyed in the command, repent, as interpreted in the light of all the facts. The author of the translation of a portion of the gospels which appeared in your paper during the past winter, translates the word metanoia, “amend your lives.” I recognized the author at once by this translation, a brother for whom I have the most ardent attachment. But this translation has the same objection to be urged against it, that the word reform has. There is but little difference between these translations; but that little difference is in favor of the former, and is more definite. But it also has reference to conduct, and not primarily to the state of the soul, which is indicated in the change the mind undergoes. I insist that the original word has no reference to conduct, only so far as the state of the soul expressed by it necessarily leads to a change in the conduct. The end in view is the life—the conduct of the person; but the means is a change first in his affections and mind—a turning about of his whole soul, carrying him from his alienation of mind and heart to a hearty embrace of God through his law and ordinances.

This return of the soul to God taking place, the people readily received immersion at his hands, and expected the advent of the Messiah according to his announcement; and through baptism, on a confession of their sins, they enjoyed the remission of these sins. But all those who would not thus turn to God, rejected his baptism; and their subsequent history, appearing here and there in the gospels, shows that their rejection of John resulted from the fact that they had rejected God by not turning to him, as John commanded. And such persons did not receive Christ when he came. Many of them, especially those high in position, piled him urgently with questions “to entrap him in his words,” and persecuted him whenever opportunity presented itself, and cast out of their synagogues all who did receive him. And the same men were foremost in every effort to destroy him; and when he was apprehended, they were jubilant and active in condemning him to death. The same persons continue their persecutions against the apostles and disciples after they began to preach in his name; and many of the same men were baptized by Jesus in fire, when he destroyed the city of Jerusalem by the army
of Titus. "For all the blood shed from the death of righteous Abel to the death of Zachariah shall be required of this generation."

The reason urged by John why they should now turn to God, was that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. The reason accords fully with the purpose of his mission; for he was urgent that all should be prepared to enter it, and enjoy the blessings of the new reign, under which there would be no respect for the persons of the Jews. This purpose was the main and principal object of his preaching and baptism, and as incidental thereto, the introduction of the Messiah to the whole nation in a public and miraculous manner. John knew not that his cousin, Jesus of Nazareth, was the true Messiah. He was confident that he was a most exemplary man, in whom he had never seen a fault. But he knew not his true origin. But God had told him, "upon whom you see the Spirit of God descending and abiding on him, the same is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit." In this way, John became a witness to Jesus, and this testimony every man on the banks of the Jordan at his baptism, had likewise. If they had believed John, they would have received Jesus. This was all the evidence that John had that he was the "Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world."

After Jesus was baptized, John continued his preaching and baptizing but a short time. He was soon cast into prison by Herod, and not long after that, he was beheaded. He said to the Jews when pointing them to Jesus, he must increase while I decrease. I must wane while he rises. I am but his messenger that has gone before him, and am not worthy to carry his sandals. The historian says, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum. From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. iv. 12, 17. John also says, (chap. iv. 1–3.) "When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples,) he left Judea," &c. From these passages, it would appear that, after John was imprisoned, Jesus took up his mission and preached the same proclamation: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And he not only preached this, but he also baptized; and what immersion could he have administered but that of John? The same command is proclaimed "turn to God," and the same reason given for it: "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He also sent seventy disciples out on the same mission. The proclamation had the same object in view as John's; and it was, to all intents and purposes, John's mission continued by Jesus and his disciples. In this way he made disciples for himself, and gathered around him disciples who became his almost constant followers. All were directed to the approaching reign of heaven, and urged to be prepared to receive it. But as Jesus was to be the reigning king of that kingdom, he more pointedly and particularly drew the attention of the people to himself by his teaching and miracles which were designed to confirm his teaching, as authorized by God. During his personal ministry he illustrated the principles on which the new administration would be conducted, by many parables. To a chosen few he explained more fully the character of his reign and the manner in which it should be brought about; how that he himself was the king, but should first suffer death at the hands of men, and afterwards he would be raised again the third day. He continued preaching the mission of John, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," until the close of his personal ministry. The "twilight" of John's mission went down in night at the death of Jesus; and the new day arose when Jesus left the tomb. The periods are distinctly separated by the death of Jesus. Here the mission, which granted forgiveness of sins through baptism on their return to God in
heart and mind, ended. It perished in the
death of Jesus, and knew no resurrection.
It belonged to the personal ministry of Je-
sus while on the earth, and while he, as a
"Son, learned obedience by the things he
suffered." When he arose from the dead
and ascended up on high, all authority in
heaven and earth was given into his hands,
and all the angels of heaven were command-
ed to fall down and worship him. He was
no longer that Man of Sorrows, who bore
such contempt from men; who never spoke
on his own authority, but only as he was
commanded by the Father; but was now a
glorious chieftain who had triumphed over
all his enemies, and was now constituted
Lord and King of the Universe. Hence-
forth, all things were to be done in his name
and by his authority. The kingdom of
heaven came when he was crowned its king
in the heavens, and an entirely new order of
things was established. What was author-
ized under previous ages was now annulled
or incorporated. He forgave sins while he
was on the earth by the simple declaration,
"your sins are forgiven," and by the immer-
sion which he preached. Now he forgives
sins as the constituted sovereign of the uni-
verse. Then he could say to the thief on
the cross: "This day you shall be with me
in paradise." Now he has commissioned
men to preach in his name, "repentance
and remission of sins" among all nations,
"baptizing them into the name of the Fath-
er, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The
proclamation which John preached in
the wilderness and along the banks of the
Jordan, and which Jesus preached over all
Judea during his personal ministry, is now
issued in the name of Jesus of Nazareth.
To the first proclamation no name was at-
tached; but now they are baptized into
the name of Father, Son and Holy Spir-
it. The command is still to repent—
turn to God—forsaking their alienation
of mind and heart and turn to God with all
their soul, and to be immersed that the same
blessings may follow the remissions of sins
and an entrance into the kingdom of heav-
en. Before his death and resurrection, all
who received John's or his baptism were
privileged to enter the kingdom of heaven;
and now all who believe in him and turn to
God, shall have the forgiveness of their
sins and entrance into the kingdom of heav-
en. Before, nothing was asked in his
name; now, all petitions are presented and
granted in his name. And as they were
commanded before to believe on him who
should come, faith in him who has come is
essential to their repentance and baptism.

All who had received him during his
ministry, and had become his disciples,
were now gathered into the Ekklesia—the
church. "The wheat he gathers into his
garner," and the chaff he will soon burn
with unquenchable fire.

It is an important question whether or no
those who had been baptized before his death,
were again baptized with Christian baptism
before they could be admitted into the king-
dom of heaven? We have no record that
they were. The presumption is strong, if
it is not positively certain, that they were
not again immersed. The apostles were not;
nor the rest of the one hundred and twenty
assembled in Jerusalem to await the prom-
ise of the Spirit. The five hundred, who
saw him at one time after his resurrection,
are called brethren by Paul. They were
regarded as brethren in the Lord.

But it is still more evident from the case
of the twelve brethren at Ephesus. Paul,
on going down to Ephesus, found certain
disciples there who had been baptized unto
John's baptism, and he commanded them
to be immersed by Christian baptism. This
is the only case of re-immersion recorded,
and the reason appears to be this: Apol-
los, who was powerful in speech, an elo-
quent man, came down to Ephesus and made
and baptized some disciples. But he knew
only the baptism of John, and consequent-
ly he immersed his disciples in John's bap-
tism. Priscilla and Aquila took him aside
and explained to him the gospel more accu-
rately. Paul, in commanding them to be
immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus,
recognized the baptism of John as valid un-
der his mission. But now, since Jesus was
crowned, and all authority was given into his hand, and everything was done in his name, it was no longer valid, and those who had been immersed by John's baptism after the resurrection had to submit to Christian immersion, before they could enjoy the blessings of Christ's reign.

It will be observed that the same means are announced by which men can be accepted by God, and that an additional blessing is added, the gift of the Holy Spirit. Peter says to the convicted multitude on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

The same word metanoia is here used by Peter. Its use here confirms the meaning given to the word in these pages. The persons who had cried out "men and brethren, what shall we do," were certainly convicted in their hearts on account of their sins, and were evidently anxious and determined to do whatever the apostle should command them. This was manifest in the fervency of their question, and Peter certainly meant something more than a sorrow for sin and a determination to do better, when he commanded them to repent. But their was no evidence before his mind that they had turned to God with all their soul, and therefore it was proper to enjoin on them in connection with the faith they thus had in the Lord Jesus, and baptism.

If I have succeeded in drawing the lines of distinction clearly between the mission of John and the full reign of the kingdom, and shown wherein the same principles are inculcated, with the same objects in view, I will have done what I intended when I sat down. The want of such distinctions is the source and cause of many errors in the world. When their is confusion of things that are distinct, there will be many errors, or many truths greatly obscured. I do not offer the reading of metanoia, here given as a substitute for our word repent. I have only endeavored to reach and express the thought that was intended in the use of the word.

Your brother,

H. C.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

FAITH—NO. III.

In previous articles, under the above heading, it has been shown, that faith is for all—for the people at large—the masses—high and low, rich and poor, bond and free—in one word, for all who are ever brought to God, or ever converted—all ever justified, are justified by faith—that "he who comes to God must believe"—that "without faith it is impossible to please God." This being shown, it has also been shown, that the precise thing to be believed—that the question, statement, proposition, or whatever it is that must be believed, must be tangible, clear and intelligible to those required to believe. The necessity of the case demands this. If salvation is by faith, and all saved at all, are justified by faith, and without faith it is impossible to please God, then all who come to God, must come by faith, and that which a man must believe, on pain of condemnation, must be of the clearest, most tangible and intelligible character. This has been shown to be the case. It has been shown that the statement to be believed, is that, Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. To believe, then, in the New Testament sense, is to accredit with all the heart, or most confidently, cheerfully and cordially, the truth, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. He who confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God. "Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." See John iv. 2, 3. "He who believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." See John v. 1. This shows that the figurative expression, "begotten of God," literally means, made a believer. "Begotten of God," is made a believer of God, or by God. It is simply, that God makes a believer. This brings us to the matter to be considered in this article,
240 THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN

**viz:** How does God make a believer? or how does God induce men to believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God? What are the means to be employed to make men believe? The question is not whether God makes men believers or not; all admit that he makes believers, but how does he do this?

In reference to this, there are two theories as antagonistical as is possible to conceive. One answers, by declaring that God makes believers by a direct power, or influence of his Spirit upon the soul. Those who advocate this theory some times say, that he employs the preacher and the word, but that the sinner is totally corrupt, or depraved, so that he can not believe or do any good thing, till he is quickened, or made alive by the direct influence of the Spirit. They maintain also, that the word is a dead letter, entirely lifeless and powerless, till it is quickened, or made alive, by the direct influence of the Spirit. At other times they maintain that God makes believers by the direct power or influence of the Spirit, without the word, independent of, and separate from the word. In both cases, it is maintained that the sinner can no more believe than he can make a world, till he has this direct influence or operation of the Spirit. These all agree, in the end, that faith comes by a direct influence of the Spirit, and without this there can be no faith, either with or without the word. Another class answer the question, how does God make believers? by declaring, that he does it through the word, or the gospel—that what man must believe is declared to him in the gospel, by credible witnesses, and that man can believe it, without any miraculous power, or direct influence of the Spirit, to quicken him or the word. How is this question to be settled? How shall we determine how God makes believers? There is one way that is infallibly safe, and that is to institute a regular induction of all that can be found bearing upon the subject in the New Testament. If men were made believers by a direct influence of the Spirit, we shall find an account of it; or if the Lord made them believers by some other means, we shall find an account of that. We must start out as if we knew nothing about it and search in the oracles of God to learn all about it.

1. Isaiah says, "By hearing you shall hear, and shall not understood; and seeing you shall see, and shall not perceive; for this people’s heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." See Matt. xiii. 14, 15. On this language, the Lord makes the following remark: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear." Jesus introduces the language just quoted as follows: "Therefore speak I to them in parables; because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand, and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah."

The following things should be observed in considering this important language from the Lord and the prophet:

1. That Dr. Conant, in the revised version, as published by the Bible Union, instead of "should be converted," has given us, should turn. They were to do four things themselves, and the Lord was to do one thing for them. 1. They were to see with their eyes. 2. Hear with their ears.
2. Understand with their hearts. 4. Turn. The one thing the Lord was to do for them, was to heal them.

2. It is a fact then, that the eyes have something to do in coming to God to be healed. That something, which the eyes have to do, is simply to see—"see with their eyes."

3. It is equally true that the ears have an office to perform. The persons must "hear with their ears."

4. The heart also performs an office. The persons to be saved, must "understand with their hearts."

5. Seeing with the eyes, hearing with the ears and understanding with the heart,
are voluntary. Men can close their eyes, as the Savior said the Jews had done, stop their ears, as the Jews did when the martyr Stephen was preaching to them, and darken their understanding.

6. The act of turning is also voluntary. A man can turn, or refuse to turn. This involves responsibility.

7. The Lord so states the case, as to show their wicked design in the voluntary acts, of closing the eyes, &c. He shows that they had a design, or purpose, in closing their eyes, &c. Why did they close their eyes? The Lord replies, "lest they should see with their eyes." Why did they make their ears dull? Lest they should hear with their ears. Why did they darken their understanding? Lest they should understand with their heart. Why did they not turn? Lest the Lord should heal them. Or to put it all together, in the Lord's own words, "lest they should see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts, and should turn, and I should heal them."

8. The eyes and ears have nothing to do with a direct influence of the Spirit, for it can neither be seen nor heard.

II. In explaining the parable of the sower, the Lord shows that the seed represents "the word of the kingdom." The word then, is the seed of the kingdom, from which faith springs. Without the seed, most indisputably, there is no grain. When Paul plants, Apollos waters and God gives the increase, we may expect the product; but certainly no sensible man ever thought that God would give an increase without any seed sown. Most assuredly then, where the seed of the kingdom, the word of God, is not sown, there is no faith. This is not only shown to be true by the parable in review, but by grave matter of fact. Not a case has ever been found where a human being became a believer in Christ who never heard or knew anything of the word of God, or the word of the gospel. Thousands of times have men been challenged to produce a single instance of one soul believing on Christ without the word of the gospel, or who knew nothing of the word. An instance has never been produced. The Lord says, "The seed is the word of God." Let that then, be set down in the mind first, that the seed from which faith proceeds, or from which the Christian springs, "is the word of God," and where the seed is not sown, or the word of the Lord is not in some way made known, there is no faith, or none turned to the Lord. The next thing to be considered is what the Lord means by the different kinds of ground:

1. The wayside ground. The wayside ground represents a certain kind of hearer. He is the man who hears the word, but does not understand it. He is not the man who has some "common operation of the Spirit," which the devil straightway catches away, or endeavors to counteract in some other way. He is a man who has heard the word, but, being the poorest class of hearers does not understand it; and even in that case, the devil sees prospect enough of good to be aroused and make an effort to counteract the good about being accomplished. The Lord says, "then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." In another place, we find a fuller report, as follows: "Then cometh the devil and catcheth away the word out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved." This shows that the word is preached, and thus sown in the heart, that the man may believe and be saved. The adversary, to counteract this, caught away the word out of the heart. As soon as this is done, there is an end to all idea of faith. Catching away the word out of the heart, would not prevent men from believing, if faith were imparted by a direct influence of the Spirit. Faith could certainly be imparted by a direct influence of the Spirit, if that were the medium through which men are made believers, without the word.

2. The stony ground. This represents the man who hears the word, joyfully receives it, but soon finds that he will have to suffer persecution because of the word, and he becomes offended and abandons the word.
This is an end to all faith and all religion, on his part.

3. The thorny ground. This represents the man who receives the word, but the cares of the world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word of God, and he becomes unfruitful. Thus again, it is seen, that whatever drives the word of God out of the mind, destroys faith and all piety. No direct influence of the Spirit will give a man faith, when once the word of God is out of his heart.

4. The good ground. This represents the man who receives the word into an honest and a good heart, understands it and brings forth fruit, or obeys it. The commencement of the work is in receiving the word of God into a good and honest heart, and understanding it. Without receiving the word into a good and honest heart, and understanding it, there is no faith, no obedience, and consequently no turning to God. The Lord divides this good ground into three classes, thus showing that all the hearers are not upon the one common level of total depravity, but that there is good, better and best. Some of the good ground produces thirty fold. That is good. Some of it produces sixty fold, That is better. Some of it produces an hundred fold. That is best. The thorny ground is bad. The stony ground is worse. The wayside is worst. We thus find six classes: good, better and best; bad, worse and worst. Paul makes the same classification under a different figure, where he compares persons that may be introduced into the church, to the different kinds of material that may be put into a building, as gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. Gold, silver and precious stones are good material. Wood, hay, and stubble are bad material. Precious stones are good material. Silver is better, and gold is best. Wood is bad material to be put into a building to be tried by fire. Hay is worse, and stubble is worst. This gives us the same as the Savior has in the parable of the sower, six classes. The Lord uses the same means to make believers in all cases. He sows the same seed on all the different kinds of ground—the word of God. The reason it grows in some instances and not in others, is that the ground is better in some instances than in others. Some ground is so bad that no seed, however good it may be, will grow in it. The seed cannot grow by the wayside, on stony ground, or among thorns. It can only grow on ground—in a good and honest heart, that understands it. Here it brings forth fruit to the honor and glory of God.

THE CONTRAST,

Between the spirit of the friends and enemies of Christ, as illustrated in the history of Stephen, the first Christian martyr. A practical matter-of-fact argument in favor of Christianity.

NO. II.

Having noticed in a former No. the arraignment of Stephen, and the charges brought against him, in this number it is proposed to notice his defense and the sequel. In this we shall see the spirit of Stephen, and that of his opposers in contrast. In the original indictment, there were two charges: 1. Speaking blasphemous words against Moses; and 2. Against God. The charge, however, was blasphemy in both cases, and the offence charged was one demanding capital punishment. But as Stephen's defense was cut short by the violence of his enemies, we cannot appreciate its design and application as we could have done had he been permitted to finish it. Doubtless his design was, not only to vindicate himself against the foul charge of blasphemy, but like Peter on Pentecost and at Solomon's porch, to convict his audience of sin in betraying and murdering the Just One, that they might be led to repentance and be saved. The first preachers had but one grand and all absorbing theme, which was Christ and him crucified. They preach-
ed not, themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and themselves his servants for Jesus' sake. Their personal care, honor, will, everything was made subordinate to the cause of the Master. If they spoke in their own defense, it was only that they might the more effectually and successfully defend and honor Christ. They counted all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Lord, for whom they had suffered the loss of all things, and did count them but refuse, that they might win Christ. With these general remarks, let us glance at the principal points in Stephen's defence.

He takes up the history of their nation, and gives a most graphic outline of it from the calling of Abraham to the time of the Messiah. He speaks of the sojourning of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the land of Canaan, which God had promised to their seed; of the covenant of circumcision which God gave to Abraham; the envy of the Patriarchs of their brother Joseph, resulting in his being sold as a slave in Egypt; of God's wonderful providence in regard to Joseph, giving him favor in the eyes of Pharaoh, so that he made him ruler over his household, and next in authority to himself; of the seven years famine, which came over all the land of Egypt and Canaan; of the ample provisions which had been made in Egypt to meet the dearth of which Jacob had heard; of his sending his sons into Egypt to procure sustenance; of Joseph's being made known to his brethren upon their second visit; of Joseph's making known his kindred to Pharaoh; of Joseph's sending for his father and all his kindred, three score and fifteen souls; of the death of Jacob in Egypt; of the subsequent multiplication of God's people in Egypt, until a new king arose who knew not Joseph, and considered not the obligations the nation was under to him for its preservation and prosperity; of his exposing the young children of the Hebrews to death, lest their great strength might, in time, endanger the stability of the throne of Pharaoh; of the birth of Moses, while this cruel decree of Phara- oh was in force; of his exposure at the age of three months; of his being found and cared for by the daughter of the very king who had decreed he should die; of his being brought up as the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; of its coming into his heart at the age of 40 to visit his brethren, the children of Israel; of his seeing one of his brethren wrongfully treated, and taking his part, he slew the Egyptian, his oppressor; supposing that his brethren would have understood that God purposed by his hand to deliver them—but they understood it not; of his attempting the next day to reconcile two of his brethren who were in conflict, saying, sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another? But he who did his neighbor wrong, who was the aggressor, spurned the mediation of Moses, and said wilt thou kill me, as thou didst the Egyptian yesterday? of the fleeing of Moses into the land of Midian, where he had two sons; of the angel of the Lord appearing to him, at the end of forty years, in a flame of fire in a bush; of God's speaking to him out of the bush, saying: I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob: I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people, and am come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt. This Moses, says Stephen, whom our fathers refused, saying, who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the angel, which appeared to him in the bush. By this Moses, did God deliver his people from the bondage of Egypt, and brought them into the promised land, after he had showed wonders and signs in the land of Egypt and in the Red sea, and in the wilderness forty years. This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he that was with the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in Mt. Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us:
whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them; and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt, saying unto Aaron, make us gods to go before us; for as for this Moses which brought us out of the land of Egypt, we know not what has become of him. He then speaks of their subsequent idolatry in worshipping the golden calf which Aaron had made; of God giving them up to worship the host of heaven; of their captivity in Babylon, on account of their idolatry; of David’s purpose to build a house for the Lord: but Solomon built it by the command of God. But God is not confined to houses made with hands. Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: What house will ye build me? saith the Lord,—or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things? What follows in this chap. from the 51st to the conclusion, is a severe rebuke of the Jews for resisting the Holy Spirit as their fathers did, and their great wickedness, in putting Christ to death, as their fathers had put the prophets to death, together with Stephen’s dying prayer for himself and murderers. We may safely conclude that, in his defence, the martyr proposed to accomplish these three ends:

I. To prove that he had not spoken blasphemous words against Moses, and against God.

II. That Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and Savior of sinners. And

III. Thus convict his hearers of sin, fearful sin, and convert or turn them to God, that they may be saved.

I. As to the first of these objects, his accurate outline of the history of God’s people, according to the Jewish scriptures is proof that he reverenced the sacred writings, and the God who inspired them, and Moses the lawgiver of Israel, who wrote the five books of the law, or the Pentateuch. His frequent references to Moses, and to God’s wonderful providences in preserving him, and having him trained up in the very palace of the king, who sought and decreed his death; to be the instrument of the salvation of that nation, which the kingsought to crush; and to be the instrument of the destruction of that king who had decreed his death. These are, it seems to me, most conclusive proofs, that he had not spoken a disrespectful much less a blasphemous word either against Moses, or the God of Moses. He showed, that while he had never spoken a word that could, by any possibility, be construed into blasphemy against Moses or God, that the Jewish people, in various periods of their history, notwithstanding all God’s wonderful interposition in their behalf, had turned their backs upon Moses their lawgiver, and Jehovah their God, and had been guilty of the most fearful, practical blasphemy against both Moses and God, in making and worshiping idols; and that God had punished them terribly for their wickedness.

II. As to the second object, he shows his hearers that Moses their great lawgiver and prophet had written and spoken of Christ; had represented himself as a type of Christ. A prophet, said the great and blessed Moses, shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall you hear in all things. Now then they must believe in Christ, or, to be consistent, reject Moses. Jesus said to the Jews, if you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me. So Stephen’s hearers were shut up to the necessity of receiving Christ or rejecting Moses. Moses was sent to save Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh; Christ was sent to save a world from the infinitely more fearful bondage of sin and death. Moses, to prove his divine mission as the Savior of Israel, performed a great variety of miracles. So Christ: The miracles of Moses were performed that the Israelites might believe on him as their Savior. So the miracles of Christ: Believing in Moses they forsook Egypt and their taskmasters, and followed Moses. So sinners, believing in Christ, forsook their sins, abandon the service of the devil, and resolve to follow Christ. The Jews were, upon their believing in Moses as their Savior, baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the Red Sea; whereupon they were saved
from their enemies, their former oppressors. So the sinner, upon his believing in Christ and confessing his name, is baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit; whereupon his sins are washed away in the Red sea of the Savior's blood. As the literal enemies of Israel were drowned literally in the Red sea; so in the baptism of a true penitent, with a new heart, his spiritual enemies are figuratively drowned, or washed away. When the Jews were baptized into Moses, they became Moses disciples, and were bound to hear him in all things, as the lawgiver of the Jews. So they who are baptized into Christ become his disciples, and are bound to observe all things, whatsoever Christ commands. But we have no room to trace these beautiful and highly instructive analogies any further here.

The proof then of his second proposition is clearly made out; the hearers of Stephen must succumb and accept Christ, or resist the Holy Spirit as their fathers had done. Stephen, I judge, could see from their countenances, they had little idea of yielding. He is therefore moved to try the result of severe reproof. Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit, as your fathers did, so also do ye. He proceeds to show how their fathers and they both resisted the Holy Spirit. They resisted it by refusing to hear the prophets, and by putting them to death. You resist the Holy Spirit in that you crucified the Lord of glory, and refuse to hear his instructions. You accuse me, as if Stephen had said, of speaking against Moses, and yet, though you have received the law through ranks of angels, you have not kept it.

We have now reached the culminating point of this controversy. So far as argument is concerned, Stephen is perfectly triumphant. His enemies feel it; they are silent, but full almost to bursting with rage. Logically they are defeated, but Stephen is their prisoner, and they are determined to try upon him the logic of stones, and beat out his brains, and thus rid themselves of a troublesome opponent. When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. But he being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and said, behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. Then they cried with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen calling upon God and saying Lord Jesus receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep. Here we have presented in perfect contrast, the anti-christian and the Christian spirit. The one infuriating its victims with rage, culminating in a most savage murder; the other inspiring Stephen with the calmness and serenity of Christian faith, hope and love, enabling him to commend his spirit to Jesus, his divine Master, whom he loved and served, and for whose sake he was giving up his life; and culminating in a prayer, (the last words he ever uttered,) for his murderers: Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. Stephen was killed and his enemies survived; but who was the true victor in this controversy? Stephen, unequivocally. He lost his life, but he has kept its life eternal. They saved their lives, but all of them, who failed to repent, are lost forever—they shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them. Stephen's name is first upon the list of Christian martyrs; his enemies among the first upon the list of murderers. I trust that none of us will be called upon to die, as did Stephen, by violence; that we may have the happiness of dying, and inspired by the hope of heaven, as he was commending our spirits to the Master, and breathing out a prayer for the salvation of sinners.—Amen. John Rogers, Carlisle, July 11th, 1862.
THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS.
NUMBER THREE.

BY ELDER JACOB CREATH, OF PALMYRA, MO.

"And it is not for them only that I pray, but also for them who shall believe in me through their discourse; that they all may be one; as thou my Father art in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in me; so that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one. I in them and thou in me; that they may be perfect even as we are in thee; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and that thou hast loved them as also thou hast loved me. Father I desire that those whom thou hast given me may also be with me; here I am; that they may see the glory of mine which thou hast given me, as thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. My righteous Father the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee and these have known that thou didst send me. I have made known to them thy name; as I will make known to them so that the love with which I lovedst me may be in them and I in them." John xvi. 21-24.

The intercessory prayer of our Saviour Jesus Christ for the unity, co-operation and glorification of Christians, who should believe on him through the testimony, teaching, or word of the apostles.

This prayer is naturally divided into three divisions. In the first six verses he prays for himself. From the sixth to the twentieth inclusive, he prays for the apostles; from the twentieth verse to the twenty-sixth, for all Christians, who believe on him through the apostle’s discourse. Three plans of union have been tried to unite the people of God. The first plan tried by the man of sin was to force all men to think as he did—to be of the same opinion; to measure all men by the iron bedstead of Procrustes. Those who were too short must be stretched to the full length of the bedstead, and those that were too long must be sawed off, so as to have them all the same length. To accomplish this desirable end, he used reason, fire, faggot, and all manner of cruelties. The effect of this plan was, he made some hypocrites, some apostates, some refugees, and many martyrs. He filled the world with war, blood and misery, and turned Christendom into a shamble or slaughter-house. Thus much for the first plan of union. The second plan of union is the one the protestant sects have been trying since the Lutheran Reformation.

They say thus: we will not receive each sect at all to any Christian communion, yet we will obtain the same end, the glory of God, by another way as good. Since we are of this opinion, you of that opinion, you make you one church of Christ, and we will make us another church of Christ, or a branch of that church; and brethren A, B, and C, will make them other branches of the same church, and we will have no fellowship with each. We will not receive you, nor do we wish to be received by you; yet we will live in love and peace, and see you can get to heaven by the shortest route. But it is horrible thus to divide the body of Christ. Nothing can be more contrary to the nature and design of the gospel than such divisions. For, as Christ is but one head, he never designed to have but one church. On this principle, however, we may not only have five churches, but five hundred or five thousand churches. For some dissatisfied member of these five branches may say, we disagree with you; we will have us a branch or a subdivision as necessary as the first branch, and on this principle all the same arguments are offered for the five hundred churches, that were offered for the first, and so on, ad infinitum. If difference of opinion will justify us in making new sects or churches, by carrying out that principle it will come to pass at last, that there will not be any two members of the same sect; for if all things relating to Christianity were to be canvassed, there are not any two men in the world of the same opinion in all things. If all Christians are to sit down and canvass every verse in the Bible, and have the same opinion about each verse before they can fellowship each other, then no two Christians will ever fellowship each other. There has always been a variety of religious opinions, and there always will be, and no force can prevent it. But there is no necessity for having as many churches as opinions. This converts the church of Jesus Christ into a rope of sand. If there was now but one communion as there was at first, the present strifes and janglings would quickly cease.
The arguments, the scriptural arguments against such a state of things—against
the present exhibition of Christianity throughout Christendom—are these: It is at war
with this prayer of the Lord Jesus Christ, the blessed Son of God. It is in the face of
it; it is in defiance of it; it is casting this prayer behind our backs; it is trampling it
under our feet; while we say, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I pray for,
which I command you to do. The present state of religious society is in direct viola-
tion of the following passages of Holy Writ. Roms. xv. 5, 6, 7. “And may the
God of patience and consolation grant you to think in harmony one with another, in Je-
sus Messiah; so that with one mind and one mouth you may glorify God, the Father of
our Lord Jesus Messiah. Wherefore, receive you and bear up one another, as also
Messiah received you to the glory of God.”

Secondly, Paul prayed the Corinthians not to admit of such a state of things. 1 Cor.
1-10. “And I beseech you, my brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah,
that to you all there may be one language; and that there may be no divisions among
you; but that you may become perfectly of one mind, and of one way of thinking.”

Thirdly, Paul exhorted the Christians at Rome to avoid all such as plead for such a
state of things. Roms. xvi. 17, 18, 19. “And I beseech you, my brethren, that you
beware of them who cause divisions and stumblings among you, aside from the doc-
trine which you have learned: and that you stand aloof from them. For they who are
such do not serve our Lord Jesus Messiah, but their own belly: and by bland speeches
and good wishes they beguile the hearts of the simple.” (Syriac translation.) But
your obedience is known to everyone. Where Christianity is in this divided state,
it is next to a dissolution or annihilation altogether. Fourthly, Paul says, “They who
perpetuate these things, such as divisions and discords, do not inherit the kingdom of
God, and all the like things as drunkenness, murder and revellings.” Galatians v. 20,
21. Fifthly, our Savior says a family or kingdom divided against itself cannot stand.
He says if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself: how then doth his king-
dom stand?” Matt. xii. 23, 26, 27. I wish the professed people of God were as united
as the devil’s people.

“O shame to men! devil with devil damned!
Firm coward, hold! men only disagree
Of creatures rational; though under hope
Of heavenly grace, and God proclaiming peace,
Yet live in hate, envy and strife
Among themselves, and level cruel war—
Wasting the earth each other to destroy.”

[Milton.]

The defenders of this plan say we may live in peace, though we renounce each oth-
er communion in religion. We see by three hundred years experience that this is
not practicable. Look at the heartburnings, hatred, emulations and bitter zeal which
the parties do always show against each other. Sixthly, the present divided state of
religious society is positively contrary to that new commandment of love which our
Savior has so emphatically and so repeatedly enjoined on his followers, in the 13th,
14th, 15th and 16th chapters of John’s gospel, and which the apostles have incul-
cated with equal earnestness in their writings, as greater than faith and hope which
pardons a multitude of sins, and which is the golden key that unlocks the palace of
eternity. Christ commands his people to live in peace, and to love as brethren. The
present state of religious society is therefore at war with the letter and spirit of the
gospel, and with all the above plain and Christian precepts—and is insufficient and
ought to be abandoned by Christian people.

The heathen cities that worshipped sev-
eral gods, would sometimes make a league of peace and say: do you worship your god,
and we will worship our god, without meddling with one another’s religion. This in-
tercommunity of the worship of different
gods, was very popular in ancient as well
as in modern times. But it is horrible so
to divide the congregations of Jesus Christ.
There are three classes of persons to blame
it nothing for puny mortals to throw off
the government of the Majesty of heaven
and earth, and institute laws, ordinances
and governments of their own? Is the
God of heaven the only one who will pass
over such offences with impunity? It is
unquestionable, that as protestant parties,
we have various things in our ecclesiastical
establishments which cannot be defended
on the pure principles of the gospel of the
Son of God. It is very true, that the
church of Rome is Babylon the Great and
the mother of harlots, and abominations of
the earth. But have no other churches
copied her example? But have no other
people taken deep and intoxicating sips,
from that golden and cercean cup, where-
withal she bewitched all the nations of the
earth? Can there be a mother and no chil-
dren? Who are the children of this meri-
tricious old lady? It is a question of some
magnitude, whether there is the most sin,
mischief and danger in these various here-
sies, tenets and opinions, to the souls of
men, or in the divisions, separations, ex-
communications and renunciations of each
others communion? Which has been the
most ruinous to the souls of men—the
Greatest stumbling block to the ungodly?
Those denominations who have no articles
of subscription, or the fewest, who are the
best fitted and prepared to obey the apos-
tolic injunction, "Wherefore, receive you
one another, as Christ also hath received
you to the glory of God." Roms. xv. 7.
(Wesley's translation.) All the apostolic
congregations were one or united in belief
and practice, externally. This unity was
based upon the facts of the New Testament
and obedience to these facts. There was an
external or constitutional unity. They had
one constitution, the New Testament; they
had one legislator, Jesus Christ; one king-
dom or church. They were internally
united in love, affection, the truth. Truth, union,
love, peace—all these are indispensable to
the accomplishment of the prayer. The
first division was not on account of doctrines
of faith, but undue attachment to leaders,
Paul, Apollos, Cephas. The pride and am-
for the present divided state of religious
society. The first class of persons who are
culpable are those who originated these di-
visions. And it would be easy to show
from history that these sects originated in
the worst passions of the human heart, such
as lust, politics, blood, ambition and war;
and they bear the deep impress of the coun-
tries, the individuals and circumstances un-
der which they spring into existence. The
second class of persons to blame for these
parties in religion, are those who have per-
petuated and transmitted them to us. The
third class of persons to blame for these
unhallowed sects and antichristian hierarch-
ies, are those who now defend and main-
tain them against light and knowledge—who
thereby serve their own appetites, pride, in-
terest and ambition.

God, in dealing with men, treats them in
the connection in which they are found—
deals with them according to the company
they are found in. Witness the Antidelu-
vians, Sodom and Gomorrah, Korah, Da-
than and Abiram—the Canaanites, Ishmael-
ites, Amelekites and others. A man may
be a very respectable private character in-
dividually; but if found in company with
counterfeiters and murderers, he will be
treated as such. Men act in the same way;
they treat men in the same way.

Some of the Popes of Rome may have
been very respectable characters in the
course of ages. But, because they stood at
the head of the grand rebellion or apostasy
from the pure gospel of Christ, they will go
into perdition. And if the church of
Rome, which certainly stands at the head
of the grand rebellion of 1260 years dura-
tion, shall sooner or later go into perdition,
will not all other churches, of whatever de-
nomination, whether established, tolerated
or persecuted, which partake of the same
spirit of rebellion, or have instituted doc-
trines and ceremonies inimical to the pure
and unadulterated gospel of Christ, share
in the fate of that immense fabric of human
ordinances and abominations? What is to
hinder them? See how rebellion against
human governments is dealt with. And is
bition of leaders fostered, matured and widened the breach. See Rome and Constantinople, or Constantine's city—the Greek and western Roman church. All who assist in healing the present breaches in Christendom, render most acceptable service to the Christian religion, and the salvation of men's souls. Happy are the pacificators said the great Master of assemblies. There is a milestone of guilt attached to all those who hinder, divide, or break the unity of Christ's church. There is no one thing that is oftener commanded, inculcated, and prayed for by Christ and his apostles, than the unity of Christians. On the other hand, no sin is more surely forbidden, none that is represented more mischievous, none more terribly threatened, than divisions and whatever breaks the unity of the church. J. CREATH.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION,
NO. XIII.

FAITH NO. IV.

Having clearly determined that the great foundation truth, that "Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God," is that which must be believed; and that to accredit this with all the heart, or to accredit this cheerfully, cordially and freely, is to believe, in the New Testament sense, and, still farther, demonstrated that "the seed is the word of God," from which faith comes, and that where there is no word of God, there is no faith, the present paper will be a still farther effort to set forth the scripture teaching showing how men are made believers. We have seen that the Lord has anticipated and clearly intimated how persons are made believers in the parable of the sower. Let us then proceed with the argument.

I. In the Lord's last public prayer before he left the world, he prays for the believers, and in doing so, he apparently incidentally makes a clear statement showing how faith comes. He says, "I pray not for these alone, (the apostles,) but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." If there are believers who were made such by some other means than "through their word," the Lord did not include them in this prayer. But this is not the case. There are no believers on him who do not believe through their word. He aimed to pray for all the believers and did pray for them, and includes them all, when he prays for them also who shall believe on him through their word.

II. The apostle John says, in giving us his object in writing his gospel, as it is generally styled, "Many other signs did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, but these are written that you might believe." This book contains a record of his testimony, as a witness of Jesus, and he declares his object, in writing it, or recording it, to be that the reader might believe. This shows, beyond all dispute, that testimony, in written words, was deemed necessary, as the means through which man is enabled to believe, or might believe, by the inspired apostle John. When he says, "these were written that you might believe," it is implied that men could not believe without testimony, in some way conveyed to the mind, and this is done that they might believe, or have the privilege of believing.

There are two parts in faith; a human and a divine part; or what God does, on the one hand, and what man does on the other. The Lord gives the truth to be believed, and the testimony, or means of conveying it to the mind and rendering it credible. Hearing the truth, considering the testimony, accrediting or believing it, is the human part, or what man does. Here is wherein the will has much to do with believing. The hearing must be secured, or no faith can be produced. The most sublime and important truth ever uttered, accompanied by the best testimony in the world, never made and never can make a believer of a
man who will not hear or consider the testimony. No truth can have any force on the mind till heard and considered. Persons can refuse to hear, or consider, and thus prevent the truth from having any force on the mind; or, having heard, and even considered, they can be blinded or prejudiced by sin, so as to act the most unreasonable and unfair part, in deciding both in reference to the truth, and the testimony sustaining it. Here is precisely where human accountability is incurred. The gospel of Christ is placed before the world, challenging the credulity of mankind. The matter is of sufficient importance to demand attention, in any way a man can look at it. If a man closes his eyes and refuses to see the most important matter ever brought to the vision of mortals, stops his ears and refuses to hear the most astounding things ever heard; darkens his understanding, thus failing to understand the most stupendous and wonderful things ever brought before the world; he is, in so doing, incurring as great guilt as is possible for man to incur; and it was in view of this that the Lord said, "He who believes not shall be damned." The fact that the Lord has given eyes to see, ears to hear, a mind to understand, and a judgment to determine, involves guilt, if we do not see, hear, understand, and decide in reference to the matters the Lord has placed before us.

III. The apostle Peter says, "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." If there were not another expression in the Bible, showing now men were to be made believers, this one should settle the question. If we should find one clear expression in scripture, stating that "God made choice that the Gentiles by a direct operation of the Spirit should believe," it would settle the entire question; but there is no such passage, or anything equivalent, nor can there be consistently, so long as the apostles language declares, that "God made choice that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe." Every attempt made to show that faith comes in some other way, than by the word, or that the faith that comes by the word is not the true faith, not sufficient and that man must have something more, to constitute the justifying faith, is an attempt to depreciate the Lord's own plan, maintain that it is insufficient and bring it into disrepute before the world. An attempt of this kind, is an attempt to set aside the clearest teaching of the word of the Lord, for the vagaries of men; to set aside the Lord's own method of making believers, and substituting a human method; to set aside the only true faith, which comes from the word of the Lord—the gospel of the grace of God—and substituting a poor weak human imagination, arising from a vague impression that we have experienced a direct influence of the Spirit, and thus been made a believer. But what do those believe, who claim thus to have been made believers? Can they tell what they believe? Not one in a thousand of them. Why not? Because, in reality they do not believe anything. They are not believers at all. They are simply deceived. The sum of the matter is, that they having been, it may be, drawing upon their imagination for days, and looking for a direct impression, have imagined that they have experienced one. They have felt an impression. This they call faith. But ask the man the next hour what he believes, and he cannot tell you. He can tell what he felt and how he felt, but no matter if it is all true, it is not faith. The man is deceived and induced to call that faith, which is not faith at all, and to repudiate that which really is faith, as no faith at all. There can be no worse deception than this. Mormonism is not a worse delusion.

IV. Let us hear Paul, on the question, how does faith come? He answers, "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." If it be true, as here asserted, that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God, it does not come by seeing, feeling, or a direct impression of the Spirit without words. But the apostle was not content to state, by apostolic authority, how
faith comes, but he gives us some very plain reasoning upon it. He quotes the language of the prophet Joel, "And it shall come to pass that whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." He then proceeds as follows: "But how shall they call on him on whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how can they hear without a preacher? and how can he preach except he be sent?"

The reasoning amounts to this: If the preacher had not been sent by the Lord, he could not have preached the word; had he not preached the word, men could not have heard; if they had not heard, they could not have believed; if they had not believed, they could not have called on the name of the Lord; and if they had not called on the name of the Lord, they could not have been saved. The apostles were called and sent that men might hear the gospel. The object of their hearing was that they might believe. Their believing was that they might call on the name of the Lord. The design of their calling on the name of the Lord was that they might be saved.

V. We are said to be begotten by the word. The literal import of this is, that we are made believers by the word. This will now be shown by introducing several passages where the expression occurs. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." This is not an incidental expression, in relation to how a few are begotten, but a general expression, telling how all are begotten of God—that it is with, or by the word of truth. See Jas. i. 13. Peter says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever." 1 Pet. i. 23. The word, born, here, is from the original word, ἀναγέννησις, translated begotten, 1 Pet. i. 3, and should be so translated in the passage just quoted. In these passages we have the expression, begotten by the word. In the letter of Paul to Philemon, verse 10, we have the following: "My son Onesimus whom I have begotten in my bonds." In this case, Onesimus is said to be begotten by the apostle. Paul says, to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. iv. 15, "I have begotten you through the gospel." Here the begetting is ascribed to the apostle, and, at the same time, said to be "through the gospel." We are said to be "born (or begotten) of the Spirit," John iii. 8, and "born (or begotten) of God," 1 John v. 1. Thus it is seen that the same result is ascribed to four causes, or whatever is meant by the figurative expression, begotten, is ascribed to God in some instances, in others to the Spirit, again to the apostle and lastly, to the word. How is this to be harmonized? It is ascribed to God as the author, the Holy Spirit as the agent, the apostle as an under agent and the word the instrument. The begetting in all these cases is the same, and the manner in which it is accomplished is the same. It is not that one man is begotten of God, another of the Spirit, another by the apostle and another by the word, but every one begotten at all, is begotten of God, by the Holy Spirit, by the apostle and by the word. The word is from God, given by the Holy Spirit, through the apostle, and the result of it, when received into a good and honest heart, is that the person is begotten of God, by the Spirit, the preacher who proclaimed the word, and by the word, or, in literal language, the person is made a believer, by God himself, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, who was in the apostle and spoke through him by the apostle, who preached the gospel, and by the gospel, or the word, when preached. The begetting is the same in all cases, no matter whether ascribed to God, the Spirit, the apostle, or the word. No man is begotten by the Spirit without God, the apostle and the word; nor is any one begotten by God, without the Spirit, the apostle and the word. When the apostle said, "I have begotten you through the gospel," the amount of it is, I have made you believe through the gospel. Making believers is the work of God. It is done by him; but he does it by his Holy Spirit, as his agent, who inspired the apostles and spoke through them; and he does it by the apostles, as agents under the Spir-
it, who preached the word, and by the word itself, as the instrument. God is the first cause of this begetting; or making persons believers, as the author of it. The Holy Spirit is the cause, as the agent, through whom he does it. The apostles are employed as agents through whom the word is preached, and the word is the instrument through which the work is accomplished. It is then, the work of God, the work of the Holy Spirit, the work of the apostle, and the work of the word of truth, or the gospel.

This view of the subject accords with the apostles' practice and the commission under which they preached. They were commanded to "go, and disciple all nations"—to "preach the gospel to every creature," and this is followed with "he that believes and is immersed shall be saved, and he who believes not shall be damned."

I endeavored to sustain the same conclusion by the design of the confession. I assumed that it was designed to satisfy the administrator, and other interested witnesses, that the candidate does believe. Bro. F. asks where is this taught. I answer, it is obvious from the very nature of the confession. What is the confession but a declaration to the administrator, and to others present, that you believe? And for whose satisfaction is it made? It cannot be for the satisfaction of God, for he already knows your faith; nor of yourself, for with you it is a matter of consciousness. There are no other interested parties, but the administrator and the witnesses. Moreover, in making the confession you speak to them, and what you say is of course designed for them. So it was with the eunuch. He desired to be immersed, but Philip would not immerse him unless he believed; in making the confession to Philip therefore, his obvious and only object was to satisfy him that he did believe. We have, then, the nature of the act of confessing, and the example of the eunuch, to sustain our assumption. We might further fortify it, by Paul's allusion to the fact that Timothy "confessed the good confession before many witnesses," and the Savior's promise to those who should confess his name "before men." All these expressions indicate that the confession has reference to other men, and is designed as a declaration to them of our faith in Jesus Christ.

Seeing now, that it is the duty of the administrator to require a confession, it necessarily becomes that of the candidate to make the confession. But this duty of the candidate, being designed for the satisfaction of the administrator, the omission of it is a loss to the latter, leaving him without the scriptural evidence that his candidate is a believer; but the candidate himself loses nothing. If the omission had occurred through the refusal of the candidate to make the confession, this refusal would be a sin on his part which might invalidate his subsequent action. But occurring simply through the failure of the im-
merser to require it, the fault is his and his alone; and the fault being his, the candidate must not be held responsible.

If it were the duty of the candidate, independent of all other human beings, to make the confession, as it is to believe and to repent, then no circumstances could justify its omission. If a sinner were left alone upon an island, it would be his duty to believe, and to repent; but it could not be his duty to make the confession, simply because there is no one there to hear it. It became the duty of the eunuch to make the confession when Philip called for it; but if Philip had not called for it, he would have committed no fault in omitting it. So in every other case. It being a duty, not absolute, but dependent upon the instruction and requirements of the evangelist, its omission is a sin of the candidate only when it is required, and he refuses.

I believe that my general proposition; that when the candidate has done all that is required of him, the immersion is valid, although the immerser may not have done all of his duty, is undisputed. Granting this, and the positions above established, the conclusion inevitably follows, that a failure to make the confession, when caused by the action of the administrator alone, does not invalidate the immersion.

Bro. Franklin desires me to reconcile this conclusion, with the statement of Paul, that "with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." He seems to think that this statement makes the confession a condition of pardon, like faith and immersion. He therefore asks three questions:

1. Are faith, confession with the mouth, and immersion, in this order of succession, conditions of the remission of sins?
2. If so, should they not be required in this order of succession, of all who seek our fellowship?
3. If any one of the items is not such a condition, is it right to demand it in any case?

To answer the last question first, we reply, that it might be right to demand it, even if it were not a condition of remission of sins. The question implies that nothing is to be required of a sinner, except such things as are conditions of pardon; while the truth is, that we are to require everything which the scriptures require, whether it be a condition of pardon or not. If we should find, then, that the confession is not a condition of pardon, we must still require it under the guidance of scripture precedents.

The second question, I answer in the affirmative. If the three duties—faith, confession, and immersion, are, in this order, conditions of pardon, we must require them in the same order, of all who seek our fellowship. The whole discussion, therefore, turns upon the first question.

Is the confession, then, a condition of the remission of sins? Paul says, With the mouth confession is made eis soterian, in order to salvation." This is merely a statement of a fact. It became a fact in this way. Under the apostolic teaching, no one was admitted to immersion for the remission of sins, who did not make the confession. Hence it was made in order to salvation, because it was preliminary to that act which brought the party into the enjoyment of pardon. It certainly ought to be so still. No preacher ought to immerse anyone until he makes the confession; but some preachers do it, and the question is, whose fault is this, the preachers or that of the candidate? Evidently the preacher's. Now, in all such cases, that circumstance which, with the apostles, caused the confession to be made in order to salvation, is absent by the fault of the preacher and not of the candidate; hence the preacher must answer for a sin of omission, but the candidate is innocent. The confession, then, can be regarded as only conditionally a condition of pardon. It depends upon the other condition, that the administrator of the ordinance does his duty. In this case it is a condition. In case he fails of his duty, his failure relieves the candidate, and throws the responsibility of a perversion of the gospel scheme upon his own shoulders.

We must qualify our position, by the fol-
lowing observation: It may sometimes happen that the candidate is better informed upon the subject than the administrator. In that case, it would be his duty to call upon the administrator to receive his confession. This I argue simply upon the ground that we should not permit a brother to omit an important duty in our presence, without a remonstrance.

During a protracted meeting which I attended a few years ago, a gentleman sent us word one morning that he had concluded to be immersed, and wished it to be done before the hour of meeting. A group of brethren and sisters were soon called at the water, and the brother who was immersing led him in, and was about to pronounce the formula of immersion, when I called to him and remarked “you have not taken his confession.” He immediately stopped and received the confession as they stood in the water, and then immersed him. Now if I had not interfered, the man, who stood ready to make the confession, would have been immersed without it, not through any fault of his, but through forgetfulness on the part of the immerser. Who would say that he should have been re-immersed before we should receive him into the church?

Lest it should be supposed that I presume too much upon the ignorance of candidates, in the above argument, and attach too much consequence to the negligence of the administrator, let it be remembered that thousands are immersed whose want of education renders them entirely dependent upon the instruction of their preachers. It is impossible that they should know their own privileges, or the duties of the preacher, farther than he instructs them. Practically, indeed, the mass of disciples, having been inattentive to the scriptures previous to their conversion, are dependent upon preachers for a knowledge of the steps to be taken in becoming a Christian.

When a man applies for membership who did not confess before he was immersed, if I were to undertake to mend the matter, instead of taking his confession and re-immersing him, I would call on him to confess that he did believe before he was immersed.

In conclusion, I would remark that Bro. Franklin’s objection strikes what I conceive to be the weakest point in my former article, and if he, or any other brother, after reading this, still considers it weak, I would be glad to consider any well studied objections that may be urged against it.

J. W. McGarvey.

July, 1862.

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER AND HIS MISSION.

A DISCOURSE BY ELD. W. H. TAYLOR.

Delivered at the Ordination of Ilvron Woods and John Darnell, at Ripley, Ohio, May 31, 1862.

“How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” Rom. x. 15.

His Social Position.

I. By universal consent, a high social position is accorded the Christian preacher. His office is justly regarded as a high and a sacred one. His relation to society is of such a character as to exempt him from suspicion, and almost wholly from the time and care usually required, in every other avocation, in gaining public confidence and position in society. By virtue of his position, he comes on the stage endorsed by his brethren, and by all the holy and sacred pledges of love and purity which spring from the divinity of the commission he bears, and the cause he pleads, as well as from the name of Christ, by whose authority he acts, and whose servant he claims to be. No tedious trial in winning his way to place and honor is demanded of him. It is sufficient to be introduced, simply, as a preacher of the gospel. The young preacher in this, though unear-
ed it may be, finds a ready passport to the hearts and homes of every Christian family. To him will be committed, in generous confidence, many a sacred trust. To his society and guardianship will be given the sweet, the innocent, the artless and the young. And with all this will come responsibility, and with all this may come temptation. Pardon me for the admonition—preachers are only men. Ordination services impart no spiritual or miraculous gifts. Whatever attainments you make, either of intellectual or moral advancement, must be gained by industry and watchfulness—from the Bible and the closet. It is possible for us to forget that we have intellects and hearts of our own to improve, in our watchfulness and care for others.

CHARACTER OF HIS MISSION.

II. It is the highest, the holiest, and the greatest ever ordained on earth. It enfolds in its angel purpose the salvation of the human race. Beauty, health, love, honor, truth, glory, immortality, eternal life—all this in the heaven of heavens, in the home of angels, in the presence of God, by the side of Jesus—all this forever!

"Go, preach my gospel." The Christian preacher acts by the highest authority in the universe. "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach." Michael and Gabriel act upon no higher a commission than this.

Authorized of heaven's great sovereign you, my brethren, go forth with the sweetest story, the most stupendous truths and the most astonishing facts ever uttered, and with heaven's own offer and terms of eternal life to erring, sinful, dying man.

All the pure and benevolent of earth, and all the exalted and glorified in heaven, sympathize with you. Angels, your fellow laborers, are profoundly interested in this work, and will be until they come with their Lord, the world's great Judge, to reap the world's great harvest, and to gather to their heavenly rest the saints of the Most High. Christ has not commissioned one of his angelic hosts to preach the gospel; he gives them only a second position in the work of salvation. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak." · They watch over those you bring into the kingdom. O, how surprised must Gabriel be to see a preacher falter and go back from the field, when the field is whitening to the harvest!

HIS MOTIVES.

III. Man's motives ever should be honorable. But the motives of a Christian, and especially a Christian preacher, should be more than honorable. His motives should lie beyond the orbit of earthly rewards. Let no young man enter this field if he has ambition for the world's applause. If he desires ease, or wealth, or fame, let him pursue them on the name of earth. And if he finds, as find he will, that he has grasped shadows, he will not say heaven has cheated him. Let no young man enter the field if he would as soon follow something else. But if he can say with a full and swelling heart, I must preach, I cannot be happy unless I do preach, let him go forth. If you, my young brethren, have made up your mind to confront toil and hardship, and if needs be, poverty and neglect, go forth to the battle.

If you can take Christ as you model, go forth and tell the immortal story. And as you go, remember the self denial and the patient love of him,

"Who o'er a lost world wept."

Remember he left wealth, ease, honor, friends, home and heaven. Thirty-three long and weary years, in spotless purity and innocence, he lived among men in a corrupt and an ungrateful world. Can we not imagine that heaven was less joyful during his absence? Can we not believe the seraphim were restless for his presence, and that angelic choirs laid their golden harps at the foot of the throne until the coronation morning? Can we doubt that earth looked dark and sorrowful and cheerless to him? Can we realize that he was "a man or sorrows and acquainted with grief?" Can we doubt his longing desire to go back
Is a classical education indispensable to success? It would be of great advantage for every young man to have a knowledge of polite literature, but it is not an indispensable qualification. Must the young preacher wade through all the standard theological books? No, a knowledge of the various systems may be well, in order that we may see, and help others to see their "Emptiness and vanity."

but can be of very little consequence beyond this. You ask me to say what is necessarily indispensable. We answer, a simple knowledge of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; a warm heart and a clear head. Add to this, a correct use of language, and a meek and teachable spirit, and you have excellent qualifications to begin with. You will perhaps inquire, "Is not the study of the old scriptures necessary and valuable?" We answer, incalculably valuable, and should largely engage your attention as long as you live and preach. It was the old scriptures that Paul referred to when he said to Timothy, "And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through which is in Christ Jesus." And we doubt not when Paul exhorted Timothy to "study," he included the old scriptures. Paul desired that Timothy should preach and study both. He did not hold Timothy back until he learned everything. At the same time Paul knew there was great advantage to be gained by an uninspired man, attentively studying the inspired word.

Paul did not know what some very remarkable young men in modern times have discovered, viz: that idleness and ignorance are no obstacles—that if a man is only a "Holy Ghost preacher," he has only to "open his mouth and depend upon the Lord to supply his lack by a direct inspiration; therefore he encouraged Timothy to study. As an indispensable qualification, you should start with the faith that inspired Paul to say, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."
A man who has this faith will never preach philosophies, politics, opinions, speculations nor human creeds. He may have his views on all these matters, and may like other men express them, on all fitting occasions, but he will never expect to convert any one to Christ by preaching them.

VI.—HIS DUTIES.

His duties are numerous, we can scarcely attempt to enumerate them. All might be summed up in a single sentence. Who gives himself to the gospel gives himself away—to God and man.

It is but a poor imitation of Christ to confine our attention and love to a choice few, and to seek the abodes of wealth and refinement. Christ doubtless loved some more than others, but his mission was to the world: “to seek and to save the lost.” The blind Bartimeus was of equal value in his mind with Nicodemus, with all his learning and official dignity. His apostles were mainly chosen from the humbler callings of the age. The dearest spot he ever found on earth was the humble abode of the dear orphans of Olivet. He seldom entered the lordly palace. The rich aristocrat, in flaunting arrogance, scorned him; and derisively spoke of his poverty and humble parentage.

“How hardly shall a rich man enter the kingdom!” “And the poor have the gospel preached unto them,” were sayings of Christ. If you desire to win the hearts of many to Christ, you must mingle with all classes as Christ did. There are many varieties and phases of human life; in all these varieties there are men and women that may be saved. Soot-proud fools may sneer, and talk of the “lower classes,” and boast, as we have known them to do, of having all the wealth and fashion in their societies. Well let them strut; but we should like to read them a story from an old book, about a “Rich man who fared sumptuously every day.” And another of a rich Pharisee whose good opinion of Christ was very much shaken because he received the meek, and penitent and loving Mary Magdalene. Simon said within himself, “This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who, and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner.” We shall see many in heaven, Simon—doubtful? It will be your duty to visit men when they are happy and prosperous; to mingle with the joyous and the gay in their social enjoyments, as far as they are chaste and temperate; and to be at the marriage feast, and thanksgiving dinner. But it will be more frequently your duty to go to the house of mourning, and to the couch of affliction. Your presence will be welcome and cheering in the house of poverty, bereavement, sickness and death. There you may soothe many a bitter pang; whisper courage in the hour of irresolution; and give assistance in the hour of need.

You may stand by the side of the lonely and stricken orphan, when he sheds blinding tears at the grave that is closing over the pale form of a mother that tenderly watched him while on earth, and who has gone to watch for him in heaven. And when he turns away from that grave, feeling that sorrow and darkness are as boundless as the great wide world that lies before him, and asks his own heart, silently, who will care for me now? Then you have a work which an angel might covet. You can take that orphan’s hand, in your own and tell him things he ought to know, and give advice he ought to receive. You may find a home, if you have none to give, for him.

And in the great day when the heavens and the earth are fled, you may see that orphan boy, now an heir of glory, crowned by angel hands, and hear him tell his joyful mother in that happy land it was you that led his erring heart to Christ, and his wandering feet to that blissful home.

O how many good and kind things may be done in Christ’s name, and for his sake. But he who waits for calm skies, and tranquil seas, to do good on a wide and splendid scale, may never do anything. If all things worked just as we could desire; if everything moved in harmony; if all men were what they ought to be; and this world were sinless; then would Christ have no use for
evangelists; then should we have no use for ordination services. "The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." It was a miserable race for which Christ died. It was a fearful and a stormy mission on which he came. He knew men would scorn him in life, and curse him in death. He knew that his earthly pilgrimage lay through a thorny maze. He plainly saw earth's blindness and stupidity. He expected to meet bigotry, falsehood, cruelty, ingratitude, and perfidy; It was under the pressure of all this, that passionate wail of sorrow was wrung from his divine heart, when he cried, "Now is my soul troubled and what shall I say?" Father, save me from this hour:" As much as to say, it is no use to die, my father, the world hates me to the end; all is going to ruin; then spare me the bitterness of dying amid the fury of a mob; take me back to thyself, and the dear ones that wait for me in the skies—if it can be thy will. But then he remembers the grandeur and the greatness of his mission, and exclaims "But for this cause came I unto this hour." You too may, and will be, treated unkindly. Yes—and bitterer of all—you may have to bear the unmanly and evil insinuations of pretended brethren who have neither the courage, nor generosity to approach you and tell of a fault—if you should possess it. If you meet none of this class you will be more fortunate than we have been. These men are always remarkably jealous for the gospel, and if you do not preach just as somebody else, you may be condemned for preaching politics or something else. But care for none of these things, only so preach and act as to gain the approbation of the glorious author of the gospel.

VII.—HIS DISCOURAGEMENTS.

Perhaps I should not speak of discouragements. And yet it may serve to prepare you to meet them. No position in life calls for a higher manhood, a nobler heroism, than the position you take to-day. As a usual thing young men are left, in the start, to struggle alone, and if they lack manhood or courage they go down amid the breakers in sight of shore. When a brave and determined struggle would have carried them into an open sea. Every enterprise has its obstacles, and may come behind the glowing visions of youthful fancy. But you cannot fail if you keep the honor and glory of Christ as your pole star in the voyage. You will sometimes be told, by saint-hearted brethren, that you can do nothing in their community, believe it not. Tell them the gospel is "the power of God," and that it is always in order to preach it. "Preach the word in season and out of season," is apostolic injunction. We have been chilled by such suggestions once or twice in our time, but we have got over it now. Preach! Preach! some honest heart will receive the engrafted word. Preach! every man must hear the gospel. Men will not find the gospel, but the gospel must find them.

They that go forth bearing precious seed shall return at last with the sheaves rejoicing.

VIII.—HIS RESTRICTIONS.

"My gospel." Not man's gospel. Not a gospel. Not creed. Not an ism—not a cism, but the gospel of peace." There is no peace in a party gospel. You cannot unite the world on Luther, Calvin or Wesley; nor upon their views of the gospel.

Our Lord Jesus Christ never authorized any body of men to revise his gospel, or to make a codicil to his will. You are not to preach opinions, but facts, gospel facts. You are not to preach politics, soul sleeping, nor spirit-rapping. These can only result in strife and confusion. No! no! the love of Christ to a dying world; the mercy and peace and compassion of heaven will be your theme.

"Go preach." It is as important that the gospel be preached as that Christ should die; for, "How can they believe on him of whom they have not heard?" Simpletons may speculate as much as they will about faith as a direct gift, we know that the faith which has a living, moving energy upon the mind, heart, and lives of men, comes, as Paul says, by hearing. By hearing what?
The decrees of councils, the dogmas of ecclesiastical conventions? No, by the “word of God.” By receiving into the heart the “incorruptible seed that lives and abides forever.”

IX.—His reward.

“If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereon, he shall receive a reward.”

God never enjoined labor without reward. Strange to tell, He offers a great reward to man for being what it would be right for him be to exclusive of all consideration of merit. There is, perhaps, no such thing in the world as absolute disinterestedness. We all have wants that must be met, or we are undone. To these God appeals. We want to live and love forever. And God says, “do and live.” And Christ says, “If any man keep my sayings he shall never see death.” The ancient saints had “regard to the recompence of reward” that lay before them. Paul was cheered and upborne by the motives of a promised crown. Christ himself, for a joy that was set before him, endured the cross and disregarded the shame.

With all this before us can we not bear hardness as good soldiers?

The crown that my Savior bestows,
You permanent sun shall outshine.

When earthly diadems crumble and decay, my crown and yours will burn with immortal and fadeless lustre. And then think of God’s approval in the great day, “Well done good and faithful servant.” And then the gratitude of the redeemed ones we led to Christ on earth, and consequently to their Father’s home in heaven. To stand in the presence of God, and his Son, in whose presence there is fullness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures forever more, will be the exceeding great reward of the faithful preacher. “They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever.”

X.—His fidelity.

Of all things hopeless and fearful, that of an apostate preacher is the most dreadful and gloomy. Men may select their pursuits, and abandon them, as interest or pleasure may direct, with honor, and perhaps with the approbation of their own judgment.

But a true preacher of Christ may never hope to enjoy a clear and happy heart who lays off his armor, and lays down the sword, (the word,) and throws up the commission committed to him by his Captain. I never knew a man to leave the ministry for some promise the world made him, who did not wear in his very face the expression, “I am a deserter.”

It is true all Christians should make it their first, and highest, and last object to promote the interest and honor of Christ’s kingdom. Yet it is equally true that the world is expecting more of those who are the professed teachers and guides of the people than of the taught.

The verdict upon the life and labor of the Christian preacher will be a rigid one. In traveling over the great State of Ohio we can still distinctly trace the footprints of apostate preachers who crushed the bloom of promise in the community where they fell. We could name several of these men, but we choose not to do or say anything that would rescue their names from the shadows of oblivion that are gathering around them. We have a host of true brethren in the field; we gladly welcome you to a participation in the glorious work. We hand you the commission: “Go preach.”

A Go-Between.—“There is perhaps not a more odious character in the world than of a go-between; by which we mean that creature who carries to the ears of one neighbor all the injurious observations which happen to drop from another. Such a person is the slanderer’s herald, and is altogether more odious than the slanderer himself. By his vile officiousness he makes the poison effective, which else were inert; for three-fourths of the slanders in the world would never injure their object except by the malice of go-between, who, under the mask of trouble friendship, act the part of double traitors.”
RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

NUMBER TWO.

Brother Van Dake’s pamphlet on the “Relation of Repentance and Faith.” The reader will bear in mind that the labor of the pamphlet is bestowed to prove that repentance actually precedes faith, and is the cause of faith. The issue we make with him, is that he has the matter wrong end foremost—the cart precisely before the horse. We turn the matter exactly the other way, and maintain that faith, in the order in which the events occur, goes before repentance and is the cause of repentance. Without faith preceding, repentance is impossible—a philosophical absurdiity and impossibility. “In point of time, faith begins when we repent, and neither before nor after,” says Bro. Van Dake. If it is, in point of time, “neither before nor after” repentance, that a man begins to believe, why does he try to prove that repentance is first? There can not be a clearer truism than that an event that is neither before nor after, in point of time, can not be first nor last. If, as Bro. Van Dake here states, “In point of time, faith begins when we repent, and neither before nor after,” why does he try to prove that repentance is before—that it does come first—and that the Reformers have departed from the form of sound words? If faith, in point of time is neither before nor after repentance, the Reformers are precisely as near right in putting faith before as he is in putting it after. In trying to show that repentance is before faith, if it is neither before nor after, he is certainly as far wrong as the Reformers. But we take direct issue with the statement that “In point of time, faith begins when we repent, and neither before nor after.” Unequivocally it must be before or after. Though we do not agree with him which is the cause and which is the effect, we agree this far, that one is the cause and the other is the effect, and we maintain most unequivocally that if there is a manifest truism, or a self-evident proposition in this universe, it is that, in point of time, no matter whether much time or little, the cause goes before the effect. If repentance is the cause of faith, it goes before and produces faith.

Bro. Van Dake says, “Forsmuch, then, as repentance is the immediate cause, (on our part,) of the cessation of sin, and particularly the sin of unbelief, and because to cease from unbelief is to begin faith, the beginning of faith is coeval with repentance, its immediate cause, and so, neither is repentance without faith its immediate consequent, nor faith without repentance, its immediate antecedent; but the two are as inseparable, as any cause is from its effect.” Here is something a little nice in the way of metaphysics. Repentance is, on our part, the immediate cause of ceasing to sin, particularly the sin of unbelief. There is but one way to cease the sin of unbelief, and that is to believe. Bro. Van Dake says “to cease from unbelief is to begin faith.” What, then, can repentance be? It is the immediate cause of ceasing from sin, particularly the sin of unbelief. Nothing short of faith can convince a man of sin. It can not be a change of mind or purpose, to cease sin, for a man can not regret sin till he believes he is a sinner, or as the Scriptures express it, till “convinced of sin.” Nothing short of faith can convince a man of sin. It can not be a change of mind or purpose, to cease sin, for a man can not have till convinced of sin, and a man in unbelief can not be convinced of sin. It can not be reformation from sin, for a man cannot reform from sin till convinced of sin, and can not be convinced of sin.
without faith, or in unbelief. What, then, is the repentance that a man can have without faith, or in unbelief? Or what repentance can a man have before faith, or without faith, that can, as an effect, produce faith? We should like to see some doctor, who maintains that repentance precedes faith, and is the cause of faith, who can tell us what that repentance is which a man can have without faith, or before faith and which produces faith! If Bro. Van Dake and those agreeing with him are fond of metaphysics, mystical speculations and philosophical theorizing, they shall have a liberal share of them. Let them, then, come up to the work and tell us what the repentance is that can be had before faith, or without faith. It is not from Christ, for a man can receive nothing but condemnation from him so long as he is in unbelief. It is not from the Scriptures for a man can receive nothing from the Scriptures till he believes them. It is not from God, for nothing in Christianity comes from him except through faith. This repentance, then, that is claimed before faith, or without faith, that causes faith, is the immediate cause of ceasing from sin, particularly the sin of unbelief, not being from God, Christ, the Scripture, or of faith, is a queer thing and we should like to know what it is. Can any man tell?

Again, we do not desire to push any man to the wall, too severely, nor to press him cruelly, still our inquisitiveness is excited to know several things more about that repentance possessed before faith and without faith, and which causes faith, in this new theory of "sound words." Will some kind brother, agreeing with Bro. Van Dake, or he himself answer the following:

I. Is that repentance which is before faith, or without faith, and causes faith, an uncaused cause? Or is it caused by something else before it?

II. If it is caused by something before it, what is that cause, or something before it, which caused it?

We can not believe that repentance can be an uncaused cause. If then repentance is itself not an uncaused cause, but an effect of some cause before it, as it is claimed to be before faith and the cause of faith, what is its cause? We are perfectly aware, that we are taught in the Bible, that the goodness of God leads to repentance; but the goodness of God can not lead any man to repentance who does not believe in God and the goodness of God. God and his goodness can only be brought to bear upon man by faith, and can not lead any man to repentance till he believes and is thus moved by the goodness of God. The goodness of God has no power on a man who knows nothing of his goodness, or believes nothing of it. Or to give the matter more point, if possible, we ask

I. Is the goodness of God the cause of repentance, or that which leads to repentance?

II. Can the goodness of God be the cause of repentance, or lead a man to repentance, before he believes, or while he is in unbelief?

III. Must not a man be made sensible of the goodness of God before it can have any power or influence on him to lead him to repentance?

IV. Can a man be made sensible of the goodness of God in any way but by faith? Or can a man, without faith, be made sensible of the goodness of God? Or can a man know anything of the goodness of God without faith?

V. Can a man have any inducement to turn away from sin till he is convinced of sin?

VI. Is there an inducement that can be laid before man, such as the goodness of God, or any other, that can cause him to turn away from sin, till he is convinced of sin?

VII. Was any man ever induced to turn away from sin who was not first convinced of sin?

VIII. Was any man ever convinced of sin, or can any man ever be convinced of sin, without faith, or before belief?

Again; repentance is a commandment. A commandment always comes with authority.
God commands all men everywhere to repent. He who obeys a commandment recognizes the authority of him who commands, and appreciates, what is commanded. This leads us again to the following inquiries:

I. Can a man without faith, or, which is the same, before he believes, recognize the authority of God as a commander?

II. Can a man without faith, or before he believes, appreciate the obligation to obey the command to repent?

III. Can a man, without faith, or before he believes, render to the Lord an acceptable act of obedience?

IV. Is not repentance an acceptable act of obedience?

The true state of the case is, that the first act of the soul in turning to God, is the cordial, cheerful or willing assent to the truth that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. This act of the soul, is not repenting, but believing. Before this there can be no acts or act of repenting, or any other acts acceptable to God. That God must be recognized before there can be an act of obedience toward God, or in reference to him, or in submission to his authority, is as true as the statement of Holy Writ, that “he who comes to God must believe,” no matter whether he comes in repentance, or any other divine requirement.

It is self-evident that whatever is done in obedience to God, must be done in faith, and that without faith it is impossible to please him, in repentance or any thing else.

Reasoning with a man of righteousness, temperance and a judgment to come, if a man believes it, has an influence to lead him to repentance; but no preaching of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come, repentance, or anything else, ever had any influence to lead any man to repentance who did not believe. The conviction produced by the truth is the first impression as certain as certainty, and the very first conviction produced is faith, no matter how little, weak or small in degree, the same in kind, faith and nothing but faith, as certainly as that one grain of wheat is wheat, the same in kind as a thousand bushels, and nothing but wheat, even if so weak that it will not grow, it is wheat. So the smallest conviction is faith, even though so weak as to produce no repentance.

LITTLE MEN WITH PET NOTIONS.

Very few men can get outside of their pet notions and crude fancies. Prejudices stick to them like leeches. It is hard telling sometimes which sticks the faster, the horse to the leech or the leech to the horse. Some men’s coat of mail consists of proportionate parcels of bigotry, suspicion, and envy. It is as hard to separate the bigot from these as to pry open a bivalve with a cambric needle. This class of men view every object from one stand point. If a sign chance to be green on one side and blue on the other, and they should approach the sign from the green side, they will positively declare the sign to be green on both sides, and no counter testimony can modify the decision. Whatever position they assume is governed, not by the exercise of judgment and justice, but by their selfish inclinations. Such men never walk around an object, but always to and from it. They love to examine things in the dark. They live and breathe in an atmosphere of mist. The course they pursue is always inexplicable. They remind me of the six blind men of India, who went on a long journey to see an elephant. Arrived at the place, one feels his way up to the side of the elephant, and upon examination declares the monster to be a wall; another gets hold of the big flopping ear, and thereupon pronounces the elephant a fan; another seizes hold of the trunk and says, why, this elephant is a snake; another takes a reconnoisance of the leg, and instanter declares the beast to be a tree; and in the same manner, the fifth one
taking hold of the tusk, exclaims, why is it possible that this elephant is a spear; the sixth man grasps the caudal appendage, and lustily cries out, I've got a rope. That's the way little men, with pet notions, dissect religion—dissect politics—dissect everything.

Every such man is guilty of image worship. In the innermost chamber of his heart he has a little idol before which he pours his daily libations, before which he adoringly bows, and around which his dearest affections cluster. His devotion to this talismanic idol steals away all his manhood, and robs him of all power of mental independence. His theology consists of anise, mint and dill. Justice, mercy and faith nauseate him. His employment is to hunt up exceptions to general laws—he finds a screw loose in the machinery of nature; positive law is unreasonable; civil law is a mere contingency; moral law is unequally balanced; social law gravitates in the wrong direction. He feeds upon the putrefaction of decayed bodies. He is too selfish to love, too envious to admire, too jealous to praise, too stingy to be generous, too intolerant to forgive.

It is this class of men that give a vast amount of trouble to church and State. The preacher is constantly harassed by them. The editor of a religious periodical never finds rest from their vulgar attacks. The statesman has to run for his life to keep clear of them; and if he takes broad and independent grounds on some question of general good, the wolfish little man is there ready to obtrude his pet notion. When a man stops his paper, you may be sure that he is troubled with a pet notion, of his own ideality, with squint eyes, a stub nose, and a prodigious mouth. He stops his paper because his little pet is not smoothed down and dandled enough, or because perchance the editor has severely pinched the pet's ears and made it squeal. This slave to his own conceit subscribed for the paper with the view of having the interests of his pet notion advanced, built up, strengthened and perfected. He would snatch up his paper in expectation of finding clothes and cosmetics with which to dress up and make his dear little pet more lovely and attractive. Beyond this supposed pet notion, the editor may advocate justice, mercy, love, and faith, and plead the cause of the poor, but all that weighs nothing in the understanding of the bigot. He has mounted his horse Hobby, and that horse he will ride—to perdition! The editor in question may possess an unimpeachable character, may advocate the cause of righteousness, may sacrifice largely of his own means, and even jeopardize life and health, and bring under contribution every power of the mind, but what is this to the brusque bigot of one idea, of the size of a grain of sand. Should the editor express an independent thought on some new matter of expediency, the force of which might serve to neutralize the pet notion of the pet patter, the man with the petted and patted notion will forthwith cry, "stop your paper!" How small must be the horizon of such a man's mind. His mind is still in slavery—the truth has never made him free. I know of a good many families where the wives and children are deprived of even one good paper, just because the big burly husband caught a wild notion and tamed it for his own diversion and cupidity. When a man or woman (for women will do such things) leaves church huffy in the time of service, you may be sure that the offended individual loves some religious pet notions the preacher has impaled, more than the good manners he has just been the transgressor of. I have seen a man start out of church very abruptly with his pet notion Arminianism, and almost stamp his feet with indignation because the preacher made the gospel overleap the boundaries of his little pet dogmatism. Rather than abandon that, he would abandon the gospel. I have seen men carry with them Calvinism wherever they have gone—walk with it, eat with it, drink with it, sleep with it, hug it, fondle it, pray with it, worship with it, die with it. It is the world they live in, the only country they ever discovered, the bounds of
their spiritual existence, the only object of
affinity that ever approached them. Again;
if you think you can reason with a man
who believes himself to be the honored
recipient of special revelations, you are
simply mistaken. Why, sir, that is his pet
notion. The gospel is a distant planet to
that man. You will find yourself beating
the air, if you try to enlarge the scope of
that man's vision. He has removed himself
into a misty world, and in mist he vows to
live interminably. You lead that man out
upon the wide and extended platform of the
gospel of Christ, and so dazzling and be-
wildering will the effect be upon him, that
forthwith he becomes an alarmist, and runs
back again to the sombre shades of mist,
and there upon an outstretching limb of
the tree of orthodoxy, he cunningly cracks
and complacently eats his oily nut. I have
seen men turn pale and look perplexed
at the mention of the word immersion.
Why thus offended? Because father be-
lieved in sprinkling, and was himselfsprink-
led; the church practiced sprinkling; learn-
learned men consecrated sprinkling; I my-
self have been sprinkled; therefore sprink-
ling is a great institution. That man has
been traveling in one direction ever since
his birth into this world, and as he goes he
leads his pet notion by his side at the end
of a long string; or rather I would say, that
the pet leads him as the blind man is lead
by his faithful dog.

Some nations worship the sun. It is to
them the source of light and life. It is the
center of their adoration. They shut out
the whole universe beyond that. Some na-
tions make the earth the object of their
worship. They claim be born of the earth,
to be nourished by the earth, and at death
to be received back into the embrace of
mother earth. The earth forms the center
of all their devotions. The earth is the
universe to them. Their conceptions never
travel beyond the boundaries of the earth.
But we need not repair to heathen nations
to find examples of men who idolize an idea
of their own crude conceptions. It is of very
little consequence to this class of men wheth-
er their ideal conceptions harmonize with
the laws of God's moral government, or
come in conflict wish the great scheme of
man's redemption, or run counter to the
fixed laws of the physical universe, so that
they may enjoy with interrupted bliss the
exuding sweets of their own created crudi-
ties. Why, indeed, there are people who
really have an antipathy to the discovery of
truth, except where dollars and cents are in-
volved. They love to grub in the dark.
When they read a book they prefer not to
understand it. They would rather examine
opaque than luminous bodies. They actu-
ally take pleasure in what is obscure and in
comprehensible. They adopt an ancient
Roman dictum, "that language was given
to man to conceal his thoughts." The less
such people understand of what a speaker
says, the better satisfied they seem to be. I
have seen them chuckle with deep delight
over profound obscurities. If you make
a subject plain and lucid, they manifest ir-
ritability and chagrin. Such people live in
a world not larger than the tub of Diogo-
nes.

I have seen some of those men seated
under the ministry of the gospel from day
to day, watching like hungry hawks for
something to be said on slavery, Anti
or
slav~ry Pro, and if it were not done, they
would look daggers and inwardly swear that
that preacher must be ostracised. The
preacher might go right along, imitating
the examples of Christ and his apostles, and
preaching faithfully, and ardently and con-
scientiously, the whole breadth and extent
of the gospel, and because he has not in
some way or other interwoven the notions
of these pettish men into the thread of his
discourse, and made them the most promi-
nent features of the gospel theme, they
are burning to cry out. Away with him.
Manifestly all they want of the gospel is to
make of it a dark back ground, where on
the dancing pet may appear the more con-
spicuous, and strut around to better advan-
tage. Such men patronize none but parti-
zan preachers and papers, and never travel
beyond the latitude of a bigot's brain, whose
dictates they blindly follow, nor transcend
the periphery of the squalid little cribbed
qabin they dosily sleep in. They minister
to the priestess of craft, whose vestments
are wrought out of attenuated threads, spun
from the oo-coon of the brain of Madame
Superstition.
Some men see war in everything; some
dont see war in anything; some see war
where the preacher or editor never meant it;
others are ready to shake their fists and
stamp their feet with holy indignation, be-
cause they think they see the red-fire flash-
ing eyes of the god Mars flaming out ven-
geance and retaliation from every declaration
of the speaker. The enunciation of the
word war is music in some men's ears, while
to others it is the slow-lengthening peal of
the death knell. Some think this world
should be all peace; others think it must be
all war. Both are right. But little men
with little notions will not accord to one an-
other the merit of being right even on one extreme. One says we have the war of na-
ture's elements without peace; the other
says we can have peace beyond the war of
the elements. One says purity without
peace; the other says peace without purifi-
cation. One says the gospel and the sword
—the other says the gospel and peace. They
start off on these diverging lines and never
return. One hobbles off with cause; the oth-
er limps off by the side of effect. Every-
thing they see after this is seen inverted.
No preacher can please such men—no writer
can conciliate them. If you ask them to
investigate a question the opposite of what
they positively know to be right, or even in-
sinuate that an examination might materi-
ally modify their notions, you may be sure
of provoking the profound disgust of these
hirsute gentlemen.
The fact is, the whole man has got to be
"upset," just as as a blacksmith upsets an
old ax to give it a new edge.
This has been a nervous subject to me—
I have been under a pressure—but I feel a
good deal better now.

JOHN F. ROWE.

WILLIAM TYNDALE,
The author of the Common Version of the
Bible, on the word Repentance.
"Concerning this word—Repentance, or as
they used penance, the Hebrew hath in the
Old Testament generally (soh) turn or be
converted. For which the translation that
we take for St. Jerome's, hath for the most
part (converti) to turn, to be converted and
sometimes (agere penitentiam,) And the
Greek in the New Testament hath perpetu-
ally (metaneo) to turn in the heart and
mind and to come to a right knowledge and
to a man's right wit again. For which
(miitaneo) St. Jerome's translation hath some-
times (ago penitenstis) I do repent. Some-
times (penileo) I repent. Sometimes (penileor)
I am repentant. Sometimes (habeo peniten-
tisim) I have repentance. Sometimes (poen-
illet) it repents me. And Erasmus uses
much this word (resipisco) I came to myself,
or to my right mind again. And the very
sense and signification both of the Hebrew
and also of the Greek word is, to be con-
verted and turn to God with all the heart
to know his will and to live according to his
laws; and to be cured of our corrupt nature
by the oil of his Spirit, and wine of obedi-
ence to his doctrine, which conversion or
turning, if it be unfeigned, these four do
accompany it and are included therein.
Confession, not in the priest's ear, for that is
but man's invention, but to God in the heart,
and before all the congregation of God;
that we are sinners and sinful and that our
whole nature is corrupt and inclined to sin
and all unrighteousness, and therefore evil,
wicked and damnable and his law holy and
just by which our sinful nature is rebuked.
And also to our neighbors if we have
offended any person particularly. Then
contrition, sorrowfulness that we are such
damnable sinners, and not only have sinned
but are wholly inclined to sin still. Thirdly.
Faith, (of which our old doctors have made
no mention at all in the discription of their
penance) that God for Christ's sake, doth forgive us, and receive us to mercy, and is at one with us, and will heal our corrupt nature. And, fourthly, satisfaction or amends making, not to God with holy works, but to my neighbor whom I have hurt, and the congregation of God whom I have offended if any open crime be found in me, and submitting a man's self unto the congregation or church of Christ and to the officers of the same to have his life corrected and governed henceforth of them according to the true doctrine of the church of Christ. And note this—that as satisfaction or amends making is counted righteousness before the world and a purging of sin; so that the world when I have made full amends hath no further to complain—even so faith in Christ's blood is counted righteousness and purging all sin before God. Moreover, he that sins against his brother sins also against his Father, Almighty God, and as the sin committed against his brother is purged before the world with making amends or asking forgiveness, even so is the sin against God purged through faith in Christ's blood only. Writings of Tyn-<ref>dale, page 311-2.</ref>

Dr. Chalmers on Repentance. Much mischief has arisen from mistakes respecting the meaning of the term repentance. The word repentance occurs with two different meanings in the New Testament, and it is to be regretted that two different words could not have been devised to express these. This is chargeable upon the poverty of our language, for it is to be observed that in the original Greek the distinction in the meaning is pointed out in the words. The employment of one term to denote two different things has the effect of confounding and misleading the understanding; and it is much to be wished that every ambiguity of this kind were cleared away from that most interesting point in the process of a human soul, at which it turns from sin unto righteousness, and from the power of Satan unto God. When in common language a man says, I repent of such an action he is understood to say, I am sorry for having done it. The feeling is familiar to all of us. How often does the man of dissipation prove this sense of the word repentance when he awakes in the morning, and oppressed by the langour of his exhausted faculties looks back with remorse on the follies and profligacies of the night that is past. The word repentance, so applied, is about equivalent to the word regret. In Matthew xxvii: 3. The wretched Judas repented himself of his treachery. Now here lies the danger to practical Christianity. In the above cited passage to repent is just to regret, or to be sorry for; and this we conceive to be by far the most prevailing sense of the term in the English language. But there are other places where the same term is employed to denote that which is urged upon us a duty—that which is preached for the remission of sins that unless we have it we shall all likewise perish. To save the practically mischiefous effect arising from the application of one term to two different things, one distinct and appropriate term has been suggested for the saving repentance of the New Testament. The term repentance itself has been restricted to the repentence of mere sorrow, and is made equivalent to regret; and for the other able translators have adopted the word reformation. The one expressive of sorrow for our past conduct; the other expressive of our renouncing it. It denotes an actual turning from habits of life that we are sorry for. Now we have much the same kind of kind of exception to allege against the term reformation that we have alleged against the term repentance. The term repentance is inadequate—and why? Because in the common use of it, it is equivalent to regret, and regret is short of the saving change that is spoken of in the New Testament. On the very same principle we count the term reformation to be inadequate, we think, that in common language a man would be called reformed upon the mere change of his outward habits without any reference to the change of mind and principle which gave rise to it. Let the drunkard give up his excesses, the
backbiter his revilings, the extortioner his unjust charges, and the mere change of their external doings, we call them reformed men. There might be in each of these cases what the world calls reformation; yet no scriptural repentance. There is no single word in the English language which occurs to us as fully equal to the faithful rendering of the term in the original, Renewedness of mind, however awkward this phrase may be, is perhaps the most nearly expressive of it. Scriptural repentance, therefore, is that deep and radical change whereby a soul turns from the idols of sin and self unto God, and devotes every movement of the inner and the outer man to the captivity of obedience.” Chalmers’s Introduction to Baxter’s Call to the Unconverted, pages 5 to 10. I have not room to add anything of my own. Tyndale and Chalmers are two master spirits. JACOB CREATH.

SECTARIAN PROGRESSIVENESS.

The necessity for the distinctive position and plea of the present reformation, is to be found in the condition of the religious parties of the day. We plead for a return of primitive doctrine and discipline. If the mass of religious parties are already near enough to that standard to answer the ends of human salvation, it is both unnecessary and wicked for us to raise a quarrel with them, or to separate from them. And even if the general tendency of their teaching and practice is toward the primitive standard, we ought to be giving them all the encouragement in our power, instead of trying to rend asunder their organizations, and gain proselytes from their membership.

In order to determine their status, and the direction in which they are drifting, we should not confine our observation to exceptional characters among them, who may have risen above the peculiarities of their party, and who therefore owe all that distinguishes them, to influences not felt by the mass of their own brethren. This would be a deceptive induction, because it would be drawn from cases, which, though found among the parties, are not of them. We should rather make an induction from their representative men; men who breathe most intensely the spirit of the party and by their popularity, show that there is a strong sympathy between them and their brethren.

Such a man in a pre-eminent degree, is Henry Ward Beecher. His sermons and lectures are, no doubt, listened to by more men, and with higher admiration, than those of any other man in America. His publications are eagerly devoured by sectarians of every class, and the New York “Independent,” of which he is the life and soul, boasts of the largest weekly circulation in the world, among religious journals. He is therefore, the best representative of the most popular and taking phase of modern sectarianism, and we may safely judge the tree by its fruits as developed in him.

A copy of the “Independent” was placed in my hand recently, containing a sermon by Mr. Beecher, the reading of which has suggested the present article. His text is the last verse of the 11th of Hebrews “God having provided some better thing for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect.” He begins, by saying, “this eleventh chapter contains a list of Hebrew worthies,—the best they had: very poor indeed, as specimens of ripe and perfect manhood; but, as specimens of relative excellence, judged from the time in which they lived, the influences under which they were reared, and the special heroism of individual action, a very noble band.” This is certainly a very poor compliment to Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, and the remainder of that worthy host. It is also a poor compliment to Paul’s judgment, for he thought they were men “of whom the world was not worthy;” yet Mr Beecher says they were “very poor indeed as specimens of ripe and perfect manhood.” Paul, how-
ever, was one of those weak-minded Jews who always looked backward for "the golden age of religion." They looked back to David, to Moses, to the patriarchs, and esteemed them as enviable for their privileges and attainments." In doing this, Paul and his brethren failed to appreciate as they should, some better "specimens of ripe and perfect manhood" that were in their midst. There was Nicodemus, for instance, to whom not a single compliment is paid by New Testament writers; and there was Joseph of Arimathea, of whom one writer is so unappreciative as to remark that he was a "disciple of Jesus, but secretly far fear of the Jews," yet Mr. Beecher has discovered something in these two men that exalts them far above the heroes so admired by Paul. He says, "No man can read the life of Jacob, and not feel that Joseph of Arimathea was a much more spiritually advanced man than he. I believe Nicodemus to have possessed much higher moral culture than Isaac. John Baptist far surpassed, in all elements of higher manhood, King David. While, as for Solomon, I would be sorry to see the day come again, in which such a barbaric prince should be esteemed great."

Poor Solomon! Jesus Christ commended his wisdom and his glory, yet he was nothing but barbarian, and the age which calls Napoleon a great man would have to degenerate woefully before he could be esteemed great." What a wonderful progress men have made in their appreciation of "higher manhood," and "moral culture," since the days of Christ and his apostles!

But this is not the only particular in which Mr. Beecher and his friends have progressed beyond the apostles. They not only know better how to judge of "higher manhood," but they are actually better "specimens of ripe and perfect manhood," than were the apostles. He says "It is no more irreverent to say that the apostles were far behind our times, than for them to say that the patriarchs were far behind their times." * * * "As the Jewish fathers and prophets, noble and eminent, were yet but advanced a certain way, so the disciples and apostles, though far beyond their predecessors, were yet to be outstripped." Let not the reader innocently imagine that all this has reference to the invention of railroads, steamboats, telegraphs, &c.; for it is moral and not material progress of which our preacher is treating. He says "Although, perhaps, not a man can be found that surpasses ancient saints in the force and heroism of individual will, and in the personal glory that comes from endowment and individual energy, yet there are many that by force of circumstances, both know more and do more than any individual man did or could do in the early church." Again, in more definite terms, he says, "We are not, perhaps, in advance of the apostles, in a vivid apprehension of the Saviour, who was personally present with them. They had the aid of their senses, in forming a conception of him; but we have a better appreciation of the moral truths which he taught, than they that saw him, and heard him speak." It is, then, in respect to the "moral truths" taught by the Saviour, that we have outstripped the apostles, and in this particular, that they are as "far behind our times," as the "patriarchs were behind their times."

The idea that we should go to the apostles to learn the "moral truths" taught by Jesus Christ, is preposterous: for in the present age "there are many that by force of circumstances, both know more and do more than any individual man did or could do in the early church." If you want to be "a spiritually advanced man," don't go back to Peter and Paul, but go to Plymouth Church in Brooklyn, rent a pew at $150 a year, and listen to Henry Ward Beecher, and it will not be long before you will find yourself a much better "specimen of ripe and perfect manhood" than those old barbarians so much admired by Paul. Indeed, you will soon have "a better appreciation of the moral truths which Jesus taught, than they that saw him, and heard him speak."

Our knowing and progressive preacher does not stop at these vague generalities
but boldly proceeds to specify the moral truths which he and his brethren appreciate so much better than the apostles. He says

"The world's history and revolutions have been changing and deepening, and broadening our ideas of justice; of the grounds and principles of government; of the nature of sin and of remedial methods. The world's history is God's theological seminary, and in that he has been evolving great moral doctrines to meet the wants of the age."

Paul wrote a good deal upon justice, upon the nature of sin, upon the government of God, and especially upon remedial methods: but his writings are too far behind our time, to serve as a text book, in the theological seminary, in which Mr. Beecher has studied. In this, the "world's history" is the test book, and by the study of it, those crude and misshapen ideas learned from Paul on all these subjects, have been changed, deepened, and broadened. Not only so, but in this course of study, God has been evolving great moral doctrines to meet the wants of the age." Jesus Christ, then, was mistaken, in saying that the Holy Spirit would guide the apostles into all the truth; and Paul was a mere bigot, in saying that if even an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that he preached, he should be accursed. For God has evolved to Mr. Beecher some great moral doctrines that the apostles knew little or nothing about; and by these has met the wants of the age in a manner to which the antiquated gospel preached by Paul was entirely unsuited.

One of the great moral doctrines evolved in this theological seminary, is love. There are some silly people who imagine that Jesus and the apostles understood this doctrine very well, and put it into practice in a way worthy of our imitation. But Mr. Beecher says, "The world is learning more and more about love. There is more power of loving, and there is to be more in ages to come, ten thousand times, than there was in the days of Christ, or in the period intervening between the days of Christ and our time." The love of one another which prompted the original church in Jerusalem to offer all their property for the common good, is only about one ten thousandth part as ardent as that now existing among the members of Mr. Beecher's great church in Brooklyn. True, they don't show their love in the same way, for that would be behind the age; but you must not doubt the existence of it, for that would be to doubt the word of Mr. Beecher.

That particular manifestation of love which has reference to parents, has been developed in a degree which attracts especial attention from our preacher. He says, "Father and mother mean to us more than they meant in Jerusalem. * * * Father and mother! Two thousand years have been augmenting the literature of these two words; and when they sound out now in their amplitude, in their stores and riches, they represent what Christianity has developed in that direction. We stand on a platform vastly higher than that on which the apostles themselves stood." This may be a little surprising to those who have read about children being stoned to death in Jerusalem for mistreating their parents, and that the "platform" of the apostles reads, "Children obey your parents in all things;" but you see, Mr. Beecher has studied in the school of Young America, and stands on a platform vastly higher than that. He don't tell us exactly in what points the words father and mother have changed their meaning, but it is very evident that he tells the truth, for the very words themselves have given place, in the lips of Young America, to the more progressive titles, "the old man," and "the old woman." And the old apostolic idea that children should obey their parents in all things, has long since been exploded. We stand on a platform vastly higher than that.

The above are not all the great doctrines evolved in "God's theological seminary." Our preacher further says, "We have also developed into incontestable eminence certain great ideas that are fundamental to the progress of mankind; as, for instance, the Universal Fatherhood of God."
trine is coming to be generally received that God is the God of all the earth." This doctrine sounds very much like some things we have read in the Bible, and Mr. Beecher admits that some such words were used by sacred writers, but insists that they did not know what they were talking about. He says, "Although we find declarations to this effect from the beginning of the Bible clear down to the end of it, yet in the acceptance of the men of the early, the middle, and the later dispensations, God has not been so much the God of all the earth as the God of particular nations. He was a local God." Now this is a blow not merely at the patriarchs and the Jews, "men of the early and middle dispensations," but at the apostles of the later dispensation. For the preacher proceeds to say, "There is a relationship between every man and God, and God owns that relationship and accepts the man. There is in this fact, that God is the God of every member of the human family, and not of those who suppose themselves to be advanced near to God, more than I shall now stop to develop. There is revolution in it. There is in it disturbance to the foundation of men's believing. In other words, there is universalism in it; or, to speak still more to the point, there is outspoken infidelity in it. And so there is throughout the whole of the sermon. No man could deliver such a sermon who is not at heart an infidel.

Such is the doctrine of the first half of this characteristic discourse. It represents the present generation, as far advanced beyond the apostles in almost every virtue, especially, in love and in proper conceptions of the "universal fatherhood of God." The reader will be a little surprised to see all this contradicted in the latter half of the sermon. He says, "The feeling of arrogance and superiority was never greater; than in our times and among our people." Mirabile dictu! What a fall for a people of whom it had just been said, that "We stand on a platform vastly higher than that on which the apostles themselves stood." And then, after complimenting his audience on their great superiority to the apostles in appreciation of the "universal fatherhood of God," see what a slap in the face he gives them in the following words. "We are arrogant in supposing that God died for Anglo-Saxons; and that, as for that great and growing mass of humanity in our midst, the Africans, he made them to be rugs on which to wipe our feet. We have as much pride as the old Jews had, who would get up a mob at any time, if they heard a man say that God had mercy for Gentiles. They could stand the arguments of the apostles and old christians, but the moment Paul said "Gentiles," pop went a stone at him. And so we can stand an immense amount of philanthropy, and philosophy, but the moment the fact is proclaimed that God has a people among the black folks, we express, with an ineffable snuff of scorn, our dissent from any such detestableism as that." In this paragraph the preacher must have reference to his own congregation especially; for we of the West have not progressed quite that far. We still hang back with the old-fashioned apostles, and actually receive Africans into the fellowship of our congregations.

The reader must not think too much of these contradictions in this sermon. It would have been ruinous to one of the apostles to have contradicted himself, but they were a long way behind our times. With one of your more "spiritually advanced" "specimens of ripe and perfect manhood," such as Mr. Beecher, the fact that the last half of the sermon contradicts the first half, is mere circumstance. It is, indeed, a characteristic of your men of progress, and you will be considered an old fogy if you stop to criticise matters of so little moment.

In conclusion, I would submit to the brethren, had we not better cease our war-
fare upon a sectarianism the tendencies of which, as developed by this sermon, are to advance us so far beyond the apostles! Surely none of us will fight it so violently any longer, unless, we are so far behind the times as to be in favor of Jesus Christ and the apostles.

J. W. McGarvey.
August, 1862.

**BIBLE TRANSLATION.**

We have seen in a recent print a notice, informing the public that the Revision of the English Scriptures, as being prepared and to be given to the world, by the American Bible Union, will not retain the word, "Baptist," but instead, we are to have the word, *Immerser*. No authority, however, is given for this, if our memory is correct, but a private conversation with Dr. Hacket. We have seen no account of it from any official source, and do not desire to be decided in any way till we know certainly what the truth is. It would be an easy matter, if the Bible Union desired to give the public any such information to do so. Still, we throw no doubt over the matter. It may be that the profound position of Dr. Conant, and his reason for it, have been repudiated by the Bible Union and that better counsels have prevailed. Still, it is a late date for anything of the kind to occur. The mischief that has been done has been immense. Confidence in the Bible Union has been injured; not because the matter, in itself, is one of so much importance, but because it is such a manifest violation of one of the clearest principles of the Union. Nothing was more frequently declared, emphasized and maintained than that every word should be translated into corresponding terms in English, or as near it as possible. No one the least acquainted with the matter doubted that the Greek word, "Baptist," is *immerser*, in English, nor is there the least difficulty in so translating it. It was known, too, that a world of trouble at this time was manifested by a clamoring class of weak *Baptists*, "so-called," about their Scriptural name, *Baptist*. Whether this clamor had any influence on Dr. Conant or not, it is a fact, that he made an attempt to retain the word, "Baptist," and that he and others tried to justify him in so doing. The trouble we felt in the matter, was not the importance in the rendering of the word, in itself, but the importance of having the translators stick to their published and boasted principles. We did not desire the opponents of the Union to be able to say, that the translators had manifestly departed from one of its most cherished principles. If the right now prevails, it is one indication in the right direction.

There is, however, much reason to regret a want of faithfulness in other matters of much more importance than the one of which we have been speaking. There is a vast difference between the readings, "immersing them in the name," &c., and "immersing them into the name," &c. The most natural conclusion to which any one could come in reference to the meaning of "immersing them in the name," &c., would be, "immersing them by the authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Still, that can not be the meaning, for just preceding these words, we have the words, "All authority in heaven and in earth is given to me," and he adds, "Go, ye, therefore, and disciple all nations." All authority was given to Christ, all things were committed into his hands and "repentance and remission of sins were preached in his name," or by his authority. He did not command them to "immerse by the authority of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. How, then, can we understand "immersing them in the name," &c.? We see but one remaining
idea any one can have, and that is that
"in the name," is equivalent to "in Christ,"
"in the body," or in the kingdom. This
would suit the idea of becoming Chris-
tians, or entering "into Christ" first, and
being immersed in Christ, or in the king-
dom. This makes the rite a "church
ordinance," a ceremony in the kingdom, a
rite for the observance of a Christian—"a
Christian duty." But this, with people
who understand the New Testament, more
ridiculous than marrying people who are
already in the married state. The mar-
riage ceremony is not for those in the
married state, but for those not in it—
they are married into the new state. So
immersion is not for those in Christ, in
the kingdom, but for those not in the
kingdom—they are immersed "into Christ"
"into one body" "into one body" "into
the name of the Father, and of the Son, and
of the Holy Spirit."

We have seen many evidences that
men intensely sectarian can not give us
a pure version of the Scriptures. The
true state of the case is, that no man can
be prepared to translate the Scriptures
till he assumes, maintains and stands
upon the genuine reformation, or Chris-
tian ground—that is till he abandons,
abjures and utterly repudiates all systems,
theories and dogmas in religion, and
comes to the feet of Jesus and the apos-
tles to learn of them, till he shall so place
himself religiously, that he can open the
Scriptures with a single desire to discover
the will of God and give it to the world.
He should have nothing to care for only
to be certain and translate faithfully. He
should have no peculiar views to guard,
no doctrine to defend, and no interest to
protect, only simply to see that the truth,
the whole truth, and nothing but the
truth, be fairly laid before the world. He
should believe nothing but the gospel,
have a concern for nothing else and de-
sire simply to give it to the world as he
finds it in the divine originals.

We have a translation, in a forward
state, and understand that several schol-
and, we trust, will shortly be accomplished.

With such a translation as we hope we shall soon have, accompanied by the prefaces, introductions, and appendix, prepared by Bro. A. Campbell and published in connection with the Family Testament, and a few other works easily obtained, a young man of good mind, devotion and piety, can in one year know more about the Scriptures than ninetieths of the preachers of this generation.

Bro. Evan, within a dozen years, has had two or three "tilts" with us, in each in stance, as we thought, and still think, on the wrong side. Still, he is a worthy man, a man of ability and one whom we esteem very highly. We should dread to encounter him, in any contest where he is in the right. We should have no hope of success; but we do not believe that he can bring something out of nothing, or that he can produce evidence where there is none, or that he can convince people without evidence. True, he talks plainly, but we like him all the better for that. We do not intend to become angry nor to be thrown off our guard.

I. Bro. Evan complains, that we did not attend to many examples produced in his previous article. But, if our memory is not at fault, he will see that we did not attempt a reply to him, or a review of his article, but simply made some remarks on the same subject. We were perfectly aware that we noticed but little of what he said, but treated the subject much as we should if he had not said anything, and that too, without knowing, as we now do, who the article was from.

II. We regret the allusion of Bro. Evan, in the following words: "And I ask in faithful brotherly kindness that the columns of your journal—which exerts so great an influence over the minds of so many whose opportunities and tastes limit them to its editorials as the chief source of their religious information—be purged from so foul a blot." We should like to know what opportunities they can be that limit so many to our editorials! Certainly those who receive our sheet are no more limited to our editorials, by opportunities of any sort, than to the numerous able correspondents whose articles are spread before them in our columns. Why too, should there be an insinuation in reference to the tastes of our readers? This is not a wise start, to obtain from them an unprejudiced hearing. It is not necessary to complain of the tastes of our readers, when a man would get a hearing from them. We have
seen a kind hint to some brethren who are constantly wavering in regard to some of the clearest things ever uttered, that instead of their coming out reformers, like the editor of "the glorious Christian Baptist," they will find their own feet tripped up and their own folly exposed.

Have we come to the point, when we may not say, "some things are settled among the brethren"—that "among these things is the process through which to pass in turning to God, or the steps to be taken in becoming a Christian and the order in which they occur?" Is it our duty, in speaking of these matters, to speak of them in an equivocal manner? Must we hold these things as unsettled, in doubt and uncertainty? In these, the simplest matters in the gospel—things that thousands of Jews learned on hearing a single discourse—are we to be "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth?" We have heard much said about "too much preaching on first principles," "going on to perfection," &c., &c., but when the steps to be taken to enter the kingdom of God, and the order in which they occur, may not be considered settled, we can not say much about going on to perfection. We shall, however, take it, that "the terms of pardon, as presented by the disciples for the past thirty-five years, have been tested by as learned, shrewd and wily opponents as any principles ever had, and they have stood the test and will stand it till the last trumpet shall sound." We say not this to cut off investigation, but because it is the deep and settled conviction of our heart, and, at the same time, to challenge investigation—the most rigid scrutiny—that all may see whereof we affirm. We abate nothing of what is contained in the paragraph in question. If we may not affirm that "some things are settled," we had as well confess scepticism at once.

IV. Our brother, under the fictitious signature, Evan, starts out under the heading, "Faith, not always Faith." When the ellipsis is supplied, it will read, "Faith is not always faith," or "In the New Testament, faith is not always faith." This, as a prop-
osition, is about as consistent as white is not always white, or black is not always black. When our brother is ready for argument, he changes his proposition so as to read as follows: "The term faith, or belief, I showed clearly, as I thought, like the word grace and multitudes of other words in scripture, has various meanings, and that he who confounds these meanings must of necessity confound himself also." A man who cannot see the difference between the propositions, "Faith is not always faith," and the term "Faith has various meanings in scripture," may well demur at our saying, "some things are settled," at least so far as he is concerned. Who ever denied that "the term faith has various meanings in scripture?" No one that we are aware of, ever doubted this. But that, faith is not always faith," we do dispute, as one of the most palpable absurdities that can be found in the same number of words in any instance. Whether Evan is always Evan, or not, unequivocally "faith is always faith," no matter how various the meanings of it. That the word faith, is always used in the same sense, in scripture, or that this word always has the same meaning, we have never affirmed; but no matter how many meanings faith may have, or how many senses the English word faith, or the original from which it comes, is used in, most unequivocally faith is always faith. When Evan can prove that white is black, and that black is white, he may prove that "faith is not always faith"—not before.

V. Evan says, "the Bible does sometimes call that unbelief, which sometimes it calls faith." In the utmost kindness, and with no feeling of unpleasantness toward our brother, we most unequivocally deny this proposition. A more absurd proposition cannot be written, unless he intends, which he evidently does not, to affirm that the Bible contains the most clear and palpable contradiction. Faith, or, which is the same, belief and unbelief, are as exact opposites as can be found, and the two words never are applied to the same exercise, in scripture. That precise exercise, no matter whether it be styled assent of the mind, trust, confidence, or what, is never, in any other place, styled unbelief. If it be said, of the same persons, in one instance, that "they believe on him," and in another instance, that they did not believe, that is a very different proposition, from the Bible calling that unbelief which sometimes it calls faith. The same persons, on one occasion, may perform the exercise called faith, and on another occasion, or even on the same occasion, perform a very different exercise, in reference to the same thing, or something else, called unbelief; but this is not calling that unbelief which the Bible sometimes calls faith.

Evan alludes to the words, "How can you believe who receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that comes from God only?" John v. 44. These he affirms are "the same characters" said to have "believed on him," chapter xxii. 42, 43, and then adds, derisively, "These are the editor's 'believers,' 'actual believers.'" Why did he not, in the same derisive manner, say, "These are John's 'believers,' 'actual believers?"" John says, "many believed on him." We took it that John's statement was true, and so take it still, and not that believing on him, was unbelieving! Does he show that the many who believed on him, were the same persons to whom the question, "How can you believe?" was addressed? He assumes that they were "the same characters," without any proof, and then assumes, not only without proof, but without the possibility of proof, that the same exercise alluded to, in the words, "many believed on him," is somewhere else called unbelief!

VI. Evan makes an ado about the fear of the brethren, for which, by the way, there was no ground. Why does he write over a fictitious name? Certainly not on account of the fear of the Lord! Why then? For fear of the world? Certainly not. Why then? Why not come to the light? Whatever may be charged against us besides, it will certainly not be charged that we fear the brethren, or that we fear man; but we should greatly dread and fear the Lord, to give birth to such a speculative, mystical and unmeaning document as the one signed Evan,
especially that patrof it in which he demurs
so stoutly at our considering "some things
settled," and intimate, as we now do again,
that he cannot unsettle them.  B. F.

PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION,
NUMBER FOURTEEN.

THE REFORMATION.—NUMBER ONE.

A plea for reformation is one thing, and
a plea for the Reformation is another thing.
A plea for reformation is general, giving
range as wide as could be desired by any
talker or orator, extending to politics, 
medicine, religion—everything. A man
might talk on reformation for a year, talk
the truth, talk popularly and well, as
D'Aubine does in his History of the Re-
formation of the Sixteenth Century; with-
out having the least reference to the
Reformation of the nineteenth century; or
he might do all that and have no heart in
the Reformation of the nineteenth century,
or even regard it as a mere innovation, a
heresy or mischievous movement. The
principle of reformation in general, in
Protestant countries, is a very popular
theme, and any man, with the ability,
may deliver fine orations on it, or write
essays, without in the least ruffing the
smooth surface of the placid sea of popu-
lar opinion. But to take up the prin-
ciples of a new reformation, the refor-
mation of our time, the life principles of
which are aggressive, and even subver-
sive of popular principles and establish-
ments all round us, clearly define them,
make the issues, take the ground, main-
tain, defend and perpetuate it, against all
odds, is a very different affair. The
former is merely the work of the popular
orator, or essayist, getting feathers in his
cap, by expatiating upon and eulogizing
men who have won their laurels, are dead
and gone and principles already estab-
lished and popularized. The latter is
himself a reformer, doing the work of
reformation, pushing the principles of
reformation into new regions, defending,
maintaining, and perpetuating them. He
is not extolling, eulogizing and lauding
battles fought by others, victories won,
and principles established, to glorify him-
self and get praise from popular opinion,
to which he is merely catering; but he is
fighting battles himself, gaining victories
and reforming the world, for the good of
the millions not yet born.

We have, many of us, for many years
past, been speaking of something, we
have called "The Reformation of the
Nineteenth Century." Is this a reality? or
is it merely an imagination? Is there a
Reformation of the nineteenth century?
Many write and speak as if they were in
doubt on this matter. We are laboring
under the impression, and have been for
many years, that there is a real reformation
of the nineteenth century, of momentous
and transcendent importance to mankind,
occupying a different ground from all the
reformations before it and rising entirely
above them—that it is emphatically The
Reformation of the Nineteenth Cen-
tury. It differs from all the reformations
that have preceded it, at least in the fol-
lowing particulars:

I. It was not an attempt to reform any
one church organization, change it and
make it better, or more acceptable to the
people, or more Scriptural, but, in the
shortest possible way, to return to the
primitive model in all things and have
every thing as it was at the beginning.
It is not the intention, in this great move-
ment, to improve upon the form of the
Lutheran, the Episcopal, or any other
modern church, but directly return to
the primitive form and follow the original
form in all things.

II. It was not, in its incipiency, nor is
it now, undertaking an improvement upon
the Episcopal form of church government,
the Congregational, or Presbyterian, but
at once to return to the New Testament
form of church government, in all things, and have all things as they were at the beginning. In this grand movement, the matter is not to produce a church government that will suit the people better than the forms in use, but at once to return to the Lord's own form of government, as it was at the beginning, and suit ourselves to it, or conform ourselves to the Lord's form of government. In the place of spending time in inventing and forming systems of church government, and trying to prove them to be right, or nearer right than other systems, the true reformer takes it for granted that the form of church government given by the Savior, delivered by the apostles and practiced in the first Christian congregations, is infallibly right, and he spends his time in making himself thoroughly acquainted with it, acquainting others with it, enforcing it upon them, advocating, maintaining and defending it.

III. The reformers of the nineteenth century did not start out in an effort to point out the defects in the existing creeds and make a better creed than any of them, or an effort to improve upon the creeds now in existence. They could not hope to make a better creed than the wise men before them had made. But they discarded all creeds, confessions, disciplines and formularies, of every sort and name, of human origin, not because of defects, which they pointed out in them, but because they were of human origin, and utterly without divine authority. They saw that the people of God could never be united on any one of them, for they all stand on an equal footing—all human and imperfect, and consequently no one of them could have any claim above another; and they saw further, that if the people of God should unite upon any one of them, that it would not be acceptable to the Lord, as he never authorized any of them, or union upon any one of them. They, therefore, rejected, discarded and repudiated the whole of them, because they were human creeds, all more or less imperfect, and all utterly without divine authority.

IV. They came under Jesus and chose him for their only leader, lawgiver and king, and his law, the New Testament, as their only law. This ground they found to be wholly unassailable from any quarter, for the following reasons briefly stated:

1. If they meet the unbeliever, they show that Jesus is divine; that he is Lord of all; that he rose from the dead; that he lives forever and ever. When this is proved, they are done proving; all he said is true, all divine, or of divine authority.

2. They show that all admit that Jesus is Lord of all; the only lawgiver, "the King of kings and Lord of lords," and that this being admitted, his law must be the only law.

3. They show that all admit that the New Testament is the law-given by Jesus Christ, and that the man who receives the New Testament receives the only law authorized by the Lord.

4. They show, what is generally admitted, that for the first three hundred years of the church she had no creed but the law of Christ and that the law of Christ was then her creed, her only creed.

5. They show that they dare not depart from that law, make any other constitution or law, adopt it and form a new and separate organization or confederation under it; that to do this would be treason in the divine government.

6. They show that the law of God is common ground, where all can come, without any sacrifice of truth or conscience; that all the religious truth in the world, all the divine authority, is in the Bible, the law of God, that all can unite on this law who are under the one lawgiver.

V. This reformation maintains that a man can be converted to Christ, constituted a Christian, made a Disciple of Christ, and nothing more; that the Luth-
eran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Methodist, can be omitted, and should be omitted in every case, that the entire work of the minister of Christ, is to bring men to Christ, turn them to God, make Christians, disciples of Christ, children of God, no more, nothing else, that making mere Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, or Presbyterians, is something in addition; the work of the partisan and the work that divides the people.

VI. The genuine reformer of the nineteenth century devotes himself to building up, edifying and sustaining the church of God, founded on Christ. He knows no other church, has no labor to bestow upon any other and strives to identify no one with any other. He has no work but one, the work of God.

VII. One grand item in the work of the genuine reformer is to gather all the people of God, the true and faithful friends of Jesus, the true Israel of God, into the one fold, under the one shepherd the great shepherd of the sheep, who laid down his life for the sheep, that there may be one fold and one shepherd. This is a work that no previous reformation has attempted, yet a work now progressing most gloriously and triumphantly. It is no longer a mere matter of theory, but a matter on which we have practical demonstration. Thousands upon thousands have been gathered and are being gathered from all the parties around us, united and made one, under Christ, their living head, their all glorious and all conquering king; and no people since the time of the apostles have ever been more perfectly of the same mind and the same judgment. Large numbers from the world, too, are being gathered into the one fold, made one under Christ their common head, and the Lord of all. Those thus gathered are now found in all the States of this Union, in the distant territories, in the Canadas, in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales; in Jamaica and Australia, and, by the blessing of heaven, we believe the time is not far distant, when they will be found in every part of the civilized world.

VIII. That the faith once delivered to the saints, the new institution by Christ, the Christian religion, is a complete system, perfect and divine, is certainly a proposition that no man should be required to prove at this date, by any one who believes the Bible; and that this system is the only one now authorized for the human race, is equally certain. To admit all this, and then maintain that we can not tell what the religion of Christ is, is not only to take an unreasonable position, but to throw all into doubt and uncertainty. For, if we can not tell what the religion of Christ is, there is no certainty, in any thing else, and if we can tell what the religion of Christ is, there can be no excuse for taking any thing else. We, therefore, maintain the following propositions:

1. That we can tell what the religion of Christ is—that it can, in all its parts, be separated and distinguished from everything else.

2. That a person can become a Christian, a disciple of Christ, or child of God, without anything more or less, or anything different, and that this is precisely what the Lord now requires of all mankind.

3. That those who are Christians, disciples, the people of God, the true Israel of God, are the church of God, the pillar and support of the truth.

4. That this body is styled, in Scripture, the kingdom of God, the body of Christ, God's building, the house of God, the temple of God, the church of God, the church of Christ.

5. That this body has no law but the law of the Lord, the word of God, the Scriptures.

6. That it is the duty of all good men to make a grand effort to convert all mankind to Christ, bring all mankind to the one foundation, which the Lord has laid for the one building, one temple.

In this paper we have briefly sketched...
a few of the principal items to be discussed under the foregoing heading.—Thousands of good men have devoted the energies of their lives to the discussion of these principles, their advocacy, maintenance, defence and perpetuation, and more are enlisting continually, and we expect a glorious triumph. Let us put our hand to the work, while we have it in our hearts, and with every energy push it on till the holy prayer of Jesus, that those who believe on him through their word, may all be one as he and his Father are one, that the world may believe that the Father has sent him, shall be answered and the united praises of the saints shall rise up to him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb forever and ever.

**CONVERSION.**

**NUMBER ONE.**

Bro. Franklin—Dear Sir,—I propose to write some essays on conversion, and to point out some of the principal differences between spiritual conversions and popular conversions.

Conversion, convert, to change from one state to another; to turn from one religion to another, or from one party or sect to another, as to convert pagans to Christianity; to convert royalists into republicans. It is derived from converto, con and verto to turn—Webster. In a theological and moral sense, a change of heart or dispositions, in which the enmity of the heart to God and his law, and the obstinacy of the will are subdued and are succeeded by supreme love to God and his moral government, and a reformation of life. A change from one religion to another religion, as the conversion of the Gentiles. Acts xv: Webster. Acts xxvi: 20. Cruden, in his large Concordance, says: “Conversion is the turning or a total change of a sinner from his sins to God.” Psalm li: 13. “And sinners shall be converted unto thee.” God is the author of this change, who, by his Spirit, puts repentance, faith, love and every grace into the soul. Jeremiah xxxi: 18. “Turn thou me.” “No man can come unto me except the Father draw him.” John vi: 44. The word of God is a means or instrument of conversion. “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul” Psalm xix: 7. Ministers by the preaching of the gospel are also instrumental in this change. 1 Corinthians iv: 15. “In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.” And particularly Christians by private admonitions and exhortations are sometimes a means of this change. Jas. v: 19, 20. “Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins.” I believe Cruden was a Calvinistic Baptist.

Conversion, says the great Charnock, is to be distinguished from regeneration thus: Regeneration is a spiritual change, conversion is a spiritual motion; in regeneration there is a power conferred; conversion is the exercise of this power; in regeneration there is given us a principle to turn; conversion is our actual turning. In renewing us, God gives us a power; in converting us, he excites that power. Men are naturally dead and have a stone upon them. Regeneration is the rolling away the stone from the heart and a rising to newness of life; and then conversion is as natural to a regenerate man as motion is to a lively body. A principle of activity will produce action. In regeneration man is wholly passive; in conversion he is active. Regeneration is the motion of God in the creature, conversion is the motion of the creature to God. By acts of believing, repenting, mortifying
quickening do spring. In all these a man is active, in the other he is merely passive.

There are as many witnesses to popular Calvinistic conversion as are required by the law and gospel too. These are all on one side; we must examine some on the other side of the Bible, after sifting these witnesses. It is the same old Calvinistic song tune and chorus which was taught to me from my infancy; for as the common version says of pure Phariseism that I was taught after the most straightest sect of Calvinism. The sinner is dead, a stone lies on him, which he cannot roll off himself and which God will not roll off unless he is one of his eternally elect, and if he is one of these elect he will regenerate him by a secret, irresistible, effectual, individual, personal operation of his Spirit upon the sinners naked spirit, and then he will move, turn and act, but not till after this nondescript regeneration; before which regeneration the English Bible is as unintelligible to him as a Hebrew save as a fifth wheel to a wagon. This tradition makes the Word of God of no effect in the sinner’s conversion. It is true he uses it as he does the conversation of a poor feeble, sinful man, as a means or an instrument instead of the instrument, the power of God to salvation, which works effectually in those who obey it. The Word or law of God, which converts the soul; which Word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword, and is a discerner of the secret purposes of the heart; a fire and a hammer to thaw, melt and break the sinner’s heart. Here lies the principal difference between the gospel of Dort, the five Calvinistic points published and confirmed in the year 1618, and the gospel published and confirmed by the Apostles in Jerusalem, Symaria, and throughout the Roman empire, in the first century of the Christian era. In this theory of regeneration, the sinner is as wholly and completely passive as this pen is in my hand, and he is as incapable of his conversion before his regeneration as this pen in feeding me, or as it is in curing me of a disease. Instead of the Word of the Lord being an instrument of conversion like a man. The Bible says: “By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them, by the breath of his mouth. The two great and powerful institutions of the law and the gospel were brought into existence by the Word of the Lord. The voice of the Lord is full of power; it breaks to pieces the majestic cedars of Lebanon; it shakes the wilderness of Kadesh. Christ said the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God, and they hearing shall live; and the time is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth.

If the Word of the Lord has done, and does do, all the above named things, then it is still the seed of faith, of regeneration, the word of, or ministry of reconciliation, the word of salvation, and does, and can, save all who believe and obey it. He that believes that Jesus is the Christ; that he died, was buried, and arose from the dead, and is immersed into Christ, is regenerated, is a new creature, is converted to God. The sectarian preachers ascribe to the Spirit of God, detached from the Word of God, what the divine writers ascribe to the gospel of Jesus Christ.—They ascribe to a mysterious, miraculous, and supernatural operation upon each sinner for his conversion, what the Scriptures ascribe to the truth. They substitute the physical operation of God’s Spirit upon the naked spirit of the sinner in the room and stead of the truth or the gospel. They render the Bible as useless in the regeneration of the sinner, as the papists do in their system. The priests are to the papists what the prophets and apostles were in their day to the people. The priests are channels now through which God reveals the Bible or his will to the Catholics. So the Spirit of God in the Calvinistic system now regenerates
the sinner the same as if there were no Bibles in existence. The papists, with all the Bibles in Christendom, are without the will of God; except they have a priest to reveal the Bible to them; so the Calvinists, with all the Bibles in the world, cannot convert a sinner till the Spirit of God rolls the stone off of him.

The Bible, to a sinner in sectarianism, is as useless in conversion, until he is regenerated as the Bible is to a Catholic sinner, until the priest comes to his relief. The priest first, the Bible second. Without the priest the Bible is the cause of all the heresies on earth; it is useless, a poison and a pestilence. In sectarianism, the Holy Spirit first in regeneration, without the Bible, without or before faith—the Holy Spirit first, the Bible second. According to sectarianism, the sinner, with the Bible in his hands, can no more find his way to heaven than if he had no Bible till he is first regenerated—no more than a papist can find his way to heaven till the priest first opens his eyes. After the priest opens his eyes he has to keep them open, and guide him to heaven; so he takes the Bible away from the people altogether, and is consistent in doing so. The papists take the Bible out of the hands of the people. The sectarian take it out of the people's hearts or heads. For, if the Holy Spirit, has to regenerate the sinner, without the Bible, he can guide him to heaven without the Bible; therefore the Bible is as useless to a sectarian as to a papist. If a sinner can neither understand nor do what he is commanded until regenerated, then he is as well off without the Bible as with it. By the traditions of sectarians and papists the Bible is of no effect. "In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Their worship of me is dictated by human authority." They have shoved aside the Bible to make room for their traditions. They have substituted their systems in the place of the Bible, as counterfeit coin is substituted in the place of genuine coin. Counterfeiters are always angry when their tricks are discovered. Sectarianism and the papacy are both counterfeit coins. The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the genuine coin; no alloy in the word of God. Traditions are the supports of error. The first and most distinction between sectarian conversions and Scripture conversions is—in the former he is converted by the Spirit, and in the latter he is converted by the Word and Spirit of God. The second difference in the two conversions is, that in sectarian conversion the sinner is passive, in Scripture conversion the sinner is active. If conversion is passive, then there is no obligation resting on the sinner to turn to God; he has nothing to do but stand still till he is converted. The common version tells him to be converted. Acts iii: 19. But the common version is an Episcopal, Calvinistic and Pedo-baptist version. The Greek verb epistrepho occurs thirty-nine times in the New Testament, and is an active verb, as much so as to walk, and should not have been rendered passive, to make the Bible bow to the King's orthodoxy; to do violence to philology, to grammar and common sense, as they have done by rendering active verbs passive—where they have said at the end of the parable of the Sower, that they should be converted, and in the above passage. The Greek says: "Repent and return to God, lest they return and I should forgive their sins." God never told a man to be converted since he made him. That implies passivity, and that he is resisting some foreign influence, which is the sectarian idea of conversion. The apostolic conversions were all active; sectarians are all passive. As one apostolic convert was made so were all made. If one was active, all were active. The first three thousand were active; they were commanded to repent themselves and be immersed, both of which are active. They were all active in turning to God.

J. CREATH,
RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

NUMBER FOUR.

REVIEW OF EVAN.—NUMBER TWO.

We have divided our review of Bro. Evan into two parts because we desired to occupy about as much space as he has, and do not wish to fill the Review with such long articles. We are laboring under the most unwavering conviction that we are entirely in the right, and consequently that we need no advantage of any sort. We have started out with the intention of giving the few brethren who think repentance, in the order in which the events occur, precedes faith, a full satisfaction, but do not desire to fill the Review with it. As the article of Bro. Evan contains something a little nice, in illustration of this meaning, which reads as follows: "When, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this to them, and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said. Now when he was in Jerusalem, at the passover, on the feast day, many believed on his name, when they saw the miracles which he did." There was as certainly a conviction of the mind in this case as in any other recorded in Scripture, not yielding under momentary impulse, but yielding from the force of the most convincing testimony—the Lord’s resurrection, in the one case, and his stupendous miracles in the other. Whatever “flush of momentary impulse,” there was, only resulted from their faith, but did not produce it.

Bro. Evan gives, as his fourth sense, in which the word faith is used, “a better understanding of the meaning of Scripture.” John ii: 22 is given as an illustration. We do not find his meaning in the passage. "When he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered what he had said to them, and they believed the Scriptures and the word which Jesus had
said." His rising from the dead is given as the cause of their remembering what he had said and the Scripture. He had told them that he would rise, and referred them to Scripture where it was promised, and when he did rise they believed what he had said and the Scripture. The belief, in this instance, was as much a conviction of the mind as that in any other instance.

In his fifth instance cited, his "undoubting reliance," is nothing more or less than a full and clear conviction of the mind, or a belief so firm that it could be relied on, resulting in accepting the promise, and his "unwavering trust," in his sixth example, is simply an unwavering conviction of the mind, resulting in an acceptance of the commandment. The accepting of the commandment is not faith, but a result of faith. When the matter is carefully considered, "A conviction of the mind" is faith, and "a conviction of the mind," that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, is the faith, in its primary meaning, and trust, reliance, acceptance, are not strictly speaking, faith but results of faith. The conviction of the mind that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, results in our trusting in him, confiding in him, relying on him, &c., &c. Repentance, as a result, is as necessarily and inseparably connected with faith as trust, but that does not prove that repentance or trust is faith. We are not to conclude that the results of faith are faith itself, or we can make our entire obedience to the Lord, faith, for it all results from faith.

III. We now proceed to tighten the reins a little and thus put a stop to this rambling all over creation. The limits of this controversy only extend to the faith and repentance required in the case of the sinner turning to God. The simple matter to be considered is in the steps to be taken by the sinner in turning to God, whether he believes before he repents. — Does the sinner, in turning to God, believe before he repents? The word believe is to be taken in the same sense as in the expression, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved," and the expressions, "If you believe with all your heart you may," "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," "that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall be saved." The faith, or belief in these examples is the conviction of the mind, "that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." The repentance in question is that alluded to in the expressions: "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." "Repent and be immersed every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." "Repent, you, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." It matters nothing how many senses faith or repentance may be used in, nor how many meanings they may have, in this investigation, we have nothing to do with any sense in which these words may be used, or any meaning they may have, except the sense in these passages. Therefore, none of the parties need give themselves any trouble in regard to the speculations on the different senses in which the word faith may be used, or the different meanings it may have. We have nothing to do with any but the one meaning.

IV. The faith, or belief, which we maintain a man must have before he repents, is the conviction of the mind that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. This conviction of the mind is faith, and when, like the faith of Noah, it is strong enough to move a man with religious fear, or strong enough to move him to repentance, confession and immersion, it is strong enough to save him, and when it is not strong enough to move him with religious fear, or to induce him to yield obedience it is not strong enough to save him. Still, it is faith, nothing but faith, no matter how small, or weak the faith or convic-
tion of the mind. Our position is, that this faith, or conviction of the mind, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, must exist before the repentance required in conversion, or, which is the same, in turning to the Lord. Does Evan, or any other intelligent man, deny this?

V. This conviction of the mind or faith, no matter whether weak or strong, is produced by presenting the truth to be believed, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and the testimony sustaining it. Since Bro. Evan speaks so approvingly of "the glorious old Christian Baptist," but sneers at the teaching contained in it, that faith is produced by testimony, we invite his attention to a few examples. We regret the necessity of making these citations to anyone claiming an acquaintance with "the glorious old Christian Baptist." Still, such is the retrograde movements in certain quarters, that it becomes necessary to brush away some of the old mists settling down over certain minds. We shall only present a few examples as they may occur to us from memory, and if opposition enough to demand it shall be evinced, we will institute a regular induction of the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject.

1. The records of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are records of their testimony concerning Christ. What did he make these records or write them for? John says, of the things recorded in his testimony, "these things are written that you might believe." This shows that belief has to be produced by testimony. See John xx: 30, 31.

2. "In whom you also trusted, after that you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that you believed, you were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise."—Eph. i: 13. This belief, it is clear, came from the word of truth, the gospel of their salvation.

3. "I told you, and you believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." John x: 25.

What is bearing witness or testimony for? Certainly to convince the mind. Then the Lord intended that faith should be produced by testimony.

4. "When they heard this, they were pricked in their heart." Acts ii: 37. When they heard, or believed the testimony of Peter, they were pricked in their heart. They certainly were not pricked in their heart without believing.

5. Nicodemus said, "We know you are a teacher from God, or we believe, for no man can do these miracles which you do unless God be with him." John iii: 2. The works that Jesus did, testifying of him, convinced the mind of Nicodemus, or produced faith in him, that Jesus was a teacher from God. Examples of this kind can be produced to any reasonable extent, showing that faith comes from testimony, or is produced by testimony.

While we are on this point, we have one little matter for our brother, or any who agree with him. Will they produce an instance of faith where there was no testimony? or without testimony? We are not extravagant, and only ask for one instance of faith without testimony. We do not mean an instance where the testimony was not mentioned, but an instance where there was no testimony. Do not forget what we are in dispute about—the faith required in turning to God—the conviction of the mind that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. If that is too hard, produce an instance of faith in any sense, without testimony.

VI. Will Bro. Evan, or any one, produce from Scripture, an instance of repentance before faith—an instance where any person repented before the mind was convinced that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God. We do not mean an instance where the word repentance precedes the word faith in composition, but an instance where a person actually repented before believing. We have furnished an instance of believing where there was no repentance at all either before or after believing. We now make
the reasonable demand that they produce, from Scripture, an instance; only one instance is required, where any person repented before the mind was convinced that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. This is a plain matter, and the requisition is easily complied with, if there is any such case. We want no speculations about "faith not always faith," but we want one instance where some person actually repented before believing that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that is the faith that gives life through his name.

"Let your peace return to you." Matthew v: 30, "Turned him about in the press."

II. The Greek word, epistrophi, is found but once in the New Testament, Acts xv: 3, as follows: "Declaring the conversion of the Gentiles."

III. The Greek word, strepho, is found eighteen times in the New Testament. It is translated, converted, once in the common version; turn again, turned, or something equivalent in the remaining seventeen places. Matthew xviii: 3, it is translated, converted, in the following expression: "Except ye be converted," &c. The following are examples, where it is translated, turn, turned, &c. Matthew v: 39, "Turn to him the other also;" vii: 6, "Turn again and rend you." Acts vii: 42, "Then God turned and gave them up." Acts xiii: 46, "To return to the Gentiles."

IV. In not one instance, where man is the subject, or the being turned, or converted, is the turning, or converting, ascribed to God, to Christ, or the Holy Spirit. In most instances, it is clear that the person turned or converted, turned, or converted himself. See the following: Matthew ix: 22, "Jesus turned him about." In this case, Jesus evidently turned himself. Again, Mark v: 30, "Jesus turned him about in the press." In this case, Jesus certainly turned himself. Once more, Acts vii: 42, "Then God turned and gave them up." In this case, God turned himself. Still, again, John xx: 16, "She turned herself," &c.

V. The turning, or converting, is, in some instances, ascribed to the preacher. Acts xxvi: 18, "To turn them from darkness to light." In this case, Paul was to turn, or convert them. Again, James v: 20, "He who converted the sinner from the error of his way." Once more, Luke i: 16, "Many of the children of Israel shall he turn," and verse 17, "To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children." This turning, or converting, was done by John, the Immerser. In the same sense in which the preacher turns the sinner, the Lord turns him, for the Lord turns him by the preacher.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

NUMBER FIFTEEN.

The Converting Power.

NUMBER ONE.

We are perfectly aware that the expression, "the converting power," is not scriptural, or that no such expression is found in Scripture. We say not this because we desire to say something startling to those who have all their lives long been accustomed to hearing of "the converting power," "powerful conversions," and prayers to the Lord to "send down the converting power," but we say it for the purpose of causing those to think who may not hitherto have thought carefully on the subject. The first thing will be to find out what the New Testament means by the word convert.

I. The Greek word, epistrophi, occurs thirty nine times in the New Testament. Eight times it is translated convert. In all the other places it is translated, turn, return, turned, or something equivalent, as in the following examples: Matthew ix: 22, "Jesus turned him about." Matthew x: 13,
VI. In turning to the Lord, and that is the kind of turning we are now considering, there is a sense in which the preacher turns the sinner, and there is a sense in which he turns himself. When it stands in the form of a commandment, it must have reference to the sense in which a man turns himself, as for instance, “Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out,” Acts iii: 19. This, when properly translated, reads as follows: “Repent and turn, that your sins may be blotted out.”

The difference between these two renderings, is that the former appears to give countenance to the theory, that the sinner did the same. They said the preacher was passive, while the latter makes him active. In the same way, Matthew xiii: 15, “And should be converted,” should be rendered as Dr. Conant has done it, “Should turn, and I should heal them.”

VII. In what sense is it, in which the Lord, by the preacher, turns a man? and in what sense does he turn himself? The preacher presents the gospel to the sinner, containing the intelligence—the inducements, the considerations which produce the change in the mind, in the heart, or the affections, disposing him to turn, or creating within him a willingness to turn. When the sinner is convinced of sin, shown that he ought to turn, the preacher urges him to turn, exhorts and persuades him to turn—to do what he knows to be right. In this sense, the preacher turns, or converts the sinner. But the act of turning, the sinner must perform himself. He must himself turn to the Lord. See the following examples: “And all who dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, and turned to the Lord.” Acts ix: 35. Again, Acts xi: 21, “A great number believed and turned to the Lord.” Again, Acts xxvi: 20, “Should repent and turn to God.” Once more, 1 Thessalonians i: 9, “How you turned to God from idols.” In all these instances, it is evident that the persons converted, turned themselves, or that the turning was their own act—they turned, and not they were turned. They were active and not passive in turning.

VIII. The same original word, epistre-
him come." "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." These, and a vast number more expressions of Scripture are uttered in view of the fact that man can turn to the Lord, and if he does not do it, he will be justly punished.

For the sake of distinction, some have styled that which the Lord does, in laying before man the considerations which induce him to turn, the divine part, and the act of turning, which the man performs himself, the human part. The truth is, that all that is done, according to the divine direction, is divine. But, in view of this distinction, we proceed to inquire into the divine part, to our time, and wholly unknown in the time of the apostles.

IX. There will be but little trouble in ascertaining the truth in reference to this matter, if we shall enter the Bible for the sole purpose of finding truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. For the purpose of waking up a little reflection, we beg leave to make a few negative statements and, if any man in the nation desires to make an issue with any of these statements, we have plenty of room in our broad columns for his objections. The statements are as follows:

1. We never read, in the Scriptures, of "regeneration by the Holy Ghost," or "conversion by the Holy Ghost," or of the "converting power of the Holy Ghost." The men who use these expressions are not taught in the school of Jesus.

2. The Savior never taught any man to wait, or look, for any direct power, or influence, to convert him, or to enable him to understand the Scriptures or turn to God.

3. In all the preaching of the apostles to the world, they never intimated to any man, that he needed any direct power, or influence from heaven, to enable him to understand the preaching of the apostles, the Scriptures, or to turn to God.

4. They never taught any saint, in the kingdom of Christ, to pray for the Lord to "send down converting power," or "to come down and convert sinners."

5. They never taught any sinner to pray to the Lord to "send down converting power," or to "come down and convert them."

6. The apostles never prayed themselves to the Lord to "send down converting power," or to "come down himself and convert sinners.

7. In short, there is not in the preaching, exhortations, prayers, or writings of apostolic times, one word, or intimation, about any converting power coming directly down. This is a thing belonging entirely to our time, and wholly unknown in the time of the apostles.

If we desire to know precisely what kind of power, or influence, was brought to bear upon men, and how it was brought to bear upon them, in the time of the apostles, to induce them to turn to God, the only safe course to pursue, is to refer to the sacred record, examine the account there given, consider all that is said, all that was done, and all the results. The power, or influence brought to bear upon the people then, certainly may be brought to bear upon them now. To whatever power, or influence, we shall find conversion ascribed then, it may be ascribed now. The same means employed to turn men to the Lord then, where the work is conducted according to the will of God, are employed now. With this explanation, we are ready to institute our inquiry.

X. What was the power, or influence, that induced men and women to turn to the Lord in the time of the apostles?

1. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God for salvation to every one who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Romans i: 16. This passage does not affirm that the gospel "is power of God for salvation," or "a power of God for salvation," but in the broadest, most full and comprehensive sense, "the power of God for salvation." It is not simply "the power of God for salvation" to a few, but to "every one who be
believes," not to the Jew only, but "both to the Jew and Greek." If it is "the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes," none certainly are turned to God, or saved without it.

2. "After that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified; to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, but to them who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." 1 Corinthians i: 21-24. This passage asserts that it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching to save them who believe, and that the preaching of Christ is the wisdom of God and the power of God. This is the power to which God ascribes salvation, and the power to which we may ascribe it.

3. In the last commission, the Lord said, "Go ye, therefore, and disciple," or convert "all nations." He did not tell them to go and pray for the Lord to send down the converting power, or "the irresistible grace," to convert, or disciple all nations, but to go and disciple all nations, or make disciples of all nations. He sent them to do this, and not to ask him to do it. How were they to do this work? They were to do it by preaching repentance and remission of sins—preaching the gospel to every creature, and immersing the believers into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

4. We next turn over to the account of the commencement, under this commission, to ascertain what power was brought to bear upon the people to turn them to the Lord. The first thing brought to bear upon them was a public discourse. In this discourse, the apostle addressed their understandings, appealing to their prophets, David and Joel, showing that their predictions had been fulfilled; that Christ had risen, gone to heaven and was seated at the right hand of God. In the introduction to his discourses, he said, "Be this known to you, and hearken to my words." Again, when he is further advanced in his discourse, he says, "Let me freely speak to you," and still further on, he says: "He has shed forth this which you now see and hear." To what was the effect ascribed? The sacred writer says, "When they heard this" (Peter's discourse) "they were cut to the heart." What was it that pierced them in the heart? Certainly it was what they heard. What was the result? They inquired, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" He answered, "Repent and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Luke adds, "As many as gladly received his word were immersed and the same day, there were added to them about three thousand souls." To what power is this great work ascribed? Certainly no one can well mistake, when he considers that the apostle, entreated them to hearken to his words, and when the historian says, "When they heard this, they were pierced in their hearts, and as many as gladly received the word were immersed. What did the people hear? The gospel unquestionably. What did they believe? Certainly they believed that which was preached. What did they obey? Most assuredly the commandment given on the occasion, "Repent and be immersed." What did they obey that commandment for? Beyond doubt, for the reason given by Peter, "For the remission of sins." The whole matter is easy, when we simply go to the Scripture to learn the truth as set forth in Scripture, and not to hunt proof of some doctrine or theory outside.
The Converting Power.

In a previous article we commenced a regular induction of all the cases of conversion recorded in the New Testament. We desire the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. We, therefore, aim to find everything there is in the Book of God on the subject. Before proceeding with our induction through the Acts of Apostles, we invite attention to the commission of the Apostle Paul, in connection with the commission of the Twelve.

1. In the commission of Paul, he was commanded "to open their (the people's) eyes and turn them (convert them) from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." See Acts xxvi: 18. In the commission of the Twelve, the Lord said, "Go you, therefore, and disciple all nations." Matthew xxviii: 19. Upon these passages, we have the following observations:

1. The requirement was substantially the same in both cases. To "disciple all nations," is the same as to "turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God." This is equivalent to a command to convert them, or turn them to the Lord.

2. This requirement, laid upon men, to convert men, being in the commission, is general, for all nations and throughout the Christian dispensation. It involves the plan, and sets out, at least, an item of the means to be employed in converting all nations.

3. If, in the general plan, the instrumentality of men is employed, so that men open the eyes of the people and turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God—disciple them—no theory can be adopted which strikes the instrumentality of the apostles out.

4. The commission, requiring the apostles to disciple men—to turn them to the Lord—also implies how they were to do this work—it requires the apostles to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light—to preach the gospel to them.

5. This involves, in the Lord's general plan for converting and saving men, two things: 1. The instrumentality of men. 2. The instrumentality of the word of God. Any theory of conversion striking out one or both of these instrumentalities is false.

6. The theory that the Lord converts sinners by a direct power or influence of the Spirit, sets aside the instrumentality of the apostles and the preaching of the gospel, giving neither any part or lot in the work.

II. How can conversion be ascribed to different things? It can be done in the following way:
1. It can be ascribed to God as the Author of it.

2. It can be ascribed to Christ as the Mediator of the New Testament—the Apostle from God—the Savior of the world through whom God brings this great work about.

3. It can be ascribed to the apostles, in view of their office and work, as ambassadors of Christ, in Christ's stead, beseeching men to be reconciled to God.

4. It can be ascribed to the word which the apostles preached, as that word is the means through which the will of God is brought to the understanding.

5. It can be ascribed to the Holy Spirit, in view of the work of the Holy Spirit, inspiring the apostles, and through them, communicating the will of God to man.

But, in every instance, where a man is turned to the Lord, God turns him, through Christ, the Mediator, through the Holy Spirit, who revealed the will of God, through the apostles, by whom the Holy Spirit spoke, and through the word spoken. God is never left out. Christ is never left out. The Holy Spirit is never left out. The apostles are never left out. The Word is never left out, in a single case. In speaking of any man's conversion, we may say, in view of God, as the giver of every good and every perfect gift—who gave his Son—his grace—the entire plan of redemption, with all the means to save us, that he converted us. But, when speaking of our Savior, and the part he performed in the great work of his Father, in bringing us to God, we say that he converted us; but not without what his Father had done: When speaking of the Holy Spirit, in view of his wonderful work, inspiring the apostles and stupendous displays of miraculous power, and, indeed, speaking through the apostles, the Word which the Father gave the Son, and the Son gave the apostles, we can ascribe our conversion to the Spirit.

In looking at the work of the apostles, in preaching the gospel and persuading men to be reconciled to God, we ascribe our conversion to them, or say, they turned us to the Lord.

In contemplating the instrumentality of the word, or the gospel, we ascribe our conversion to the word. But, speaking of the whole together, God saves every man, saved at all, according to the New Testament, through Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles, the word, faith, repentance, confession, immersion, and calling on the name of the Lord.

The work of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles and the Word, is present in the conversion of every man. In the same way we are begotten of God, of the Spirit and of the word of truth. Paul says:

“I have begotten you, through the Gospel.”

This latter expression explains what is meant by the figurative expression, “begotten.” The amount of it is, simply, that “I have made you believers, through the gospel.” We are, then, begotten or made believers, by the Lord, through the Holy Spirit, through the preacher and through the word.

It is not that God makes one man a believer, Christ makes another a believer, the Holy Spirit another, the preacher another and the word another; but God makes every man a believer, who is made a believer at all, through Christ, through the inspiring Spirit, who spoke through the apostles through the apostles and through the word. It is never done without the word, without the apostles, who preached the word, without the Holy Spirit, who spoke through the apostles, without Christ—who gave the apostles the word, or God who gave Christ the word.

III. We are now ready to proceed in the examination of the account found in the third chapter of Acts, of the conversion of a large number to the faith of Christ.—What were the means present and employed in this case?

We must inquire into this case as we would any matter of fact. We must take that of which we have an account and not
that of which we have no account.—What was present on the occasion in question?

1. Two apostles were present, acting under the commission to convert men—turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God. They were not then converted without the instrumentality of the apostles, and certainly not by a direct influence of the Spirit, separate from the preacher and the word.

2. The word was present, in the gospel preached by Peter. They were not converted without the word then.

3. The Holy Spirit was present, speaking through the apostles. They were not converted without the work of the Holy Spirit then, but through his word, spoken through the apostles.

4. Christ was present, for Peter ascribed the healing of the cripple at the Beautiful gate to him.

How was the conversion brought about? The Lord healed a lame man. This arrested the attention of the people, directed it to Peter and John, gave them a hearing and proved to the people that God was with them.

The apostles, under the influence of the Spirit, preached the word. When the word was spoken and the people had an opportunity to believe, the apostle commanded them to repent and be converted, or turn, that their sins should be blotted out.

How did the apostle open their eyes, turn them from darkness to light, or disciple them?

He brought the preaching of the gospel to bear upon them; the preaching of the cross of Christ; the power of God and the wisdom of God—the gospel—the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes. This power was present and was brought to bear upon them and this is declared to be God's power for salvation. How utterly unreasonable to ignore a power known to be present and assume that the work was accomplished by a means not mentioned at all.

IV. The next case of which we find an account, is the conversion of the Samaritans, under the preaching of Philip, found Acts viii: What means have we an account of here? We find the following:

1. The preacher of the gospel. They were not then in Samaria, converted without the preacher.

2. The preaching of the gospel. They were not then converted without preaching the word.

Luke's account of the conversion of the Samaritans is very brief. He says:

"Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ to them. And the people, with one accord, gave heed to the things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did." Acts viii: 5, 6.

What they heard and saw is the reason given for their giving heed. In the following, believing the things preached, by Philip, is the reason given for their submission to Christ:

"But when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were immersed both men and women." It is stated of them afterward, that they "had received the word of God." We must ascribe their conversion to influences known to be present and not to influences not known to be present. The preacher of the gospel was present, exercising his power, or influence, and the gospel was present, exercising its power; the people believed the things spoken, gave heed and were immersed.

As the Lord commissioned the preacher to open the eyes of the people—to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God—to disciple them; and, as the gospel was present, the power of God for salvation to every one who believes, we must ascribe the work to the power, or influence, to the causes known to be present and not to some cause not mentioned. The Spirit was present in the preacher, and through the preacher and the word, the people believed and were immersed. The work done must not then
be ascribed to a direct power or influence, not mentioned or known to have been present.

THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS:

NUMBER FOUR.

Bro. FRANKLIN:—Dear Sir:—The third plan of Union, which I shall name, is the Scriptural one; that which anciently united Jews, Samaritans and Greeks of every school. They had one rule for Union, the Bible; one foundation for Union, Jesus, the Christ; one plan for union faith in him and obedience to all his commandments, institutions and precepts. The present divisions in Christendom are like a millstone about its neck. It will sink it unless it is cut loose from it. There are several significant facts, which I will specify, in connection with this subject.

The first is the Man of Sin, the Roman Hierarchy, the most tremendous, fearful and appalling power the sun ever shone upon, was born, after the ancient Christians were divided. It arose upon the ruins of the ancient church. United they stood against the gates of hell, divided they fell under this awful power. This is a momentous fact. A second fact is, that Mahommetanism arose in Arabia upon the heresies, schisms and partisan strifes and idolatries of the ancient Christians. This is a fact pregnant with meaning. It has been a widespread and an awful scourge to our race, and is so yet. A third fact is, that Mormonism has acquired its present proportions from Anti-Christian sects. They are, one and all, fully represented at Salt Lake, and without a speedy reformation, it may rise upon the ruins of sectarianism in the West. Think of these great facts, brethren, and their untold consequences, and labor and pray and spend your money accordingly. The first proposition:—Any attempt to unite the people of God, upon any other book than the Bible, is as useless as seven suns in the firmament of heaven, or is like an attempt to revolutionize the heavenly bodies. Second proposition: Any attempt to unite the people of God upon a human creed is incompatible with the nature and circumstances of mankind, and is an effort to frustrate and defeat the prayer and plan of the Lord Messiah, and to subvert his throne and government. Third proposition: In this prayer, in the seventeenth of John, the testimony of the apostles, the Union of Christians and the conversion of the world are bound together by the love and wisdom of the Father and by the devotion and philanthropy of the Son, and by the advocacy and agency of the Holy Spirit. The words of the apostles are laid as the foundation, the Union of Christians as the result and the only successful means of converting the world to the acknowledgement that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God and the Savior of the world. Fourth proposition: The will of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is, that all who believe on Jesus, through the apostle’s word, should be one. The words of the prayer demonstrate this. All who believe in any creed are not one; they are cut into sects, called churches. Our Savior prays in fact and in plain terms, that those who believe on him through any other medium may be divided or may not be one. Fifth proposition: To attempt to unite the people of God on any human platform is to overrule the will of Heaven, to subvert the throne of the Great King, and is rebellion and treason against Jesus the Son of the Blessed God. Sixth proposition: If the people of God could be united on any creed, Popish or Protestant, that creed would be more honored than the New Testament. Ho
has proscribed creeds forever. They are aimed at the dethronement of the apostles. Seventh proposition: The conversion of the world is planned and ordered by the will of God, to be dependent on the Union of Christians, and the Union of Christians is dependent on the testimony of the apostles. If divisions among Christians hinder the conversion of sinners and of the world to Jesus Christ, as they most certainly do, then what a fearful responsibility does every person incur who remains in these parties. Eighth proposition: Any attempt to convert pagans to believe that Jesus is the Messiah before Christians are united at home is an attempt to frustrate this prayer, and to subvert the throne and government of God. We may as reasonably expect that Indian corn will grow in the open fields, in the midst of frosts and snows of winter, as that pagan nations will be converted before Christians are united at home. Ninth proposition: Our Savior made the Union of Christians essential to the conversion of the world, and he that attempts it, by any other means, sets himself against the wisdom of Jesus and aims, though unconsciously at overturning the throne and government of the Great King. If the world is not converted who will be to blame for it? Tenth proposition: Should Christians ever be united on any human creed, then the plan of Heaven will be defeated, the apostles disgraced and dethroned, the Savior’s prayer will be unanswered and the whole order of Heaven frustrated and the throne of the Universe subverted. Eleventh proposition: He that advocates the necessity of human creeds to the Union of Christians, impeaches the wisdom of God, arraigns the benevolence of our Savior and censures the revelations of the Holy Spirit. Without reflection, he attempts to remodel the empire of reason, morality and religion, to rise not only above the apostles but the Savior himself, and arrogates to himself a wisdom and philanthropy which far surpasses and covers with disgrace all the attributes of God. This is treason of the highest order. Are not Catholics and Protestants of all parties laboring to build up the Shibboleths of their parties. And is not each party the cause of God? What are colleges and schools for but to build up sects? All these parties operate against the accomplishment of this prayer. The world can not become Christian while these parties remain as they are. Twelfth proposition: The only question to be decided, is the plan of Jesus in this prayer, for the Union of Christians and the conversion of the world, the better one, or that of Catholics and Protestants? Acts speak louder than words. Have not Catholics as good a right to their plan as Catholics have to their plans? God’s honor, glory and faithfulness are bound up in this order, truth, union and the conversion of the world. Who will dare to prefer his own plan to God’s? Thirteenth proposition: God is bound not to hear nor answer prayers for the conversion of the world, nor to bless our labors, while these parties continue as they are. None are now converted to Christ on Scriptural principles. Fourteenth proposition: It is an undoubted sign of a state of corruption and carnality. 1 Corinthians iii: “Are you not carnal and walk as men?” They are divided about that of which the Bible is silent. The diversity is in opinion, a word not found in the Bible. If faith and baptism were understood it would go far to unite the people of God; would go far to heal the present divisions in Christendom. When it is once understood that faith comes from hearing the Word as necessarily as the oak comes from acorn, or the stalk from the grain of corn. Then all the jargon about the Holy Spirit producing faith without the word, and being the author of all the sects, will cease. When it shall be understood by God’s people that immersion belongs to the very essence of baptism, and without it there is no baptism, and that immersion is no circumstance or mode, but the very act
itself, and that the change of it into sprinkling by the Papists was a virtual abrogation of God's ordinance for a human device. Then all devout and Godfearing men and women will obey the gospel or be immersed. It was a master stroke of policy in the devil when he made his servants transfer the Greek verb *baptizo* from the Greek Testament into the Latin Testament or Vulgate version and from that version into all the modern versions, and thereby made the people believe that one word covered the three acts of sprinkle, pour and immerse, and that all the three acts meant baptism, and were all scriptural and equally pleasing to God. I say this was a master stroke of policy on the part of the devil. Therefore we need a new version for the three-fold purpose of the Union of Christians, the conversion of the world, and the perfection of Christian character. The Bible ought to be as plain to the English reader as it was to the Greek reader. The rule of Union to Christians is the Bible plainly translated into English. The foundation of their Union is Jesus Christ. The conditions of that Union are faith in Jesus Christ, and obedience to all that he and the apostles have said. Fourthly the importance of that Union. It must precede the conversion of mankind. There are but two events in the New Testament of more importance than the Union of Christians. The first is the annunciation of the birth of the Messiah, and the second is the erection of the first Christian congregation. Acts ii: Fifthly, the arguments against divisions I have already considered. He who cannot lie has said a kingdom divided cannot subsist—his congregation is nearly dissolved or annihilated by these parties warring upon each other. United his kingdom stood against Jews and Pagans, divided we are the reproach of infidels, and a stumbling block to the conversion of mankind. Suppose all the sensible and devout people in Christendom were united to-day, and it was so announced in the papers, what a tremendous influence such an announcement would have on human society? What a shaking it would produce among the dry bones? Who would be able to stand before it? What an irresistible and overwhelming evidence it would be in favor of the truth of the gospel? All the apostolic congregations were thus *constitutionally* and *internally* united in faith, love and obedience at the death of the Apostle John, at the close of the first century of the Christian era. Thus it was then, and thus it ought to be, and will be again. What a grand moral spectacle was this? "Behold, how good, and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" The success of the first Christians was owing to their unity. Other foundation for Union can no man lay than that which God has laid in the Bible. Union is strength, division is weakness. We need a return to piety and good sense or reason. Schism is an immense evil. A return to the Scriptures can alone remove those misunderstandings which have parted the body of Christ. It cannot be imagined that a torn church should be eminently prosperous that it should be favored, as the instrument of diffusing the gospel, with triumphant success, and on a large scale among the nations of the earth. The Head of the congregation holds his admonitions in higher esteem than to put extra honor upon those who love their opinions or idols more than his commandments. Christ never prayed for the Union of sects as such but against them. Sixthly. We will now speak of some of the advantages of that Union of Christians. The divisions among Christians are one great cause of the progress and success of infidelity. The Union of Christians would take out of the hands of infidels one of the most powerful and successful weapons which they now use against the gospel. When we approach them, and urge upon them the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, they reply. You are divided into a hundred different sects, and are at variance among yourselves, and we
do not know which of you are right, show us which of these hundred sects profess the truth, and we examine your pretensions, and perhaps embrace your cause. But until this is done we must stand aloof and witness your assaults upon each other. You cannot expect us to join you before peace is made. These are specious arguments. We plead guilty to the charge in part. And reply that we are not to blame for these sects, that we have done all we could to destroy them, that we stand on original ground, that infidels themselves are not united, that there are skeptics of various names and schools, that divisions among Christians do not prove that the gospel is not divine any more than difference among physicians proves that there is no virtue in medicine—difference among lawyers does not prove that there is no such things as justice in Courts of law—differences among politicians do not prove that there is no such thing as human government; and so among farmers and mechanics and other classes. We confess that these parties are a great disadvantage to the gospel and hinder our success; but we cannot prevent them. Another advantage of the Union of Christians would be, it would greatly tend to remove the deep-rooted prejudices of the Jews against Jesus of Nazareth, especially if the nations professing Christianity would defend these bloody enactments against them and stop those cruel and unjust wars against them, which have almost exterminated them in some countries. We owe them an immense debt of gratitude, under God, for our Scriptures, and for the Messiah, the prophets and apostles were Jews. “Salvation is of the Jews,” said our Savior. The Union of Christians would have a benign influence on the nations of the earth. It would produce peace and good will among mankind. It would aid in the cause of universal education; it would discountenance wars. It would assist greatly in the diffusion of knowledge throughout the world. Disunion is not to be perpetual. The name of Jehovah is to be throughout the earth. Disunion must cease. The Union of Christians must commence. The attention of the religious public must be called to this subject; we have begun the work. The walls which separate the different religious denominations must be demolished; the creeds must be abandoned. It behooves them, one and all, to make mutual concessions to each other by abandoning their creeds as we have done. Every opinion and practice must be set aside which has no foundation in the Word of God.

J. Creath.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.—
NO. XVII.

The Converting Power.

In our previous article, on the converting power, we had proceeded in our regular induction so far as to embrace the Samaritans. The next case in order is the conversion of the Ethiopian officer, an account of which is found, Acts viii: 26. In this induction, we are searching for the power exercised in turning sinners to the Lord.

It is to be remembered that those turned by the preacher, through the word, or the gospel, are turned by the Lord, as truly as if he had turned them without any preacher or gospel. It is also by the Spirit, when done by the preacher, through the word, as truly as if it had been done without any preacher or word. The word came from God, through Christ, by the Spirit, through the preacher, so that the effect of the word in turning man to the Lord, may be, as it is in some cases, ascribed to the word, or, as it is in other
cases, to the preacher who spoke the word, to the Spirit who inspired the apostles and brought the word to their remembrance, to the Lord who called and sent the apostles, or to God the author of the entire scheme. With this explanation, we proceed with our induction.

1. The conversion of the Ethiopian officer.—What power was exercised in turning the officer to the Lord. The following might be truly observed in reference to it.

1. The work was of God.
2. He employed an angel, in bringing about the work.
3. He employed the Spirit.
4. He employed a preacher.
5. He employed the word.
6. He required the man himself to do something.
7. God did something directly for him.

This opens the way for the following inquiries:

1. What did God accomplish by the angel? He did not, by the angel, directly, turn the man to God. Indeed, the angel did not go to the man to be converted at all. What then, did he do? He went to a preacher and commanded him to go down the way leading from Jerusalem to Gaza. This was everything the angel did, so far as the narrative informs us. The Lord, then, by the angel, directed the preacher in the way to the man to be converted.

2. What did the Lord accomplish by the preacher? He went to a preacher and commanded him to go down the way leading from Jerusalem to Gaza. This was everything the angel did, so far as the narrative informs us. The Lord, then, by the angel, directed the preacher in the way to the man to be converted.

3. What did the Lord accomplish by the word? He furnished him the gospel, containing the light, or intelligence, that changed his mind and induced him to turn. It contained the truth to be believed—the power of God for salvation. It was the Spirit of God, putting forth his power, through the preacher of the gospel and through the word, which was preached, and turning the sinner to God. This power was from God, from Christ, and the Holy Spirit, was present, only in the word, and operated in turning the officer to God. Shall we ascribe the conversion to a power known to have been
present and operating? or to a direct or an immediate power of the Spirit, about which not one word is said in the entire history of the case, or known to have been present at all?

5. What did the Lord require the man himself to do? He required him to hear the word, understand it, believe it, repent, confess Christ and be immersed. This the man could do, and this he did joyfully and freely, and thus turned to the Lord.

6. What did God do directly for him? He pardoned his sins and imparted to him the Holy Spirit. This the man could not do for himself, and this the Lord did for him.

II. The conversion of Saul of Tarsus.—An account of the conversion of this distinguished man will be found, Acts, chapters ix: xxii: xxvi. In this case we find the following:

1. The Lord appeared to him.
2. The Lord spoke to him and told him who he was.
3. The Lord sent a preacher to him.
4. He was required to do something mentioned at all, or known to have been present.
5. The Lord did something directly for him.

This leads us to the following inquiries and answers:

1. What did the Lord appear to Saul for? The Lord answers this in the following words: "I have appeared to thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen and of those things in the which I will appear to thee." Let no man set this aside and say he appeared to him for some other purpose. The Lord appeared to him for this purpose, to make him a minister and a witness.

2. What did the Lord speak to him the word for? Because he inquired who he was, and the Lord replied, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you persecute." When he heard this, he believed it, and could justly say, as he does, Rom. x: 17, "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the

word of God." Thus we find, the word was present.

3. The next thing to be noticed is the presence of a preacher. In this case, then, as in the former cases, we find the presence of the preacher and the word; but no account of any direct, immediate or abstract power, or influence of the Spirit to turn him to the Lord.

4. What did he do himself, to turn to the Lord? He believed the word spoken to him, repented and was immersed. He did all things appointed for him to do, to become a Christian, the same as others—believed the same gospel, repented the same as others, confessed Christ and was immersed.

5. The Lord did the same for him as he did for all others, so far as his becoming a Christian was concerned, and nothing more. Anything more than this related to making an apostle and not making a Christian.

In this case, as in all the other cases, we ascribe the turning to the power known to be present, and not to some power not mentioned at all, or known to have been present.

III. The next case in course is the conversion of Cornelius and his family, an account of which is found in Acts, chapters x: and xi. This is a case demanding special attention. The following inquiries and answers readily come into view:

1. What converting power was present? 1. The preacher of the gospel was present, and appears to have been indispensable; for though an angel appeared to Cornelius, he was not shown what to do to become a Christian and did not take the first step till the preacher was at hand. The circumstance, too, of sending some forty miles for a preacher, shows the necessity of the human instrumentality—the preacher of the gospel. If the Lord intended to convert men by some direct power from heaven, why wait some three days to send forty miles for a preacher?

2. The word of God, or the gospel, had
an instrumentality in saving Cornelius. Hence, when the angel commanded him to send for Peter, he added, “when he comes, he shall tell you words by which yourself and house shall be saved.” No matter how many other things were concerned in his salvation, one thing is certain, and that is, that he was saved by words. Unequivocally then, he was not saved by a direct power without words.

2. The gospel was present, as preached by Peter. When we know that the gospel was present, preached by an apostle, the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes, and we have the language of the angel, ascribing his salvation to words, why should we ascribe his salvation to some other power, to the exclusion of that known to be present?

3. Was not the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit the converting power at the house of Cornelius? We think not, for the following reasons: 1. The outpouring of the Spirit is not there, or any place, said to be the converting power. 2. The salvation of Cornelius is not ascribed to the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. 3. We have conclusive evidence that the miraculous display of the Holy Spirit, on that occasion, was to convince Peter that he should receive the Gentiles. Hence, when Peter was rehearsing the matter to his Jewish brethren, after his return, after speaking of the miraculous gift of the Spirit, exclaims, “What was I that I should withstand God?” Or, to let Peter explain himself more fully, see the following: “Forasmuch, then, as God gave them the like gift as he did to us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I should withstand God?”

4. Why not ascribe the salvation of Cornelius to the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit? For the following reasons: 1. His salvation is not ascribed to this miraculous outpouring in the sacred narrative. 2. No person’s salvation is ever ascribed to miraculous gifts of any sort any place in the New Testament? We have seen that the miraculous influence served another purpose—the purpose for which it was designed—to convince Peter that he should call no man common, or that he should receive the Gentiles. 4. The salvation of Cornelius is ascribed to the words that were to be spoken by Peter.

5. We find the same at the house of Cornelius as in every other place: 1. We have the preacher of the gospel. 2. We have the same gospel preached. 3. The same things believed, or precisely the same faith. 4. The same repentance. God granted them repentance unto life. 5. The same immersion. Peter says, “He made no difference between them and us”—the Gentiles and the Jews. 6. God gave the same evidence of acceptance of the Gentiles as he did of the Jews. The Gentiles were, then, saved by Christ, by the Holy Spirit, in Peter, and speaking words through him, by which Cornelius and his house were saved, by Peter, the preacher of the Word, and by the Word preached, believed and obeyed.

“I Am.”—God doth not say, I am their light, their guide, their strength, their tower, but only I Am. He sets, as it were, his hand to a blank, that his people may write under what they please that is good for them. As if he should say, Are they weak? I am strength. Are they poor? I am riches. Are they in trouble? I am comfort. Are they sick? I am health. Are they dying? I am life. Have they nothing? I am all things. I am wisdom and power. I am justice and mercy. I am grace and goodness. I am glory, beauty, holiness, eminency, suprememinency, perfection, all-sufficiency, eternity. Jehovah. I am. Whatever is amiable in itself, or desirable unto them, that I am. Whatever is great or pleasant—whatever is good or needful to make men happy, that I am.—Bishop Beveridge.
PAUL'S POSITION AS A PREACHER

Is summed up in one verse to his Corinthian brethren. "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Paul was addressing himself to a very polished people. He knew their antecedents. He was also cognizant of their then present position. He knew that they loved philosophical discussion and subtle disquisitions. Their tendency toward the graces and accomplishments of life—of feasts and finery, he was well apprised of. Their gravitation toward the utilities and materialities of this world, he every where recognized. Their admiration of painting, statuary and architecture, and their soaring aspirations after the fleeting fancies of an earthly existence, such as oratory, poetry, philosophy, eloquence and metaphysics, he doubtless knew all about. Paul was an extraordinary man; he was master of more than an ordinary education; his opportunities in life were transcendent. With his natural power and prestige, added to his profound knowledge of men and things, together with his wonderful versatility of mind and flexibility of temper, he could have been a mighty and popular leader of the Roman people. With his sagacity, and penetration and general fitness, he could have been a representative statesman of the first order; the Nestor of the Roman court; could have been the Demosthenes of the nation and the Lycurgus of their councils; could have risen to a military dictator and controlled the fate of kingdoms; could have abounded in wealth and stood as chief of the aristocracy of his race; might have been an honored philosopher like Plato or Aristotle; and as a literary character might have stood where Cicero's fame culminated. But all these he subordinat- ed. As a minister of the gospel he took advantage of them and in a subsidiary sense made them contribute to the power of the gospel. Paul was anything else but a brawling politician, or a blustering war man, or a scientific lecturer, or an honorary member of some moral reform society. He was a mathematician and mathematically understood that the greater included the lesser, and that no accidental exception could be substituted for a general organic law. His highest ambition after his conversion was to be styled an humble servant of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul could have instructed the Corinthian church on many themes outside of his specific and restricted mission, but he determined (by the grace of God) to make known nothing among them but Christ and him crucified. (Macknight's version.) He maintained his exclusiveness among a people more excitable than ours; among surging masses more tumultuous than ours; among political intriguers more corrupt than ours; in the midst of the whirl of war more savage than ours; and in the midst of feasting and fashion more demoralizing them we lament. One would suppose that Paul, (an inspired man at that) in addition to preaching the gospel, could have found time enough to have digressed into almost any topic on the public tapis. We have no record that he ever did. But in these last days we have uninspired men who find ample time to preach the gospel, and dip into the pool of politics, and leap into the literary world, and whoop the war cry whenever they please. Let them be one or the other in a legitimate way. I once heard of an ancient king who was sorely afflicted with a chronic disease. A variety of physicians swarmed around him, each proposing to effect a cure. The king was puzzled. These gentlemen of the medical pharmacopoeia were distinguished. The king concluded to settle the matter by taking down all the prescriptions at one dose, supposing that there was some specific in some one or all of the doses that would reach his case, and send joy to
his heart. In a similar way preachers have a notion in this day that they must draw something from every department of the world in order to cure sinners of the disease of sin. Never was there a greater hallucination. The simple, unadorned gospel is the only specific that will reach the case of sinners.

But I must quote from Rev. Albert Barnes something still better than any thing I have said. Speaking of Christ and him crucified, he says, (1.) "That this should be the resolution of every minister of the gospel. This is his business. It is not to be a politician; not to engage in the strife and controversies of men; it is not to be a good farmer, or scholar merely; not to mingle with his people in festive circles and enjoyments; not to be a man of taste and philosophy, and distinguished mainly for refinement of manners; not to be a profound philosopher or metaphysician, but to make Christ crucified the grand object of his attention, and seek always and everywhere to make him known."

(3.) It matters not what are the amusements of society around him; what fields of science, of gain, or ambition, are open before him, the minister of Christ is to know Christ and him crucified alone. If he cultivates science, it is to be that he may more successfully explain and vindicate the gospel. If he becomes in any manner familiar with the works of art, and of taste, it is that he may more successfully show to those who cultivate them, the superior beauty and excellency of the cross. If he studies the plans and the employments of men, it is that he may more successfully meet them in those plans, and more successfully speak to them of the great plan of redemption.

(4.) The preaching of the cross is the only kind of preaching that will be attended with success. That which has much in it respecting the divine mission, the dignity, the works, the doctrines, (doctrine?) the person, and the atonement of Christ, will be successful. So it was in the time of the apostles; so it was in the reformation; so it was in the Moravian missions; so it has been in all revivals of religion. There is a power about that kind of preaching which philosophy and human reason have not. "Christ is God's great ordinance" for the salvation of the world; and we meet the crimes and alleviate the woes of the world, just in proportion as we hold the cross up as appointed to overcome the one, and to pour the balm of consolation into the other."

In view of Paul's position and practice it does seem strange, and the question inexplicable, that we have preachers of talent among us who are longingly looking for, and nervously seeking place and power, in Cesar's kingdom. They manifest an itching desire to be ranked among the legislative benefactors of our "common country," or to obtrude themselves into the councils of our nation as Christian Statesmen, or, if that is not accessible, to figure as plumed officers on the battlefield of blood and carnage. I have heard these religious politicians (or political religionists, which?) extenuate their conduct by alleging that if Christians were sent to the centers of law and power, they would soon be in a condition to neutralize the influence of base men, and clean out the Augean stables of corruption.

They have boasted how they could give prominence to the gospel, and how that they would make their political promotion the occasion of promoting the cause of Christ in the halls of legislation. Numbers have gone to those coveted places of power. Alas! instead of neutralizing the influence of bad men, bad men have neutralized them; instead of elevating the gospel over all, our sacred colors have been drawn down at half mast; and instead of absorbing political men in the elements of the gospel, they themselves have been absorbed in the great whirlpool of politics, and they never rise again to their former religious place of power.
and influence. I know of entire churches wasting away under this baleful, miasmatic influence. Have not these men discrimination enough to know, and does not history inform them, that the alliance of church and State in former ages was consummated by gradual moves and imperceptible agencies? Many ministers of the gospel have risen as high officially in the church as the church is capable of raising them; but still eager for greater conspicuity, and intent upon more dazzling glories among their co-adjuvators, they abandon the drudgery (?) of a common minister of Christ, to become, perchance, the favored and fawning ministers of a more refulgent kingdom—in which imperium in imperio their rewards of toil shall be more tangible, and in which their merits shall receive larger increments of the plaudits of an appreciative world! All devotion, and piety, and self-denial and Christian fervor are paralyzed in these churches where the political element permeates.

You are recognized there by the cheerless appellation of Mr. or Mrs. instead of by the former warm salutation of brother or sister; and instead of rising or kneeling to pray in the time of worship, they remain sitting upon their seats lazily and irreverently. What an abomination in the sight of God!

All this may account for the strange and startling attitude of many of our young preachers just fresh from some of our high places of learning. They preach nearly everything else except Christ and him crucified. Instead of the atonement and sacrifice of Christ, his sufferings and death, the resurrection and justification, the pardon of sins and reconciliation, and judgment, and death, and hell and eternity, they deliver scientific theses, geologically, astronomically, logically, ethically, esthetically, botanically, horticulturally—transcendentally! The reader will please pardon this awful array of expletives. But manner and style, among our buoyant benedictines, have well nigh displaced strength and solidity. These ought ye to observe, but the weightier matters indicated above ye should in no wise despise. Preaching on nice themes to please and placate every body is a virtual abandonment of the fundamental principles of the gospel.

While, in point of scholarship and general literary attainment, we are advancing beyond all precedent, must our preachers grow less devoted, less ardent, less earnest Christ-like? We have too much pulpit piety, and not enough private devotion; too much piety for public posts and patronage, and not enough sympathy for God's poor, and for a poor wrecked and ruined world; too much communion with men in high places, and not enough association with Christ and his poor people in low places; too much daintiness with the fancies and fashions of the day, and not enough wrestling against sin in high life; too much display of learning, and talent, and wit and elegance, but not enough of the thunder bolts of God's truth hurled down into the hearts and consciences of wicked and perverse men. As a people we have labored severely and assiduously to purify the pulpit of these disorders. We have not abandoned that work. A few have apostatised—if indeed they ever approached to the true standard—but singular as it may appear, while we must confess to partial signs of apostasy, our religious contemporaries see with alarm the decay of their own pulpit power, and are at this time strenuously urging reform. Let me quote a few extracts from a discourse by Rev. Joel Hawes, entitled "Decay of Power in the Pulpit."

He says: "Does it not savor more of the school of Gamaliel than of Christ, more of high literary culture than of a deep, mellow-toned piety, figuring more in that excellency of speech and of wisdom, which Paul abjured when he went to preach the gospel at Corinth, than in those elements of the doctrine of Christ crucified, which he intended to make the burden of his ministry? The pulpit is,
no doubt, more learned and tasteful and accomplished than formerly; but is it not as bold, direct, and home in its dealings with the souls of men? Its topics are more multiform and varied, but are they not less fraught with evangelical truth and doctrine; discussed more elegantly, but less impressively; in a style more elaborate and finished, but less suited to reach the conscience, and stir the deep springs of feeling and action in the inner man?

Instead of coming right out in the strength of God, with the naked sword of the Spirit to do battle with sin and error, it is too common for the preaching of our day to study to be ingenious, original, elegant; to make literary sermons, great sermons, popular sermons, as one says. To this end, instead of conforming itself within its proper commission, that of delivering God's message in God's way, it ranges abroad over creation to find novel and strange subjects; and then it seeks to handle them in a new and original way; decking them out in tropes and figures, and all fine things; just suited to make the whole exhibition elegant and popular, it may be, but utterly ineffective and powerless as to all Spiritual impression."

The above is a pretty lucid description of what takes place at some of our annual meetings. This explains why so few converts are made in certain localities, where big guns, with a large bore and a long range, are selected to do all the firing. They over-shoot in almost every instance. Give me the bayonet and short sword yet for execution.

Here is another extract from the same writer:

"There is, too, a tendency in the pulpits of our day to cover over and dilute the truth of God; to soften and bring it down from its high unbending demands, and so to mix it up with other things as to keep its point and edge out of sight. It may still be the sword of the Spirit, but it is the sword so muffled up and decked out with flowers and ribbons, as no longer to show what it is, or for what purpose it is to be used."

I sometimes think that we must all go back to the days of the Christian Baptist and learn the lesson and design of this reformation over again. Must we indeed go back and reconsider the whole ground of controversy? Is not the whole religious world moving, slowly, I confess, but in the right direction? I have documentary evidence of that fact before me. Shall we now retrograde? We are not guilty as a body, but there is a visible sloughing off. We have individual defections, but the great temple of God is surely and unmistakably going up. We have a host of God-fearing men among us, whose minds and motives, and lives and living, and plans and principles, are wholly engrossed in Christ and his blessed work. But, notwithstanding this, I know of some places where our once invincible and uncompromising cross bearers of thirty-years ago, cannot now preach, because those delicate, silky, simpering, spoiled churches, say warningly to those weather-beaten veterans, "If you preach here you must do so and so, for other churches do so and so. You must conform somewhat to the customs and peculiarities of other churches around us; there is no necessity why we should offend the more cultivated ears of our religious neighbors; we must pursue an easy policy and fraternise them."

Abomination of desolations! In those very churches you will find the cause of this moral monstrosity in the fearful fact, that sundry persons are ensconced there, (couchant as lions and penchant as wolves) strategetically planning for office and political preferment, or commercially and speculatively seeking their own aggrandisement. O for a second Daniel to rise in judgment!

And then we have paid preachers, preaching for a particular few, subjected to the control of a one man power that fearfully contracts the individual and
monopolises all church authority. His
government must be their government;
his discipline their discipline; his policy
their policy; his freaks their fancies; his
preacher their preacher; his standard of
right their standard; his finality their
conclusion. He selects the preacher and
the church must hear him; he selects
themes for the preacher and the preacher
must dilute them.

This obliges the cramped and cramped
preacher to study the science of the
world more than the science of heaven;
to roam the fields of literature more than
the rich fields of prophecy; to sketch and
paint scenes of human sentimentality
more than the blood and sorrows of the
garden of Gethsemane; to soar upon the
buoyant wings of ideality more than upon
the outstretched wings of love and mercy.
The Lord deliver preachers from toady
is! It is these lordly prelates that en-
gender and foster church aristocracy.

These moneyed prelates become so re-
finéd and sublimated that an honest,
humble minister of the church of Jesus
Christ becomes almost a nuisance in the
august presence of a pampered few in
these pampered churches. Nothing short
of a President or Professor of some dis-
tinguished institution of learning, or some
literary celebrity, can preach to them.

They facetiously say that those rough old
pioneer preachers will do for rough places,
where the people prefer to hear nothing
but the first principles of the gospel.
Indeed! Why, then, you would exclude
Paul and Peter, for they were pretty
rough chaps, and so was John Baptist,
yes, and so was old man Elijah! I know
of a preacher, recently sloughed off from
our body politic, who invidiously stated
of another preacher that all he knew to
preach, was Christ and him crucified!
The demons in hell must have chuckled
just then, the angels of heaven must have
stood aghast with blanched cheeks!

The preachers themselves are largely
culpable for all this state of things. Too
many lack moral courage, are fearful of
loosing caste, are apprehensive of want
and beggary, and are so fearful of doing
wrong that they refuse to do right. Let
them present a bold front, an unbroken
phalanx, and declare a war of extermina-
tion against these apostasies in the church.

Let there not be such an isolation as there
has been hitherto, but let every preacher
come out of his hiding place, and ex-
change sentiments with every preacher he
may meet, and let there be a general
ministerial co-operation, and a mutual
understanding in all their counsels, let all,
learned and unlearned, attend our con-
ventions, and be present at our annual
meetings; and let them courageously and
cordially discuss every question involv-
ing the welfare of the church; and let there
be a blending of their sympathies, and a
mutual recognition of each other in all
positions of life; and let there be a gener-
ous and loving correspondence inaugurat-
ed and established among the preachers of
the gospel, and then, without fear or favor
at the hands of any man, they can re-
dress all grievances, rectify all mistakes,
popularize every correct principle, and
consummate every grand end.

Let preachers use this friction and abrasion
in the church, and then very soon every
"monstrum horrendum" in the sanctuary
of the Lord will be squelched.

Let Christ and him crucified be the sole
business of preachers. I presume to say
that within the limits of the last year we
have had more accessions to our body of
people than all other religious bodies
combined. And facts and figures attest
that wherever our preachers have preach-
ed exclusively the gospel, that right there
we have been blessed in the ratio of our
exclusive devotion to the supreme cause
of Christ, while conversely, where the
gospel has had an admixture of a little of
every thing else, the work of the Lord
has been retarded correspondingly.

The awful sins of the world, the lying
hypocrisies of men, the plutonic malignity
of rebels against God, the insidious dis-
pisers of Jesus Christ, and the defective
and apostasies of the church, demand of this age a reproduction of such invincible moral heroes as Elijah, John Baptist, Paul and Peter, and Knox and Luther and Campbell, and a thousand other expurgators of human society. How long, O Lord, how long!—JOHN F. ROWE.

CONVERSION.
NUMBER TWO.

Bro. FRANKLIN:—Dear Sir.—I will endeavor to contrast popular or sectarian conversions with scriptural conversions. I use the words convert, conversion in their popular acceptation as equivalent to turn, turning, returning to God. The Greek word epistrepho properly means to turn, to return to a path from which one has gone astray, and then to turn away from sins, or to forsake them. The word is generally used to denote the whole turning of the sinner to God, body, soul and spirit, to be guided and governed by the word of God.

Man turned away from God's law like a man leaving the plain broad frequented path for the wrong road. Now then, he must return to the right road; to the road he left before he can reach the place of destination. Sinners have turned away from God's law and gospel, from obedience to the same to disobedience. Now before they can enjoy his favor and the blessings of the gospel, they must return to faith, to the road of penitence, confession, submission, obedience. This is reasonable and scriptural. This turning away from God and returning to him are both active and not passive. Man turned away from God and man must return to God.

The devil devised a plan, a well adjust-
wicked turn not God will whet his sword."

"Every one turned to his course as the horse rushes into the battle." Jeremiah viii: 5, 6. Hosea xi: 5. This is the uniform language of the Bible. It is written as with a sunbeam throughout the Scriptures. The holy prophets make it invariably the duty of saint and sinner to turn or convert themselves, the sectarian preachers make it God's duty or part to turn the sinner; the sinner has no more agency in his turning to God than the dead man has in rolling a large stone from his grave. This is another important contrast between sectarian conversions and scriptural conversions. When God commands men to do any thing in the Bible, whether to believe, repent or obey, he expects them to do it, without their waiting and expecting him to prepare them to do it, or waiting for him to regenerate them before they can do it. All persons in authority when they give commands they expect to be obeyed whether fathers, masters, teachers, generals, or governors, without any delay, so does God expect every rational and responsible being to do or to refrain from doing whatever he commands in the Bible, while orthodoxy does not allow that a man can convert or turn himself once in a lifetime. Our Savior says, "If our brother turn us seven times in a day, saying I repent thou shalt forgive him." Here our Savior allows a man can convert himself and repent seven times a day. The divine teachers make it the duty of the sinner to turn and repent, the popular preachers make it God's duty to turn the sinner. Preachers turn sinners according to the Scriptures. Two or three witnesses on this point will suffice. They that turn many to righteousness. Daniel xii: 3.

Elijah shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children. Malachi 4-6. It is said of John the Immerser: Many of the children of Israel did he turn to the Lord. Matt. 3: Luke 1, 3 chap. What do our Calvinistic Baptist Brethren say to preachers converting sinners? All the prophets and apostles did it. Peter converted three thousand by one sermon. Acts 2. Paul was sent to turn the Gentiles to God. Acts 28. He turned or converted thousands. One person converts or turns another. James v. 19.—Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth one convert or turn him. These three points are all scripturally settled, then.—Sinners turn themselves. Preachers turn sinners to God. One person turns another. Let no one who believes God's word object to it. These things are all according to the common practice and good sense of mankind as instanced in the following things.

1. In the great temperance movement one man turns another from intemperance to temperance.

2. One person turns another from dishonesty to honesty.

3. One person reforms another from falsehood to truth.

4. One person turns another from lewdness to chastity.

5. One person converts another from ignorance to intelligence.

Persons convert or turn others on all the following subjects: medicine, law, politics, agriculture, gardening, mechanics, philosophy, religion.

One person or persons convert others from Judaism to heathenism, from heathenism to Judaism. The historical books of the Bible are full of instances of it. Persons are turned from Judaism to Mahometanism, and vice versa. They are turned or converted from the Greek sect to the Latin or Roman sect, and vice versa; and from both to Judaism and Mahometanism. They are turned or converted from popery to Episcopacy, and vice versa. They are converted from Episcopacy to Presbyterianism, and vice versa; from Baptistism to Methodism, and vice versa—and all of them are fully represented in Mormonism. Jews, Samaritans and heathens of every school were turned to the gospel anciently. All these facts are undeniable; every school boy is supposed to know them. Now comes a tough question: What converted these persons. Who turned them? As an example of the whole list:
Does the Spirit of God make a man a papist, and afterwards find that he made a mistake and did not make right, and has to undo his work, or do it over again, and has to make him an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or something else, before he is right.—Does he make a man or a woman a Methodist, and after while finds out his mistake, and has to make him over again? If he made right at first, why alter him? Come, you religionists, and enlighten us poor deluded creatures on this subject. You all claim to have been converted by the Holy Spirit.—Why are you not one, as were the New Testament Christians? We will show in our next what converted the ancient Christians, and that their commissions were uniform.

JACOB CREAT.

REVIEW


BY J. M. HENRY.

Several months since there appeared an article in the Weekly Review, afterwards copied in the first No. of the Quarterly Review, by W. T. Moore, on the above work, so just and appropriate as to have made me anxious to see another article that was promised the reader from the pen of the same able reviewer. To the present time, my expectation of it has not been realized. Believing that what the Archbishop says on the Causes of the Corruptions of Christianity, and the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for the Faith and Conduct of the Primitive Church, would be appreciated and highly valued by many, and especially by those who are pleading for the completeness of Divine Revelation for "all things that pertain to life and godliness," I have concluded to lay his remarks before the readers of the Review, as well as I can. I trust also that my endeavor to do this will not discourage nor embarrass any intended effort of brother Moore to meet my own anxiety to hear from him again on this very valuable work of the Bishop.

The Bishop says, in reference to the Corruptions of Christianity and their causes, that "these two general rules, then, are to be kept in the mind:—"

"1st. That whatever opposed Christianity at the outset, afterwards tended to mix itself up with the Religion, and corrupt it."

"2dly. That as far as any corruptions depended on local and temporary circumstances, so far they would be likely soon to die away, without spreading widely; but so far as they were connected with Human Nature, we may expect to find them appearing again and again in various countries."

Under the first of these two general rules he enumerates, as forming the chief opposition to the Gospel, the five following causes:

"(1.) Judaism; (2.) Pagan Superstitions; (3.) Heathen Philosophy; (4.) Immorality of Character; and (5.) Worldly Policy."

"And the spirit of Judaism, Paganism, &c., afterwards found their way into Christianity and tended to corrupt it."

"(1.) It has been pointed out in an earlier part of this Dissertation, how much opposed the prevailing Jewish notions were to the religion of Jesus Christ. And accordingly, one of the very earliest attempts to corrupt Christianity was made by the Judaizing teachers, who were continually endeavoring to bring the Gentile believers under the yoke of the Mosaic law. (Acts xv, Gal. ii., Phil. iii.)."

Many in the present day think they see in the Church, effects of Judaizing that possibly escaped the Archbishop's notice, viz.: the practice of infant baptism as the antitype of circumcision. The Jews not only circumcised their children, but insisted that except Gentile adults were circumcised they could not be saved. Infant baptism now, as..."
the anti-type of infant circumcision under the Mosaic law, has filled churches established by law, and wherever it is extensively practiced, with multitudes of the ungodly, thus contributing somewhat to strengthen his 4th and 5th causes.

"(2.) Then, again, of the opposition of the Pagan worshippers to the Gospel, we find many instances mentioned in the book of the Acts of the Apostles; especially in chap. 16: 20, 21; and 19: 26, 27. And we find from time to time, attempts made to incorporate into Christianity superstitions borrowed from Paganism, or of a similar nature. The earliest, perhaps, of these corruptions of Christianity, was introduced by those very ancient heretics, the Gnostics, whom the Apostle John was particularly occupied in opposing, both in his Epistles and in the opening of his Gospel."

"These men, it is well known, blended with Christian doctrines many of the notions of the Pagan, of the Persian, and some other eastern nations. The religious system of these nations consisted in acknowledging and renouncing two beings of equal power—a good and an evil god,—whom they called Ormuzd and Ahriman. And some of their descendants, in the same regions, at this day, are said to retain this faith, said to be worshippers principally of the evil god. The Gnostics accordingly taught, among other things, that the world was not created by the supreme God, but by an evil being, or by a certain inferior god." The truth and propriety of the above remarks are obvious to every informed historian on Pagan innovations and corruptions of the religion of the Bible. For the vestal virgins of Paganism we have had incorporated with Christianity nuns and nunneries in the Roman Catholic church. Instead of Pagan priests, to whom alone the sacred mysteries of their religions were known, we have under the name of the religion of Christ, priests to whom the truth of the Gospel of Christ is alone made known, and who carefully guard against its free communication to the masses of the people. Instead of the worship of dead heroes, we have the invocation of reputed saints. For the dedication of children to a priesthood of abominations and obscenities too gross to be mentioned, we have an early immolation of children to the domination of a class of spiritual rulers who bind them in the chains of religious bigotry and scriptural ignorance and hand them over for Episcopal and Papal ruins.

"(3.) The ancient heathen philosophers again, who believed little or nothing of the popular superstitions, were no less opposed to the Gospel, which they derided as foolishness. And many of them, when they afterwards embraced Christianity, endeavored to reconcile it with their philosophical speculations, and thus to be wise above that which is written. It is evidently to this danger that Paul is alluding, in many passages; especially when he warns the Colossians, 'Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.' (Col. 2: 8. See also 1 Cor. 1: 20-23.)"

"It appears, therefore, that even in the Apostolic age, men had begun to introduce into Christianity presumptuous speculations on matters not revealed in Scripture, and to make the Gospel a field for the exercise of their philosophical ingenuity. But in later ages this evil prevailed to a far greater degree."

On this, our author, commencing on page 204, adds: "Philosophy is not at all opposed to true religion, as long as men confine their speculations to matters which properly come within the province of reason. (It is remarked by Locke, that those who are for laying aside the use of reason in matters pertaining to Revelation, resemble one who should put out his eyes in order to make use of a telescope. Note.)" "But in what relates to Divine Revelation, reason should be confined to these two points:—1st, to judge of the grounds on which any professed revelation should be received or rejected, as being 'from Heaven or of men;' and, 2dly, to determine what it is that we are enabled and required to learn.
from the Revelation which God has actually given."

"The restless spirit of philosophising, however, was not easy to be subdued, or to be confined within these limits. Even during the times of the Apostles, and still more after their departure, many philosophers, on embracing Christianity, transgressed their proper limits, and sought to exercise their ingenuity on that subject— one of so much interest and importance—in order to maintain their superiority over the vulgar, even in the knowledge of divine mysteries. They acknowledged, for the most part, that the Christian Revelation had made known things pertaining to God, which could not otherwise have been known; but these things they seem to have regarded as fresh materials for human reason to work upon; and when the illumination from heaven—the rays of revelation—failed to shed full light on the Gospel dispensation, they brought to the dial-plate the lamp of human philosophy."

In a foot-note we find 'the following: "Some persons have been so much struck with the resemblance between some of Plato's speculations, and those of certain ancient theologians, respecting the Trinity, as even to imagine that he must have received some revelation from heaven. But instead of concluding that Plato had imparted to him by inspiration, knowledge beyond what was communicated to the Apostles—or at least beyond what they were commissioned to teach—we ought rather to infer that those theologians had corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel by mixing up with it Plato's philosophy."

"Accordingly we find in very early times, curious questions raised concerning the incarnation, and the nature and person of the Lord Jesus. One system, so ancient as to be alluded to by John in his Epistle, represented Jesus Christ as not really 'come in the flesh,' but as a man in appearance only. Other systems made Jesus to have been born a mere human being, on whom, at his baptism, a certain emanation (which they called Christ) from the divine fulness, descended and dwelt in Him. And endless were the questions raised, and the different hypothesis set up, as to the manner in which the divine nature was united with the human in Jesus Christ; whether He was properly to be called one person, or two; whether the Virgin Mary were properly to be styled the Mother of God; whether Christ should be regarded as of one substance, or of like substance with the Father; whether the Deity suffered at the crucifixion; in what way the sacrifice of Christ was accepted as a satisfaction for sin; why this sacrifice was necessary; besides (in later times) an infinite number of equally subtle speculations as to the nature of the Trinity—the divine decrees—and, in short, everything pertaining to the intrinsic nature of the Supreme Being, and the explanation of all his designs and proceedings. And yet the motions of the earth, and the circulation of the blood, were not discovered till many ages after. The cause of the vital warmth in animals, philosophers are not yet agreed upon; nor is it decided whether light, heat, and electricity, are substances, or qualities of bodies. But as to the substance of the Supreme Being, and of the human soul, many men were (and are still) confident in their opinions, and dogmatical in maintaining them; the more, inasmuch as in these subjects they could not be refuted by an appeal to experiment."

"All those various systems of philosophical theology were discussed in language containing technical terms more numerous than those of almost any science; some of them taken from the sacred writers, (we may say, in every sense of the phrase, taken from them, since hardly any theologian confined himself to their use of the terms,) and others not found in scripture, but framed for each occasion. These were introduced professedly for the purpose of putting down heresies as they arose. That they did not effect this object, we know by experience; which, indeed, would lead us to conclude, that heresies were by this means rather multiplied. We are inclined to think, that if all Christians had always studied the Scrip-
tures carefully and honestly, and relied on these more than on their own philosophical systems of divinity, the Incarnation, for instance, and the Trinity, would never have been doubted, nor even named. And this at least is certain, that as scientific theories and technical phraseology gained ground, party animosity raged the more violently. The advocates of the several systems did not, like the ancient heathen philosophers, carry on a calm and friendly dispute, but (to the disgrace of the Christian name) reviled, and (when opportunity offered) persecuted each other with the utmost bitterness. For each of them having not only placed the essence of Christianity in faith, but the essence of faith in the adoption of his own hypothesis, and strict adherence to his own use of the technical terms of his theology, was led hence to condemn all departures from his system, as involving blasphemy against God, and danger to the souls of men. And they employed accordingly, that violence in the cause of what they believed to be divine truth, which Jesus himself and his Apostles expressly forbid in the cause of what they knew to be divine truth. ‘The servant of the Lord,’ says Paul, ‘must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will lay open Christianity to infidel objections, giving them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.’ (2 Tim. 2: 24, 25.) But those who lose sight of the real character and design of the Christian Revelation, generally lose also the mild, patient, and forbearing spirit of the Gospel.”

“There is no one of the numberless systems we have alluded to that has not been opposed, and strongly condemned, by the advocates of some different one; but they have not been usually condemned on what appears to us to be the right ground.”

“The proper objection to the various philosophical systems of religion,—the different hypotheses or theories that have been introduced to explain the Christian Dispensation,—is, not the difficulties that have been urged (often with good reason) against each separately; but the fault that belongs to all of them equally. It is not that the Arian theory of incarnation, for instance, is wrong for this reason, and the Nestorian for that, and the Eutychian for another, and so on; but they are all wrong alike, because they are theories, relative to matters on which it is vain and absurd and irreverent to attempt forming any philosophical theories whatever.”

“And the same, we think, may be said of the various schemes (devised either by those Divines called Schoolmen, or by others) on which it has been attempted, from time to time, to explain other religious mysteries also in the divine nature and dispensations. We would object, for instance, to the Pelagian theory, and to the Calvinistic theory, and the Arminian theory, and others, not for reasons peculiar to each one, but such as apply in common to all.”

“Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate are, confessedly, and by their own account, beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly revealed in Scripture; but it is a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own. One of the many evils resulting from this is, that they thus lay open Christianity to infidel objections, such as it would otherwise have been safe from.” pp. 204–210.

This long extract has so many just remarks on the evils of philosophising, that no intelligent reformer will, I trust, feel weary by reading it. The Archbishop objects to Calvinism, Arminianism, &c., not because of anything peculiar to any one of them, but because they are theories.

“(4.) As for moral depravity, no one can doubt how much this must have led many persons to shut their ears against the evidences for a religion which requires them to reform their lives.”

“The description given of Felix, the Governor, would no doubt have suited a great many others. ‘When Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and the judgment to come, Felix trembled and said, Go
says, "we have in Scripture no record of any of these." Again on the same page, he says, "And there is nothing in the Christian religion, considered in itself, that stands in the way of such a procedure, is plain from the number of works of this description which have appeared from the earliest times, \textit{(after the age of inspiration)} down to the present—from the writings entitled the 'Apostle's Creed, and the 'Apostolical Constitutions,' \&c. (compositions of uncertain authors, and amidst the variety of opinions respecting them, never regarded as Scripture) down to the modern Formularies and Confessions of Faith."

"There is nothing in the Christian religion, considered in itself, that stands in the way of creeds, catechisms, &c." From this we would be led to suppose that the Archbishop was about to introduce arguments for creeds, catechisms, \&c., that could not well be answered. But strange enough, he says, that of the numerous works of this description, none appeared till \textit{after the age of inspiration.}

3. And this it was that made the Apostle John so vehement in his censure of them."

"But there are many allusions in the Apostolic Epistles to others besides these Gnostics, who sought to hold the truth in unrighteousness."

(5.) Lastly, \textit{worldly policy} was evidently one of the chief causes which, in the outset, acted as a hindrance to the reception of Christianity. It is plain, from the very nature of the case, that all views of worldly ambition—all desire of worldly profit or advantage of any kind—all considerations of supposed political expediency—must have been, at first, arrayed in opposition to the Gospel: And every part of the sacred narrative confirms this. We find the Jewish rulers influenced by the fear that 'the Romans would come and take away their place and nation.' We find them urging before Pilate, that 'whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar.' And we find the same sort of plea repeatedly used to the Roman Governors, and often with effect. Acts 17: 7, and 19: 23."

Sad to tell, but fearfully true, the Church at length employed \textit{worldly policy} for recruiting her numbers. Now, all these original causes of opposition have become her characteristics, as seen in the numerous rival ecclesiastical establishments.

On the subject of creeds, catechisms and forms of prayer, and of the administration of the sacraments, the Bishop's statements are somewhat peculiar. He
t o us such compositions. On the contrary
the apostles were brought up Jews; ac-
customed, in their earliest notions of re-
ligion, to refer to the books of the law, as
containing precise statements of their
belief, and most minute directions as to
religious worship and ceremonies. So
that, to give complete and regular in-
structions as to the character and requis-
itions of the new religion, as it would
have been natural for any one, was more
especially to be expected of these men."

Why, then, did not the apostles, or
some others who were inspired, give the
"precise statements" and "minute direc-
tions" concerning their belief and religious
ceremonies? The Bishop answers this
question very well. He proceeds as
follows:

"How comes it, then, that no one of the
elders (Presbyters) of any of these
Churches should have written down, and
afterwards submitted to the revision of an
apostle, that outline of catechetical in-
struction—that elementary introduction
to the Christian faith—which they must
have received at first from that apostle's
lips, and have afterwards employed in the
instruction of their own converts? Why
did none of them record any of the pray-
ers, of which they must have heard so
many, from an apostle's mouth, both in
the ordinary devotional assemblies, in the
administration of the sacraments, and in the 'laying on of hands,' by which they
themselves had been ordained."

"Is it not strange, then, that these ver-
bal directions should nowhere have been
committed to writing. This would have
seemed a most obvious and effectual mode
of precluding all future disorders and
disputes; as also the drawing up of a
compendious statement of Christian doc-
trines, would have seemed a safeguard
against the still more important evil of
heretical error. Yet if any such state-
ments and formularies had been drawn
up, with the sanction, and under the re-
vision of an apostle, we may be sure they
would have been preserved and trans-
mitted to posterity, with the most scrup-
ulous and reverential care. The conclu-
sion, therefore, seems inevitable, that
either no one of the numerous elders and
Catechists ever thought of doing this,
or else that they were forbidden by the
apostles to execute any such design, and
each of these alternatives seems alike in-
explicable by natural causes."

"Since then no one of the first promul-
gators of Christianity did that which
they must—some of them at least—have
been naturally led to do, it follows that
they must have been supernaturally
withheld from it; how little soever we may
be able even to conjecture the object of the
prohibition. For in respect of this, and
several other (humanly speaking, unac-
countable) circumstances in our religion,
it is important to observe that the argu-
ment thence derivable in favor of the
divine origin of Christianity, does not
turn on the supposed wisdom of this or
that appointment, which we conceive to
be worthy of the Deity, and thence infer
that the religion must have proceeded from
Him, but on the utter improbability of its
having proceeded from Man; which leaves
its divine origin the only alternative. The
Christian Scriptures considered in this
point of view, present to us a standing
miracle; at least, a monument of a mira-
acle; since there are in several points such
as we may be sure, according to all natural
causes, they would not have been.

He thinks the apostles and Presbyters
in the Primitive Church had forms of
prayer and compendious statements of
doctrine, but did not commit them to
writing lest they should be superstitiously
and blindly followed in succeeding ages of
the Church; and lest they should discour-
age the study of the Holy Scriptures; and,
again, because no forms would be adapted
to all climates and circumstances of men.

He says men were naturally inclined to write
out those forms and ceremonies but were
supernaturally restrained from doing so.
This would seem a good reason then why
they should not write them out now. The
evils which the Bishop says would have followed their record do follow those that are written now. The creed is studied to the neglect of the study of the word of God. The ceremonies are observed without inquiring into their divine authority, and a cold and lifeless repetition of the liturgy takes the place of the earnest worship of a grateful heart. If it is right to have a written creed and formularies, the apostles could have either written such an one, or sanctioned one written by some one of the numerous Elders who were "naturally" led to do so, and added a proviso for its alteration whenever and wherever the climate and other circumstances should render it necessary; so that the evil of blindly and superstitiously following it to the neglect of the Sacred Scriptures would be avoided. That they did not do so is a proof of the divine origin of the Christian Religion. Their conduct in this respect is also a proof that no human creed is of divine origin and not necessary to the success and good order of the Church of God.

The Bishop thinks he finds approbation for the introduction of some "things not precisely laid down in the sacred record" in the Savior's language, concerning the "Scribes and Pharisees," who sat in Moses' seat; "that is, they are his successors in the office of making and enforcing regulations for the Jewish Church; "whosoever they bid you observe and do, so do ye; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not." I find not in Jesus' language here any authority for the Scribes and Pharisees to make regulations for the Jewish church, I do find in another place that Jesus charged them with making "void the word of God by their traditions." This is what has been done by some more, by others less, by every creed from the "apostolic creed" to the latest effusion of moonstruck spiritualists.

Judaism and its ritual were designed for one nation and one country and for that reason a more precise ritual and worship could not with propriety be pre-scribed and was accordingly given by divine authority. The gospel of Christ was intended for all nations and countries and was divinely arranged with reference to its Universality. There is in it, as recorded on the inspired page, all the flexibility and precision necessary to attain the order and decency the Lord requires of His church. Did the Lord intend that two or more creeds should be professed by one nation in the same age of its existence? If he did, what becomes of the argument for creeds and ceremonies being changed, to meet various climates and circumstances? And how is it that the people of the same nation have many creeds and ceremonies, each claiming for itself divine authority? Would the Bishop proscribe Presbyterians, Baptists, Independents and Quakers, because their creeds differ from the Episcopalian? And yet all these are in existence in England. We have a greater number of religious parties in this country, each one claiming for its creed that it is nearer to the Scriptures than any of the others. One of the consequences from these creeds is what the Bishop correctly says would have followed from the apostles having written one. "In fact, all study, properly so called, of the rest of Scripture,—all lively interest in its perusal,—would have been nearly superseded by such an inspired compendium of doctrine; to which alone, as far the most convenient for that purpose, habitual reference would have been made in any questions that might arise. Both would have been regarded, indeed, as of divine authority, but the Compendium, as the fused and purified metal; the other, as the mine containing the crude ore. And the Compendium itself, being not like the existing Scriptures, that from which the faith is to be learned, but the every thing to be learned, would have come to be regarded by most with an indolent, unthinking veneration, which would have exercised little or no influence on the character.

Precisely so. And this is just what
creeds have done. If from the Scriptures the faith is to be learned now, why was it not sufficient in the apostolic age? The Bishop seems to admit that the Scriptures were sufficient then and we conceive that they are sufficient still. We must learn our faith from the Scriptures if we would avoid "an indolent and unthinking veneration" for a petrified Orthodoxy under either Prelatical or Presbyterial dominion. The inspired word was sufficient for three hundred years, and now after a long dark night under the dominion of creeds for fifteen hundred years the proof is being again furnished to the world of the sufficiency of the Scriptures for the faith and manners of the children of God.

I conclude this long article by repeating the argument for the Bible, without human creeds, as sufficient.

If a creed has more in it than the Bible, it has too much; if it has less than the Bible, it has too little; if it is just like the Bible, then it is the Bible, and that we have already.

CONVERSION.
NUMBER THREE.

Bro. FRANKLIN:—Dear Sir:—According to the book of apostolic conversions, the Acts of Apostles, there is but one way to turn a man to Jesus Christ. The scriptural way of conversion is uniform, the sectarian way of conversion is multiform, many. This is important to be known. The circumstances leading to the conversions in the Acts were different, but the end or issue was the same, they were all converted in one way. For example, the circumstances leading to the turning of the three thousand pentecostians were different from any others in the Acts.

Yet as they, the three thousand, were converted, so was every person converted by the apostles.

They believed in Jesus the Christ, the Son of God crucified, buried, risen and ascended to God, they abandoned their sins and their Judaism and were immersed for remission of sins; so were all the apostolic converts. The second example, Peter healed the crippled man, in Acts the third, and explained the miracle to them in words, as he did the miracle of tongues in Acts second, they believed in a risen and crowned Savior, repented of their sins, returned to God in immersion, and their sins were canceled or blotted out Acts iii: 19. The number became five thousand. The circumstances of their conversion differed from the two miracles but they were in the same way. The circumstances leading to the conversion of the Ethiopian differed from the other two, but he was converted in the same way. He believed and was immersed and was converted as the three thousand were. So of Cornelius, the Jailor, and Paul.

"In conversion, as in all his other works God observes a certain order of process, which is the settled arrangement of his own wisdom and mercy. We have no authority to expect him to work out of that order. Take an illustration. In the granite quarries of India immense blocks, six feet deep and eighty feet in length, are separated from the solid rock by this simple process. In the direction of the intended separation, a groove is cut with a chisel a few inches in depth. Along this groove a narrow line of fire is then kindled, and maintained—the rock below is thoroughly heated, immediately on which men and women, each provided with a bucket of cold water, suddenly clear off the ashes and pour the water into the heated groove, when the rock at once splits with a clean fracture. In this beautiful and wonderful process, let us suppose either of the measures inverted, suspended or neglected, it is plain the result would not take place. The result is
produced by the influences which God has put already in the fire and water, but he will not let these influences operate to produce the phenomenon without the agency of man and the use of means. Suppose these men poured the water before they heated the rock, or heated the rock before they cut the groove; and suppose they did all and neglected to pour the water, the granite rock would never have been displaced. In such a case, no one would ascribe the failure to the absence of Divine influence from the fire, or their withdrawal from the water, but all would ascribe it either to the unadroit- ness and carelessness of the workmen, or to their inattention to the order of measures which God himself had adjusted.

If the laborers prayed and expected that the fire would do what the water was to effect or God himself to do what they as laborers ought to do, they would inevitably fail. If they had put either the fire or water before they cut the groove the rock would never have split off. If all the laborers in Christendom were to kneel and pray to God to split off the rock by mere power till their knees grew as hard as leather the rock would never split off. Just so in conversion. In the process of conversion there are four agencies in operation—the agency of truth on the mind, the agency of the church in supplying the truth, the agency of the sinner himself and the agency of the Holy Spirit. If the operation of either of these agencies be inverted, suspended or neglected, or if we make the truth, the spirit or the sinner to change place, or the church or either do the work of the other, it is a fact as certain as the existence of yesterday that conversion will not take place. Neither God nor man can, without altering the moral order of the universe turn the world without the instrumentality of truth and the co-operation of the Church; and the Holy Spirit cannot convert by a direct act of physical Omnipotence, for he has limited his influences to the presence of truth, and to the agency of Christians. Hence, in conversion it is of the last importance that there be a union of method and order between the Holy Spirit and the church.”

The apostolic conversions were all uniform, were all made to Jesus Christ. The popular conversions are made in diverse ways to men, to systems, to sects, and not to Jesus Christ. The converts made by Jewish prophets and the apostles were active, they turned themselves, modern converts are passive, they are made by the Holy Ghost in many ways. The word convert, converted does not occur, I believe, but three times in the Old Testament, and then it would be better rendered turned or return. Ps. 51 13. Then shall sinners return to thee. Is. vi: 10. Lest they should return to thee and I should heal them or forgive their sin. The word convert should never be used while it retains its present signification. According to the Scriptures, what is it that turns a man to God? David has told in outline. The law or doctrine of Jehovah is perfect, converting or restoring the soul. Peter revealed the whole secret when he said, Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel that by the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone set at naught by your builders, which is become the head of the corner. Acts iv: 10, 11. Miracles did not convert the people till they were explained in words. Men of Israel hear these words, Acts ii: Truth, reason, argument, miracles explained in words produced apostolic conversion. Popular conversions are produced from one sect to another sect, by interest, motives, excite- ments, by the superior truths which it is supposed one sect has over another sect. Waldo the French Reformer, and Luther were awakened by their companions being killed by their side, by lightning. Most of the apostolic Fathers were converted by reading the Scriptures like the Eunuch and Bereans. Now it is all done without
the Scriptures. If mankind are ever turned what will it be from and what to? Will they be turned from Popery to Protestantism, or from Protestantism to Popery? From Episcopacy to Presbyterianism or from the latter to the former? What will the converts be called, Jews, Mahometans, Catholics or Sects? Will all men ever be Christianized? When, before or after the second advent of Christ? Will it be done by miracles by the residue of the Spirit, his outpourings or by ordinary means? On the plan pursued for the last three hundred years, how long will it take to make all men Christians? Do things look much like the conversion of all men at present? Answer these questions, brethren, and oblige yours truly.

JACOB CREATH.

RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

The question whether, in turning to the Lord, the sinner repents before he believes is not, strictly speaking, a question of reasoning or logic, but a question of fact. Can we find an account in the scriptures of any person repenting before believing, or, which is the same, repenting without faith? There is one method of settling this question beyond controversy, and that is to examine every place where the word repent is found in the New Testament, and see if there is a single instance where repentance did actually occur before the subject believed; or without faith. When this is done, we can turn the matter the other way, and see if there is any instance where faith actually occurred before repentance, or without repentance. If we can find an instance of any one repenting before believing, or without faith, that case will stand as conclusive evidence. If, on the other hand, we can find an instance of any person believing before repentance, or without re-

pentance, that case will stand as conclusive evidence. With this statement of the case, we are now ready to proceed with a regular induction of all the cases in the New Testament.

1. The first occurrence of the word, repent, is found in the following: “Repent ye for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.”—Matt. iii. 1. In this passage John the Immerser gives the reason why they should repent. That reason is “for” or because, “the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” A man can not repent “because the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,” till he believes the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. The fact that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand was the reason the Immerser gave why they should repent. This could not be effective in leading any person to repent who did not believe the fact, that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. In this instance, unequivocally, the belief of the good news, or the gospel, that the Kingdom was at hand, was before the repentance, and induced them to repent.

II. The next repentance mentioned is in the following: “Generation of vipers, who has warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore, fruits worthy of repentance.” We do not see anything in this passage, isolated from all others, determining which occurs first, believing or repenting; but, as it is the same repentance referred to, verse 1, of the same chapter, the same reason for repentance exists, viz: “for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” The belief of this fact was the cause of their repentance, or the reason why they should repent. This reason, leading to repentance, certainly existed before the repentance.

III. Matt. iv. 17, we find the following: “Repent; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” In this case we have the beginning of the preaching of Jesus. He preached to the people, commanding them to repent, adding, “for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” The fact that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, was the reason he gave why they should repent. This fact, or reason, they must have believed before it could
have led them to repentance. We defy hu-
man ingenuity to show that they repented
first and then believed the good news that
the Kingdom was at hand. They believed
first, the good news, or the gospel, that the
Kingdom was at hand, and repented because
the Kingdom was at hand.

From these cases we find that John the
Immerser and Jesus both urged the same
reason for repentance; that the Kingdom of
Heaven is at hand. This was not the rea-
son in an isolated case simply, but in every
case—all the time. The unvarying reason
for repentance, as urged in all their preach-
ing, was that the Kingdom of Heaven is at
hand. See the following: “Now, after that
John was put in prison, Jesus came into
Galilee, preaching the gospel of the King-
dom of God, and saying, “The time is ful-
filled and the Kingdom of God is at hand;
repent ye, and believe the gospel.” Mark i.14.
Here stands the same reason for repent-
ing. “The time is fulfilled, and the King-
dom of God is at hand.” This Jesus and
John preached, as the reason why men should
repent. It could not be a reason why any
man should repent, or could not lead any
man to repentance, till he believed. The
passage just quoted gives us a sample of the
preaching of Jesus. That which was preach-
ed was what was to be believed in all cases.
Jesus, then, preached that the time was ful-
filled, and that the kingdom was at hand.
This was what men were then required to
believe. They were commanded to repent
because this was true, or because the King-
dom was at hand.

IV. The mere circumstance that the word
repent, occurs before the word believe, in
this passage, and a few other cases, does not
prove that the repentance actually occurred
before believing. In some instances both
in scripture and other good compositions, the
order in which things are mentioned, is not
the order in which the events occurred. —
This we shall now demonstrate from a few
clear examples from scripture.

1. “Who will have all men to be saved
and to come unto the knowledge of the
truth,” 1. Tim. ii. 4. Here we have, in
composition, saved first, and then coming
to the knowledge of the truth. The real
state of the case is, we come to the knowl-
edge of the truth first, and are saved after-
ward.

2. “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth
the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart
that God hath raised him from the dead,
 thou shalt be saved.” Rom. x. 9. Here
we have, in the order of words, confessing
with the mouth first, and believing with the
heart afterward; yet we all know that the
believing was first and the confessing after-
ward.

3. “Except a man be born of water and
of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the King-
dom of God.” Being born, or begotten
of the Spirit, is simply being made believers;
and all admit that the sinner is begotten
of the spirit, or made a believer, before being
born of water, or being immersed. Yet, in
the order of the words, born of waters comes
before born of the Spirit.

4. Titus iii. 5., we have the words, “wash-
ing of regeneration and renewing of the Ho-
ly Spirit.” In the order in which the words
occur, here we have the washing of regener-
ation first, and renewing of the Holy Spirit
afterward. Renewing of the Holy Spirit
evidently in the order of events, takes place
before washing of regeneration. We suppose
that no clear expositor of scripture will
doubt that “renewing of the Holy Spirit,”
amounts to the same as born of the Spirit,
begotten or made believers. This certainly
occurs before the washing of regeneration.

5. 2. Tim. i. 9, we find the following:
“Who hath saved and called us with a holy
calling.” In the order of words here we
have saved before calling; whereas in the
real order of the events, they were called
first, and afterward saved.

These specimens are deemed sufficient to
show that the order of the words, in the sen-
tences where we find the expression, “Re-
pent and believe,” prove nothing in regard
to the order of events. If, in the case the
sinner turning to God, he actually re-
pents before he believes that fact must be
proved by some other circumstance than
the mere order of the words. The arguments of Bro. Van Dake, from what he calls "the style of scripture," therefore proves nothing.

He gives us the following: "Repent—change your minds—become willing to obey God—make up your minds to do what God requires." A command to do all this would have wonderful force on a man who does not believe! What is the inducement to change the mind—to become willing to obey God, while in unbelief? The idea of a man changing his mind, becoming willing to obey God, while in unbelief for absurdity is unequalled in all the absurd things of these times.

THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS AND THE EVILS OF ECCLESIASTICAL RIVALRY.

NUMBER FIVE.

BRO. FRANKLIN.—Dear Sir:—Having in my former numbers spoken of the Union of Christians, and the advantages arising therefrom, I shall now name some of the evils which have arisen from the divisions among professed Christians. These evils are numerous, multiform, and ruinous to the souls of men. Woe to the world, because of stumbling-blocks, or snares laid in the way of men. Stumbling-blocks there must be; but woe to them who put them in the way of men's conversion. To Skandala, means temptations to sin, stumbling-block, offences, provocations to sin, apostacy.—And though he represented such things as necessary in respect of the exercise and improvement which they afford to virtue, and unavoidable by reason of the pride, anger, revenge, malice, vanity, and other jarring passions of men, he did not fail to set forth their evil nature, in their dreadful punishment. Woe unto him through whom they come. Unspeakable misery has been brought in mankind through the malignity, weakness, folly, and wickedness of professors. I con-
and common justice. This is an immense evil.

The second evil which I shall name, is the worst. The needless waste, the sinful waste of money, in which Sectarianism has occasioned in erecting separate places of worship in every village, hamlet, town, and city; which money, if employed in building one commodious house of worship, and in employing one good man to teach the people the scriptures, might do much good, but as it is, neither party can pay a man to teach them, and thus much evil is done to the morals of the people. Pride, ignorance, and bigotry, is the cause of much evil in the world.

Look at the unnecessary waste of money in erecting separate school-houses, colleges, academies, universities, and employing Sectarian teachers. What a shameful waste of money in printing separate hymn books, commentaries, sermon books, tracts, Sunday school books. Who can enumerate the sums of money wasted in fitting out different missionaries and their enterprises, to teach the heathens Sectarianism.

3rd. Sectarianism has engendered and established inquisitions, jails, pillories, dungeons, bastiles, racks, and tortures of every description, for the purpose of destroying, burning, torturing, and massacring, banishing, and imprisoning heretics; plundering and hanging them. Many eminent and illustrious Christians, for their virtues, such as Tyndale, Huss, Jerome, of Prague, and others, have fallen victims to such unchristian and infernal barbarities; all done under the garb of religion. Who can count the sums of money expended in Europe by Protestants warring on and killing each other for "the faith?"

4th. Sectarianism has infected the prayers, the songs, and sermons of all the sects. If God had answered the prayers of any one of them, probably no other sect would have been spared. These sects cannot all be right. They may all be wrong. There is but one Christian religion, and that stands on the pages of the New Testament. If that is deficient, who is to supply that deficiency?

5th. Could we fly with the swiftness of an angelic-messenger, through the various assemblies convened on Lord's day, while they are offering up their prayers to heaven, what a repulsive and discordant scene would present itself, when we behold the leaders of the sects confining their petitions to their own votaries, imploring a special blessing on themselves,—as if they were the chief favorites of heaven, lamenting the errors of heretics, throwing out insinuations against rival sects, taking credit to themselves, as the chief depositories of gospel truth, and thanking God for their superior attainments in Christian perfection. How unlike the noble, benevolent, expansive spirit, which Christ inculcates.

6th. The additions, subtractions, and perversions of the scriptures, are three great and fruitful sources of corruption.

7th. Sectarianism has introduced a phraseology and language altogether different from the New Testament, as different from it as German is from English. Each sect has a dialect peculiarly its own, as each nation of men has a peculiar dialect of its own. No two of them speak the same religious dialect. The dialect of Baptists is not that of the Methodists. They differ as widely as Italians and French; and so of all the others.

8th. Sectarianism has hindered the conversion of sinners to the gospel. The union of Christians must precede the triumph and diffusion of the gospel, according to John, 17. The sects are not united among themselves, and they will not unite until they will agree to unite on the word of God. There are now three great Anti-Christis reigning over mankind,—Papal or Roman Anti-Christ; Mahometan Anti-Christ, and Sectarian or Infidel Anti-Christ. These three great Anti-Christis leave but a small portion of mankind for Jesus the Christ, to reign over. John said there were many Anti-Christis in his day. There are a great number now. The remedy for all these evils is a return to the language, the teach-
not himself, maintain that believing and repenting are the same, else he could not argue that repentance is before faith, nor could we, in that case, have the expression, "Repent and believe the gospel." Repent, is one thing and believe, is another. The change of the mind from unbelief to belief, is simply to believe, and not to repent. We defy any man to show anything that could cause a man to change his mind, or that could produce so much change in his mind, as to amount to a resolve to turn to God, before faith, or without faith. Yet a change in the mind, amounting to a resolve to turn to God, is certainly the least that brother Van Dake himself could possibly call repentance. This brings the matter to a point. Can a man resolve to turn to God without faith? If he can, what can induce him thus to resolve? We can easily see how faith could induce a man to resolve to turn to God. Anyone of ordinary intelligence can see how the goodness of God can lead anyone who believes to resolve to turn to God; but we can not see how the goodness of God can have any effect on a man to induce him to turn to God, who is in unbelief, or without faith. We can easily see an inducement in the expression, "Except you repent you shall all likewise perish," to lead a man who believes, to repentance, or to resolve that he will turn to God; but there is certainly no motive in it to induce any man to thus resolve who does not believe.

Brother Van Dake occupies his article, No. V., mainly in criticising brethren Campbell and Scott, on their definitions of repentance and faith. We shall not attempt to justify or defend them against his arguments, but, in a shorter way, rid the subject of all difficulty. In order to this, in accordance with what we have said above, we grant him as follows:

1st. We grant him his own definition of repentance—a change of mind—amounting to a resolve to turn to God.

2nd. We grant, that faith that does not move a man, like Noah's did, with religious fear; that does not induce him to repent—to resolve to turn to God—is dead, being
alone. There need, therefore, be no trouble about definitions.

Still, we maintain, that the faith that moves a man with religious fear—that brings the goodness of God before him so as to lead him to repentance—to resolve to turn to God, is as certainly before repentance, as that any weak faith, dead faith, or ineffectual faith of any description or degree, is or ever was, is before repentance. It requires as true, genuine, and strong faith, to induce any man to resolve to turn to God, as to do anything any man ever did in obedience to God. There is nothing that any man ever did, in obedience to God, harder to perform, than to resolve to turn to God, and a grander absurdity in all the erroneous teaching and theorizing of modern times, does not exist, than that a man can perform this, the most difficult and trying of all gospel requirements, without faith. We defy any man to think of, and write down, a greater absurdity than that a man can comply with a gospel requirement, acceptably, before faith, and consequently without faith, and that too, not dead faith, but living faith. The faith that is before repentance, leads to repentance, by bringing the goodness of God before men, is the living faith, the only divine faith, and the faith that saves the soul.

Brother Van Dake says, page 18th, Repentance and Faith, "The Pentecostians were convinced of sin, asked what they should do, and, after they were told what to do, ‘gladly received, the word’; and thus they became true believers, according to the definition which requires in faith and joyful consent to the truth and reception of it."

We should be happy to know where Bro. Van Dake got the item of information, that the Pentecostians, after they were told what to do, ‘gladly received’ the word! Where is the evidence that they, after they were told what to do, gladly received the word? The historian says, when they heard this—the discourse of Peter,—they were pricked in their heart. Were they pricked in their heart before they believed? Certainly not.

Were they pricked in their heart and induced to cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?” before they believed? Surely not. Still, it is true, that after they were pricked in their heart, and after they cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Peter commanded them to repent. The historian, then, referring back to what had taken place, says, "As many as gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day, there were added to them about three thousand souls."

Nothing is clearer than that the hearing was the ground of their believing, and their believing was the ground of their resolving to turn to the Lord, and their resolving to turn, was the ground of their obedience. Whether repentance means a change in the mind, amounting to a resolve to turn to God, or reformation, a man had as well, in our estimation, try to prove that water runs upstream, that the attraction of gravitation is in the opposite direction from the centre, or that slaking of thirst goes before drinking, as that any man ever resolved to turn to the Lord before he believed. A change in the mind is an effect, and an effect was never produced without a cause. We defy any man to refer to any cause that is adequate to produce such an effect—to change the mind, so as to amount to a resolve to turn to the Lord, before faith, or which is the same, without faith. Accept any definition you may of repentance, and then nothing is more difficult for a poor, weak, and sinful worm of the dust, than to repent and to say, that he can perform this greatest, most important, and difficult of all the requirements God has ever laid on him, before faith, or, which is the same, without faith, for absurdity, can not be transcended. Or to say that he can perform this great and important work, without which he must perish, and thus please God, with only a dead faith, a bare assent of the mind, or with anything short of the genuine faith that saves the soul, is no less absurd. There is no greater act required of poor, sinful man, than to repent, and to say that a man can do that without faith, or before faith, is to say; that
he can serve God, and please him, in complying with one of his most important requirements, before he believes, or without faith. To say, that he can do this with dead faith, a mere assent to the truth, or anything short of the genuine faith that saves the soul, is no better.

**FAITH AND INFIDELITY.**

**NUMBER ONE.**

**Faith.**

And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.—Acts viii: 37.

For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.—Romans x: 10.

There is, perhaps, no truth more fully illustrated in the whole Bible than that God requires every man who hears the Gospel to do something, as a test of his loyalty, and as a condition of his enjoying that salvation which Christ has purchased with his own blood. Almost every page of the Living Oracles contains some precept that is to be obeyed, in order to the enjoyment of some blessing that is promised. Even in Eden, Adam was required to abstain from the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, as a condition of his having free and continued access to the Tree of Life. So, too, were the Israelites, in the wilderness, required to be obedient in all things, as a condition of their entering into the Promised Land. And in like manner, Christ offers rest to all who are weary and heavy-laden, on condition that they come to him; take his yoke upon them; and continue to learn of him.—What these terms and conditions of enjoyment are, can, of course, be learned only from the Holy Bible. It is the only revelation that God has ever made to man on the subject of his salvation from sin. On this point, nature is a perfect blank; and all human philosophy is as silent as the grave. And hence, it follows, that to the Bible, and to the Bible alone, we must ever look for all the terms and conditions on which life and immortality have been offered to guilty man.

Some of these are, in their nature and character, positive. That is, they depend wholly on God's legislative appointment; and may therefore be changed, by Divine authority, according to circumstances.—The offering of bloody sacrifices, for example, was, for many years, made the duty of every patriarch. He was required to offer frequently bleeding victims both for himself and for his family. But the law of Moses restricted this privilege to the house of Aaron. None but the priests, under the Sinaitic covenant, could lawfully officiate at the altar. Numbers iii: 10, and xviii: 3. And since the coming of the Messiah, the legal custom of offering animal sacrifices has been wholly abolished! Spiritual sacrifices are the only kind that is now required. 1 Pet. ii: 5.

But other conditions again are immutable. Founded, as they are, in the nature of things, and in the moral relations of man to his Creator, they are essentially the same in all ages and under all circumstances. Faith is one of these conditions. It has always been required as a condition and means of salvation. It was required in the Patriarchal age; it was required in the Jewish age, and it is required in the Christian age. And so it ever must, and it ever will be required. "For he that cometh to God," says Paul, "must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Hebrews xi: 6.

But it is important to observe just here, that God never requires of any man, what is impossible. If He requires us to behold His glory in the firmament, it is because he has given to us both light and the powers of vision. If He requires us to hearken to the sweet melodies of nature, it is because He has given us an atmosphere to conduct sound to our ears, and auditory nerves to communicate it to the sensorium. And just so, if he requires
us to believe, it is because he has endowed us with the necessary faculties, and given us, at the same time, the most reliable and indubitable testimony. This is a matter which Christ himself places beyond all doubt. In speaking of His rejection by the Jews, He says, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now," He adds, "they have no cloak for their sin." John xv: 22. And again He says, "If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they had not had sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father." John xv: 24.

The first thing then that God requires of every man who hears the gospel, is evidently to study it; and to weigh well the evidences of its Divine authenticity. It is here that every successful attempt at reformation must begin. For without testimony there is no faith; and without faith, it is impossible to please God in anything "for whatever is not of faith is sin. Romans xiv: 23.

We cannot, then, study the Bible too diligently. We cannot too earnestly impress it on the tender minds and hearts of the rising generation. We cannot sacrifice too much in our efforts to send it to the benighted nations of the earth; to those that are perishing through the ignorance that is in them. It is the germ of immortality, which, when planted in the soul, buds, and blossoms, and brings forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness and love.

I wish, however, to say here very emphatically, that something more than the mere study of God's word, is essential to the perfection and consummation of our faith. A man may read his Bible more or less every day; and he may study with much care and logical precision, the varied and multiplied evidences of its genuineness, its authenticity, its integrity, and its inspiration; and still he may come far short of the faith that the gospel requires. For as the Spirit itself testifies, "It is with the heart that man believeth unto righteousness."

It is not my purpose to give, in this essay, an analysis of the powers and susceptibilities of the human mind; nor to go into a logical or metaphysical disquisition respecting the intellect and the heart of man. This is not necessary for my present purpose. My readers, no doubt, all sufficiently understand this matter. They know that it belongs to the intellect to think; and to the heart to feel. They know that the former is the seat of perception, memory, imagination, and reason; and that the latter is the seat of the emotions, the affections and the desires.

They know, moreover, that these two faculties of the mind do not always act in concert and harmony with each other; that the intellect, for example, is often exercised on one object, while the heart is firmly fixed on something else. Of this all are conscious. And many, at least, are also conscious, that this distraction of mind occurs more frequently on the subject of religion than on anything else. God has so multiplied the evidences of Christianity, that a man in this country, might about as well attempt to shut out the light of the sun from his eyes, as to shut out the light of the gospel from his understanding. These evidences are seen in the Bible itself; they are seen in profane history; they are seen in the fulfillment of prophecy; they are seen in the effects of the gospel on society, they are seen everywhere. And hence it is, that almost every intelligent person in this country, is willing and ready to give an intellectual assent to the Divine authenticity of the Christian religion. But how many of us, like the eunuch, believe with all our hearts? Ah, this is the question.

Before any man can do this, his heart must be set free from its earthly attachments, and allowed to accompany his understanding in the investigation of the truth. This is the one thing needful, so far as it respects human agency. When this is done, we may say that all is done.
The intellect then, immediately conveys the truth to the heart; the heart then influences and directs the will; the will controls the hand, the hand opens the purse; and the purse, properly directed, sets in motion the whole machinery of society for the glory of God and the good of humanity. And hence it is, that the true believer has no compromise to make with God. He never stops to inquire how much he must do, or how little he may do, in order to get to Heaven. His only question is, “Lord, what will thou have me to do?” When this is ascertained be no longer confers with flesh and blood.

To set our hearts free, then, from all the undue and evil influences that the world, the flesh and the Devil, have thrown around them, is evidently the second, and, I may add, the paramount duty of every man, who hears the gospel of the grace of God; as it is also an essential condition of that faith which works by love, and which purifies the soul. I do not say, that it is made the duty of any man to do this simply by his own unaided efforts; nor do I say, that any man, whatever may be his capacity, can do all this, solely in and of himself. In this respect, we have no ability to do any thing. “Without me,” says Christ, “ye can do nothing.” John xv: 5. We cannot even live a single moment without Him. But nevertheless, he has allowed us to have some agency in the preservation of our own lives as well as in the lives of others. And just so it is with respect to the discipline and government of our hearts. We can never control and purify them by our devices. But with the proper use of the means that God has himself provided, and with the gracious assistance that He has promised to give us, we may all do so, and do so most effectually if we will.

It is only necessary to change our circumstances, and to place ourselves under the influence of Divine grace, in order to feel a corresponding change in our whole mental and moral constitution. How often, for example, have we felt that our hearts were being gradually weaned from the world and its vanities, while we were attending a protracted meeting while we were listening to the pleadings of the sanctuary; or to the songs of Zion; or to the prayers of God’s children? Under these circumstances, we have felt, that it is good to be with Jesus; and like Peter, James and John, when they saw His glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, we may perhaps have wished for tabernacles in some secluded spot, where we might be permitted to remain with Him forever.

But oh, how very different are the influences of this vain world. When we neglect even for a short time the ordinances of God, and allow our affections to be absorbed in the things of time and sense, how very hard and insensible our hearts soon become; and how greatly changed is the appearance of every thing else, both within us, and around us! The heavens above us seem to lose much of their brightness; the church too, loses many of her charms and attraction; and Jesus himself, it may be, is no longer to us the one altogether lovely. And all this, be it remembered, has been brought about by a change of circumstances which are in a great measure under our own control. O, yes, we have an agency in these matters. Otherwise, God would never have said to each of us, “Son, give me thy heart;” Proverbs xxiii: 26; otherwise, He would never have commanded us, “to watch over our hearts with all diligence.” Prov. iv. 23.

Let us then, dear reader, give good heed to these admonitions. Let us ever remember that it is not a mere cold assent of the understanding that will save us from our sins; that will serve to make us pure and holy; that will unite us to God as the children of His adoption; and that will give us a title clear to mansions in the skies.— O, no; it is with the heart, as well as with the understanding, that man believeth unto righteousness. It is this living principle,
that; through the agency of the Holy Spirit, fills the soul with love, and joy, and peace, and long-suffering, and gentleness, and goodness, and fidelity, and meekness, and temperance. It is this, that prepare us for the solemn hour of death; and that, through the infinite grace of God, gives us an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

While then God is giving us life and reason, and while he is aiding us and warning us, by His Spirit and by His providence, let us all be more diligent in turning our hearts from the unsatisfying vanities of this world, to Him who, of God, has become unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; so that when He who is our life shall appear, we also may appear with Him in glory.

R. MILLIGAN.

RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

We commenced, in a previous article, a regular induction of all the passages where the word repent, is found, to see if there is one case where the repentance occurred before believing. We shall now proceed in order as follows:

I. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here." Mat. xii: 41. The expression, "repented at the preaching of Jonah," when fairly appreciated, amounts to this: They repented when they believed the preaching of Jonah. They certainly did not repent at the preaching of Jonah, or on hearing the preaching, without believing the preaching. The language clearly implies, that the preaching led to the repenting. Most assuredly the preaching did not lead to repenting till the preaching was believed.

II. Mat. ix: 13, we find the word, repentance, as follows: "For I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." What effect would a call to repentance have, from our Lord, on those who did not believe on him? Manifestly none in the world. So far as there is any evidence in this passage, it is in favor of the position that faith goes before repentance.

III. Mark i: 4, we have the following: "John did immerse in the wilderness, and preach the immersion of repentance for the remission of sins." Here we have the design of "the immersion of repentance," as stated by Mark, "for the remission of sins." Could a man come to John's immersion of repentance for the remission of sins, before faith, or without faith? The repentance, Mark i: 15, has been considered with its parallel in a former article. The repentance, Mark ii: 17, is the same as Mat. ix: 18.

IV. Mark vi: 12, we have the following: "And they went and preached that men should repent." This, so far as anything can be inferred, implies that the act of believing is before the act of repenting, because they must believe that men should repent before they repent. The preaching of the immersion of repentance, for the remission of sins, Luke iii: 3, is the same as that already noticed, Mark i: 4. The expression, Luke iii: 8, "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance," has already been alluded to, as found in Matthew, as containing nothing in itself, isolated from other passages, bearing upon the question which comes first, faith or repentance; but it being John's immersion of repentance, other passages show that the faith in every case, was preceded by repentance. The expression, Luke v: 32, is the same referred to above.

V. Luke x: 13, we have the following: "Woe to you, Chorazin! woe to you Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they would have repented long ago,
sitting in sackcloth and ashes." Why would they have repented if these miracles had been done among them? Because they would have believed. But the Jews did not believe, when these works were done in their midst, and, therefore, did not repent. This passage is a clear evidence that persons must believe before they repent. The expression, Luke xi: 32, "for they repented at the preaching of Jonah," has already been considered.

VI. Luke, xiii: 3, 5, we have the expression, "Except you repent you shall all likewise perish." What force can the expression, "you shall all likewise perish," have to induce any man to repent, who does not believe the statement? This passage is a clear evidence that a man must believe before he repents. The belief that he will perish if he does not repent, is an inducement to repent. The expression, Luke xv: 7, "I say to you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repents more than ninety-nine just persons, who need no repentance," throws no light on the question in any way.

VII. Luke xvi: 30, we find the following: "And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said to him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." In this case, the rich man argues that if one from the dead would go to his brethren, they would repent. To this Abraham replies, that if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one should rise from the dead. This implies that they would not repent unless they first were persuaded, or made believers, and thus is a clear evidence that faith must precede repentance. The expression, Luke xvi: 4, "and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him," furnishes no evidence any way touching the question.

VIII. Luke xxv: 46, in the commission, we find the following: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooves Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." In this language, repentance and remission of sins are connected together, and the repentance is in order to the remission of sins, and certainly no man can repent, or do anything else in order to remission of sins, who does not believe in the institution appointed for remission. But this, being in the commission, is the same as Acts ii: 38, when they heard what was preached, were pricked in their heart, or believed, and were then, commanded to repent and be immersed for the remission of sins. In this case, then, believing unequivocally is shown to occur before repenting.

IX. Acts iii: 19, we have the following: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." What does this word, "therefore," refer to? Evidently to what the Lord just said, as if he had said, "seeing that what I have said is true, repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." This case shows conclusively that they must have believed before they repented. The expression, Acts v: 31, "to give repentance to Israel," furnishes no evidence on the question in hand, on either side. The same is true of the expression, Acts xi: 18, "granted repentance into life," and that other expression, Acts xiii: 24, "the immersion of repentance to all the people of Israel."

X. Acts viii: 22, we find the following: "Repent, therefore, of this, thy wickedness." This was not in a case of conversion at all, and, therefore, does not bear on the case. Still, it is evident, Simon believed what Peter said, from his imploring Peter to pray for him, and that the belief was before the repentance and intended to lead to repentance.

XI. Acts xvii: 30, we have the following: "But now he commands all men everywhere to repent." In the times of the ignorance before the gospel—when they did not have the light, and could not believe—the Lord did not hold them strictly accountable.
But now, since the gospel has come—the means of faith—he commands all men everywhere to repent; because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, whereof he has given assurance to all men in that he has raised him from the dead. This Paul preached to the Athenians, that they might believe it, before they repented, and as a reason why they should repent. The expression, Acts xix: 4, "immersed with the immersion of repentance," is the same as we have alluded to heretofore, and needs no further comment now.

XII. Acts xx: 21, we have the following: "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."—This passage has been confidently relied on, as proof, by those, who maintain that the sinner, in turning to God, actually repents before he believes. We must, therefore, give it a passing notice. We dispose of the case as follows;

1st. It is maintained by high authority, that the apostle was simply speaking of his own repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. This may be so, or not, we shall make no defence of it. But before it can be used in argument, to prove that repentance is before faith, this must be set aside.

2d. Before this case can be used in argument on the question in hand, it must be shown that the order of words in narrative is the order of the events detailed. There is no proof in the passage that the sinner, in turning to the Lord, repents before he believes, only that the word, repentance occurs before the word, faith. This is no certain proof, for we have given sundry examples where that which is mentioned first evidently occurred last: This we believe to be the true solution of the matter in hand.

3d. The connection shows, that the faith was before the repentance. The verse preceding the language in question, reads as follows: "And how I kept back nothing that was profitable for you, but have showed, and have taught you publicly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." What would his having shown them and taught them publicly, and from house to house, have amounted to, if they had not believed what was taught and shown them? The fact in the case is, when they heard Paul preaching, teaching and showing them, all about the gospel, they believed, and their faith led to repentance and every act of obedience.

4th. Before this passage can be conclusive proof that repentance occurs before faith, the following points must be established: 1st. That Paul was testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, their repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and not his repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. 2nd. That the order in which the items are named in narrative, is the order in which the events occurred. 3rd. That the repentance actually did occur before the faith. It may be that none of these things can be established.

XIII. The only remaining passage found in Acts, is chapter xxvi: verse 20, which reads as follows: "But showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God." Did he show them that they should repent and turn to God, before they believed? He most unequivocally did not. They certainly believed what he said, or he could not have shown them that they should repent and turn to God, or do anything else.

We have now examined every place where the word, repent occurs, or repentance, to the last of Acts, coming from metanoia and metanoeo, and find no instance in which repentance occurred before faith, but find conclusive evidence that, in all cases, faith must precede repentance.

In our next we shall continue our regular induction through the New Testament.
METHANOIA.

In the times of the Savior, there were two great parties; the Pharisees and Sadducees. Each of these parties had its peculiar mode of thought, argumentation, reasoning, which constituted what we call the *mind* of the party. The Pharisaic mind differed from the Sadducean in important particulars. But each *mind* was opposed to the *mind* of the Christ. The Pharisaic mind, as long as it remained Pharisaic mind, could not believe in the Christ. Its mode of thought was not such as disposed it to receive the Christ. The same may be said of the mind of the Sadducee. There was a third party, not mentioned in the New Testament, distinguished for their austere manner of life, and general opposition to the Pharisees and Sadducees. These were the Essenes. These parties were professet believers in God. But as already said, their state of mind, their mode of thought was such as to make them hostile to the mind of the Christ. Professing the highest veneration for the law of God, they had rendered it null by their traditions. Such indeed was the corruption among the Pharisees and Sadducees, that the Savior and John the Immerser, named them serpents, generation of vipers. The state of mind being such, we see the necessity for a *metanoia*, change in the mode of thought and feeling, which we call repentance.

In accordance with this necessity for a change in the mode of thought and feeling, John makes his appearance on the banks of the Jordan, and calls on the people to repent; that is, to change their mode of thought and feeling. And in order to produce this effect, he announces the coming of the Christ, and of the Kingdom of God. John came to prepare a people for the Lord, and taught them that they should believe on Him who was coming after him. The announcement of the coming of the Kingdom of God, of the appearance of the Christ, of the day of God's wrath upon the wicked, wrought powerfully upon the people. The traditions, the customs, the mode of thought common to the Jews were all violently broken up by the sudden incursion of truths so momentous. As many as believed the Immerser were immersed into a new state of mind, a new mode of thought, into a state of mind the very opposite of that, which distinguished the Pharisee, the Essene, and the Sadducee. A new body of men arose at once, possessed of a new mind, a mind filled with the expectation of the coming Christ. I immerse you in order to repentance; that is, in order that having your minds renewed by the hope of the Christ, you may be prepared to receive him at his coming. Accordingly, we find that all the people and publicans justified God, by having been immersed with the immersion of John: but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the counsel of God, which was for their benefit, in not being immersed by him. As many as were immersed by John were prepared for, and received the Christ, but the Pharisees, in rejecting John's immersion, remained in their former Pharisaic mode of thought, and consequently rejected the Christ.

Now it is evident from the above facts, that without a change in the mode of thought and feeling, the Jews could not believe in the Christ. It is further evident, that this change of the mode of thought and feeling, was based upon their belief in and acknowledgment of God. Hence the Savior said: Repent and believe the Gospel. Therefore, the order of truth requires faith in God, repentance toward God, faith in the Christ. God is the lawgiver: you have sinned against God: now, in order to remission of sins, repent, change your mode of thought and feeling towards God, believe in him whom God has sent as a *lamb*, a sin-offering, to take away your sins. Gentiles were full of religious feeling and action: but this, as in the case of the Jews, was misdirected. A change in the mode of their thoughts and feelings was as neces-
sary as in the case of the Jews. Hence, a repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The Gentiles were worshippers, full of religious feeling. But they knew not what or whom they worshiped. The mind of the Gentiles was idolatrous. Hence a change of mind. Where this religious feeling was sincere among Gentiles, the annunciation of the Gospel was gladly received. There was a feeling of want, a real want of something far better, something satisfactory, something, on which the mind could rest with certainty; and the Gentiles readily turned away from the effete forms of idolatry to the service of the Living God. The annunciation of the existence of the Living God, had a power among the Gentiles, which we can not realize. They were worshippers of lifeless idols. They were, many of them, sincere; but felt the vanity of their worship. When the Living God was made known to them, and this, authoritatively, by mighty deeds and wonders and signs, they repented, that is, changed their thoughts and feelings with joy, and believed in the Christ as the Savior of men.

Indeed, no man can ever really embrace with joy the Gospel of Jesus, who does not know himself to be a sinner against God. The first great Gospel fact makes this evident. Jesus died for our sins. Who cares for this truth, unless he feels that he is a sinner? When we see that we have sinned against God, and that there is no help in ourselves, then we joyfully turn to the Christ. God is our Creator, our Preserver, our Benefactor, ever kind and benevolent; against him we sin: our repentance must be directed to him. And when this is the case, He points us to his Son as the sin offering by which all our sins are taken away. All repentance is based on our faith in God; and our repentance is directed to Him, and not to Christ: for Christ is the sin offering by which our sins against God are taken away. Did not the Jews sin against God when they crucified the Christ? Surely they did. Then, their sin being against God, their repentance must be
the Gospel; unacquainted with reason and philosophy; and he should be treated as one who is unfortunately confused in mind, and, if possible, lead along gently to a change in his mode of thought and feeling. Nothing is so unfortunate as mental confusion, an aberration of thought. Such persons should be treated with kindness, fed on milk, and their eyes should be anointed with eye-salve that they may see.

This article is in all kindness offered to such persons.

P. S. That there may be no misunderstanding with respect to the argument in the above article, I will add a few thoughts.—The Apostle Paul, in his address to the Athenians, said: Men of Athens, I perceive that, in all respects, you are more reverential toward deities than others: for as I was passing through and examining the objects of your worship, I saw an altar with this inscription: To the unknown God. Whom, therefore, you ignorantly worship, him I make known to you. Here we observe that the Athenians had faith in some object of worship. Wherever, indeed, worship exists, faith must exist. For worship is an effect of faith: It matters not, then, how crude the conception of a God, in the mind of a Gentile, may be, the conception exists, and the faith in that conception exists. Two things are done by the preaching of the Apostles: 1. The crude conception is removed, and a true knowledge of the Living God is given; This establishes faith in the true and Living God. 2. Then follows the repentance towards the true God: and faith in the Christ whom he has sent. As said above, the Gentile mind was full, in many instances, of a religious feeling toward their objects of worship; but this was misdirected. This religious feeling was founded on faith in what they conceived to be God. Hence the readiness with which the Gentiles received the knowledge of the true God, repented toward him, and believed in the Christ.

It is well known, (the reader will pardon the comparison,) how zealously many sec-

tarians of our day worship God. These men worship what they conceive to be God; but they have need of a real metanoia, repentance, change of their mode of thought and feeling toward God. When they are induced to hear the oracles of God, and can understand them, then their knowledge of God is enlarged, their modes of thought and feeling are changed, and they believe in the Christ, * whom the Apostles preached, and find great joy from such repentance and faith.

Preaching should be adapted to the condition of men. If we meet with those who do not believe in God, then, we must argue the existence of God, that such may believe; when such men believe, repentance toward God follows; we then present Jesus crucified, as the sacrifice which takes away their sins.

I will conclude this article with saying that in Acts xx: 21, there is an arrangement of the Greek words which will, in my estimation, justify the following translation: The repentance that leads to God, and faith that leads to our Lord Jesus Christ. And this will be obvious, when we consider, that metanoia existed as a Greek word, and in that language, meant after thought, change of mind, purpose, but was not, by any means, confined to things religious. In the New Testament its sense is fixed unalterably and its application is to things religious. The reader of the Greek will notice the position of the article:—en eis ton theon metanoian; literally—the toward God repentance, which is called the attributive construction, and is very emphatic. The change of the mode of thought and feeling in man, leads to God. Hence, Metanoia, being thus fixed in meaning, must express that change which is thorough, lasting and effective.

P. S. That there may be no misunderstanding with respect to the argument in the above article, I will add a few thoughts.—The Apostle Paul, in his address to the Athenians, said: Men of Athens, I perceive that, in all respects, you are more reverential toward deities than others: for as I was passing through and examining the objects of your worship, I saw an altar with this inscription: To the unknown God. Whom, therefore, you ignorantly worship, him I make known to you. Here we observe that the Athenians had faith in some object of worship. Wherever, indeed, worship exists, faith must exist. For worship is an effect of faith: It matters not, then, how crude the conception of a God, in the mind of a Gentile, may be, the conception exists, and the faith in that conception exists. Two things are done by the preaching of the Apostles: 1. The crude conception is removed, and a true knowledge of the Living God is given; This establishes faith in the true and Living God. 2. Then follows the repentance towards the true God: and faith in the Christ whom he has sent. As said above, the Gentile mind was full, in many instances, of a religious feeling toward their objects of worship; but this was misdirected. This religious feeling was founded on faith in what they conceived to be God. Hence the readiness with which the Gentiles received the knowledge of the true God, repented toward him, and believed in the Christ.

It is well known, (the reader will pardon the comparison,) how zealously many sec-

tarians of our day worship God. These men worship what they conceive to be God; but they have need of a real metanoia, repentance, change of their mode of thought and feeling toward God. When they are induced to hear the oracles of God, and can understand them, then their knowledge of God is enlarged, their modes of thought and feeling are changed, and they believe in the Christ, * whom the Apostles preached, and find great joy from such repentance and faith.

Preaching should be adapted to the condition of men. If we meet with those who do not believe in God, then, we must argue the existence of God, that such may believe; when such men believe, repentance toward God follows; we then present Jesus crucified, as the sacrifice which takes away their sins.

I will conclude this article with saying that in Acts xx: 21, there is an arrangement of the Greek words which will, in my estimation, justify the following translation: The repentance that leads to God, and faith that leads to our Lord Jesus Christ. And this will be obvious, when we consider, that metanoia existed as a Greek word, and in that language, meant after thought, change of mind, purpose, but was not, by any means, confined to things religious. In the New Testament its sense is fixed unalterably and its application is to things religious.—The reader of the Greek will notice the position of the article:—en eis ton theon metanoian; literally—the toward God repentance, which is called the attributive construction, and is very emphatic. The change of the mode of thought and feeling in man, leads to God. Hence, Metanoia, being thus fixed in meaning, must express that change which is thorough, lasting and effective.

*There are many Christ's imagined by men. The true Christ is the Christ of Apostolic history.
The subject of my last essay, as my readers will all remember, was faith,—the faith of the gospel; the faith which works by love; which purifies the heart; and which overcomes the world.

It comes, says Paul, by hearing the word of God; that is, by and through the careful study and critical examination of the testimony that God has given to mankind, in his Holy Oracles, concerning his only and well-beloved Son. And hence, as I endeavored to show in my first article, it always begins with the understanding. Afterwards, it reaches and permeates the heart; and through the heart, it influences and controls the will. And thus it is, that it finally brings our whole persons, with all their attributes and accidents under the dominion and government of our blessed and adorable Redeemer.

And hence it is, that the faith of the gospel always implies the obedience of the gospel. When Paul says, for example, that the gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one that believes it; he does not mean to say that it is the power of God for salvation to every one that merely yields an intellectual assent to the truth of the proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of the living God. Nay verily: for he says afterwards, in the same letter, that it is with the heart that man believes unto righteousness. Romans x. 10.

And in his letter to the Hebrews, he says, that it was by and through this ever active, vivifying, and fruit-bearing principle, that Noah was moved to build an ark for the saving of his house; that Abraham was induced to offer his son Isaac upon the alter; and that many of the other ancient worthi-
Proteus—like negation; to enumerate and classify its phases; and to treat of it with any degree of logical precision and accuracy. And indeed it is not often necessary to do this. The best way to remove darkness from a room, is to fill it with light. And the best way to remove all infidelity from the soul, is to fill it with faith which comes to us through the multiplied evidences of God's love.

But sometimes there is an advantage in looking at the negation, as well as at the positive side of a question. And there are certainly some prominent features and forms of infidelity which all persons should endeavor to understand. If a knowledge of them does not serve directly to promote and to increase our happiness; it may do so indirectly, by guarding us against the snares and vices into which they are ever prone to betray the unwary. If it does not fill the soul with the joys of the redeemed, it may at least help to save it from the agonies of the damned. To the very brief consideration, then, if some of the most prominent and popular forms of infidelity, I now respectfully invite the attention and consideration of my readers.

The first of these is that to which the apostle refers in our introductory quotation from his second letter to Timothy. It is commonly called Formalism; and as its name implies, it consists in having the mere form of godliness without its power. It is the body of religion, or rather, it is its lifeless carcase without its soul. It is a disease of the heart.

As a form of infidelity, it is peculiar to no time or place. Wherever true religion has prevailed, there Formalism has to some extent prevailed also. The ancient Hebrews were often charged with it, Isaiah i. 10-15, and xxix. 13-14, so too were the Pharisees. Matt. xxiii. 23-28. But it is in the Church of Rome, that Formalism has received its fullest and most complete development.—And it is probable, that it is to this phase of it, that Paul particularly alludes in his to Timothy. ii. Tim. iii. 1-5. But be this as it may, one thing is very certain, that Formalism is not now confined to the Catholics. It exists to a most alarming extent among all classes of Protestants. Indeed it would be difficult to give a more perfect description of modern Christendom, than the apostle has given in this short paragraph. These are certainly perilous times. There is also now a great amount of selfishness in the church, and covetousness. Many who profess to be the followers of Jesus, are "boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, dispersers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof."

But wherever Formalism exists, whether among Jews or Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants, it always proceeds from one and the same cause; it may always be traced back to one and the same source. It is, in all cases a compromise between conflicting principles; between the natural tendency of the soul to worship God, and the preternatural alienation of the heart from him. The fact is manifest, that mankind will worship something; and it is, moreover, just as manifest, that they will worship this real or imaginary divinity, whatever it may be, under some material form or through some material medium. Such is man's nature, and such is his history. But under the full blaze of Christianity, men are almost compelled to assent to the claims of its evidence. They concede that it is from God; and many are constrained to accept and to adopt its form of worship. But the misfortune is that in many cases, their hearts are not in it. Their spirits do not lay hold of it, and appropriate it as a means of union, communion, and fellowship with God, through Christ. Like the ancient Israelites, many of us are still prone to worship God with our lips, while our hearts are far from him. Isaiah xxix: 13, 14.

And hence it is evident that Formal-
ism, wherever found, is utterly worthless. We might as well attempt to satisfy the appetite, and to supply the wants of the body, with the mere pictures or shadows of bread and water, as to satisfy the desires of the soul with the empty forms and ceremonials of any system of religion. So teaches the Holy Bible. Isaiah i: 10–15. John iv: 24. So teaches all sound philosophy, and so teaches all human experience.

Indeed a merely formal profession of religion is always worse than useless. I know of no condition that is so much to be dreaded as that of the formalist, as that of the man who is nominally alive in the church, but who is really dead in spirit. O it is bad enough to go down into perdition under any circumstances; even amidst the errors and darkness of heathen superstition. But to hear the awful anathema, “Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire,” after we have been baptised into the sacred name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, after we have had our names inscribed on the rolls of the church, and been allowed to participate in all her rites and ordinances,—this, it seems to me, is the very consummation of human woe! O wretched state of deep despair, how can any one endure it!

The very thought of such a state seems to us dreadful and horrible in the extreme. But it is rendered doubly so, from the reflection that many of us will, in all probability, have to endure it, unless we amend our lives. My dear brother I ought not to conceal from you the conviction, that I fear for you, and that I fear for you my dear sister. Indeed I fear for myself. O, brethren, what a contrast there is between the cold and heartless formality of our lives, and the standard of piety and practical godliness that is required by the Holy Scriptures!

But let us not be discouraged. God our Father loves us and pities us: Christ, our elder Brother, has died for us, may more, he lives for us; and he has sent his Holy Spirit to comfort us, and to help our infirmities. We have, moreover, the blessed Bible to guide us. And all that is now necessary, and that is now required of us, is, that we give up our hearts to God; that we be united to Christ; that we believe in him, and love him and serve him with all our hearts, and with all our souls, and with all our strength, and with all our understanding.

Let us do this, and then all will be well. For, then, indeed we can say with Paul, that all things are ours, whether Paul, or Appollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are ours, and we are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s. Then, indeed, life with all its cares and labors will be but a pleasure to us; and death itself will be but a calm sleep, a state of sweet repose, from which we will finally wake up to partake of the joys, and honors, and pleasures of God’s everlasting kingdom. Then, there is rest for the weary soul; then, there is fulness of joy; and then, there are pleasures for evermore.

R. Milligan.

RELATION OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

I. Romans ii: 4, we find the following: “Or despisest the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance.” This passage, we have already introduced, to show that the goodness of God could not lead to repentance, unless men believed in the goodness of God. The goodness of God certainly did not lead any man to repentance, or to any other act of obedience, who did not believe. The passage, 2 Corinthians, xii: 21, sheds no light on the subject. The same is true of 2 Corinthians vii: 9. But the expression’ 2 Corinthians vii: 10, has a bearing on the
question, "For Godly sorrow worketh repentance not to be repented of.—We should be pleased to know how Godly sorrow worked repentance before faith or without faith! Who ever knew any man to have Godly sorrow sufficient to lead to repentance, or to work repentance, before faith, or without faith?

II. The remaining twelve passages, where we find metanoia, are all in Revelations, and shed no light on the question in hand. The remaining places where metanoia found is are 2 Timothy ii: 25; Hebrews vi: 1; verse 6; xii: 17; 2 Peter iii: 9, and shedding no additional light on our question. We have thus completed our induction of all that is said about repentance, in the New Testament, and find no instance of repentance actually occurring before faith, or where there was no faith. Instead of repentance, in the process of the sinner turning to God, as the regular rule, occurring before faith, we can find no instance of its existence at all before faith, or in any person who was not a believer. Let him controvert this who can.

III. We now proceed to notice Bro. Van Duke's essay, No.6, commencing on page 19 of his pamphlet. He says, "Because 'without faith it is impossible to please God,' it has been inferred, with much assurance, that faith is before repentance, or any other compliance with Divine requisition. The inference rests upon the hypothesis, that everything else is without faith, that is not preceded by faith; and it assumes, that faith alone,' is pleasing to God; for, if we can not please God by 'faith alone,' then, we can not please God without something else beside faith, and then the logic of the inference above, places that something else, whatever it may be, before faith; and how many things that logic will require us to conclude antecedent to all other things, is not requisite just now to enumerate." We suppose our worthy brother was aiming to express himself clearly and to remove all ambiguity. But had he been aiming to bury the argument in a bundle of words, we can not conceive how he could have been more successful. Let us try whether we can see through this bundle of mist.

1. Can any man fail to see that repentance before faith, is repentance without faith? Is not the inference correct then, that everything else is without faith; that is not preceded by faith? or, to express it forwards instead of backwards; is not every thing else without faith; that is before faith? If repentance is before faith, is it not without faith? If anything is self-evidently true, it is that repentance before faith, is repentance without faith. There is no such thing as covering this with a long parade of words. Any man can see it.

2. No one thing that sinful man can do is more pleasing to God than to repent. If he can do this before faith, or without faith, he can please God before faith, or without faith.

3. As to any sanction, or endorsement of that old veteran, "Faith alone," we do not see it, in any position we have taken. No faith can save, or justify, that does not lead to repentance, or indeed, to a full submission to the Savior. The faith alone pronounced, "dead," is not the faith preceding repentance, and leading to repentance, but the faith of the man maintaining that he can be saved by his faith without obedience to the Lord. The only evidence we know that faith is strong enough to save, or to be acceptable to God, is when it is strong enough to lead to repentance and full submission to Christ in everything. So long as faith remains alone the subject is not justified, but when it leads to a compliance with the gospel, the man is justified. No man can be justified by faith, so long as faith remains alone. The best faith in the world, and the faith by which man is justified, brings him to no justification, till it first brings him to repentance, confession and immersion. Still, a man can no more repent without the faith, or before he has it, than he can be immersed and pardoned before, or without faith. This position does not, therefore, "assume that 'faith alone' is pleasing to God." No faith pleases God
that does not move man to acts of obedience, and the faith that does move to acts of obedience, is not faith alone.

Bro. Van Dake admits that repentance cannot exist without faith, though he maintains that repentance precedes faith and causes it; yet, in point of time, there is no precedence. This is coming as near right as possible and not be right. There are but two errors in this:

1. That repentance is first.
2. That repentance is the cause of faith.

These are both errors in teaching, but cannot be in practice. No matter how long, how zealously and ably a man preaches that repentance precedes faith, he never can cause repentance, in a single instance, to occur before faith. In the same way, he may, till the day of his death, preach that repentance is the cause of faith, but he never can make it cause faith in a single instance. To invert cause and effect is a natural impossibility and one of the greatest absurdities.

At the close of Article No. 6, Bro. Van Dake blends faith and repentance together, making both the same thing. He says, "Repent,—repent of your disobedience to God,—your sin in rejecting Jesus Christ, whom he sent; change your mind from the rejection to the reception of the Messiah,—from unbelief to faith." What is it to "change your mind from the rejection to the reception of the Messiah—from unbelief to faith?" Is it anything more than simply to believe? Certainly not. Is that what the command to repent means? If it is, the command to repent, means believe, and the command to believe, is repent. This makes believe and repent the precise same thing. It is simply to change the mind from unbelief to faith, which is simply, when properly expressed, to believe. According to this, the expression, "Repent and believe the gospel," means "change your mind from unbelief to faith," which is simply to believe, and believe the gospel." This is jumbling and mixing, but certainly explaining nothing. It puts us in mind of the doctor, who was inquired of, what he did, with all kinds of remnants of medicine; when he replied, that he put them all together in one jar. The question was then put to him, what he did with this mixture of all kinds of medicine. He replied that he occasionally found a patient and could not tell what the ailment was. In a case of that kind, he said he used medicine from the jar containing all kinds, and he was certain to hit the disease. In the same way, Bro. Van Dake mixes faith and repentance till repentance is faith, and faith is repentance. His repentance is simply to change the mind from unbelief, to belief, which is to become a believer, or to believe. Seeing, then, that faith is repentance, and repentance is faith, we may easily understand Bro. Van Dake, when he says, "repentance and faith are inseparable," and maintains that the one cannot exist without the other. Certainly if to repent, is to "change from unbelief to faith," a man cannot believe before he repents, or repent before he believes, for then, to repent is to believe, and to believe is to repent. If there is anything intelligible in this we cannot understand it. But there is nothing in it. It is not true, however. No two things are more distinct in the New Testament than faith and repentance, in both Greek and English. The conviction of the mind, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, is faith, and not only faith, but the faith of the New Testament; and to call this repentance, is an utter disregard of the meaning of words. Repentance, to say the least of it, must contain a resolve to turn to God—to cease to do evil and learn to do well. This is not faith, nor the act of changing the mind from unbelief to belief, but a man is led to thus resolve by faith. Believing that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God—that all authority in heaven and earth is given to him, the man is ready to receive the command to "all men everywhere to repent."
HOW TO EVANGELIZE.

There are some egregious blunders committed in the attempt to evangelize the world and build up Churches. The first radical defect consists in the fact that we are too much inclined to despise humble instrumentalities, and leave untouched those small means which God in his providence has placed at our disposal. And in pursuance of this very transgression, in our attempt to exalt ourselves, God is abasing us. We have comparatively few Churches in large places. Our Missionary Boards have, at sundry times and in divers manners, made attempts at revolution in centers of power and influence. Preachers of acknowledged ability, and of commanding talents, and of brilliant powers, have been furnished those places. Abundance of means and money has been lavished upon our clerical genii to spur them on. The pulpit performance has been splendid. In their oratorical flights they have leaped to heaven and stormed down to hell. They have dipped, they have plunged, they have swooped. They have gravitated, they have oscillated, they have undulated. Coruscations flew up in all directions; scintillations were struck off at every gilded point. The preachers may have been prepossessing, it may be, attractive in style, graceful in manner, convincing in logic, and overwhelming in Scripture knowledge. But their long range overshot the gaping mass below. What were they firing at? Do you see in the haziness of the dim distance that long troop of "bulls and bears," stocks and dividends, rents and interest, wealth and aristocracy, fame and fashion? That's what's the matter. The gospel has been preached, but invested with so much of human drapery as to disfigure the very object sought to be made lovely and attractive.

At those meetings a sensation is produced; the meeting is a "success," the multitude have gone off wondering; the pageantry of the dissolving scenes has awed a few of the "baser sort" into obedience; the clerical genius leaves the pulpit, (not the people) and sails for another port; his dignified and prudential patrons of the higher sort steal back to their homes of comfort and congeniality, and in luxurious ease wonder what's the matter! The fact is that these big (sensation) meetings, in big places, by big preachers, are pitched at such a high key, that unless those sopranic preachers are continued right along, so as to play upon the silver cords of the golden hearts of the picked populace, every subsequent tune on the minor key, by minor men of the baritone, proves an inevitable failure. And suppose you get up a Church by these inflated means of artificial heat, a Church composed of picked men, you get up a carnal institution of "pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness," spiced off with just as much of the poor man's gospel as to give it the semblance of home and heaven.

But if you want to build a Church for the people permanently and profitably, in a large place or in a small place, send a working man there—one that moves in society and through the world, around all corners and at all points; one that speaks to every man, and labors for every man, gentle toward all men, and patient under all abuses; one that understands the logic of prepositions. My specific would be to choose a man with a large heart, of simple but cultivated manners, full of energy and fire, (not hell fire,) more remarkable for kindness of heart than for sparkling wit, and more admired for his geniality of temperament than idolized for his placid profundities. Place him right down among the people. Let him shove out to the extreme limit of fallen humanity, and make that the base of his operations, which in turn also will soon become the basis of supplies; and let him give the people the Bible, educate them, elevate them, free them by the truth of God, and spiritualize them; and by this means your missionary can wedge himself through every circle of society, until he reaches even the power behind the
throne. I would note here, in passing, that while it is an axiomatic truth that individual reformation is centrifugal—proceeding from the heart, it would seem that the reformation of the crude mass is centripetal—moving by concentric circles toward the heart. And this idea is further intensified and illustrated by the parable of the King's son who made a feast. The invitation was thrown out to the lords, then to merchants and stockholders, then to fashionable people and pleasure-seekers, and last of all to stragglers wandering among hedges and on the high-way. Here among the rustics the work of revolution began, and by gradual paces, counter-marched the same road, until it leaped into the very palace of Caesar himself. This walking out where there is plenty of room is what gives leverage to the Church. Archimedes, of ancient renown, boasted to his friends that if he could find space enough for a lever he could tilt over the earth. If the missionary will take the Bible for his lever, and the hearts of the people for his fulcrum, he will soon find ample space wherein to heave up the elements of the moral world and of the social fabric. Let this missionary make himself an example of good works, and fidelity, of self-denial and courage, and besides the conversion of the "baser sort," many of the "noble" born and bred will follow in the wake. The light of the sun descends to the lower earth before it is reflected, and blesses mankind in a material point of view. So too the light of the sun of righteousness must pass through a refracting medium, and descend to the lowest circles of society, before God will choose to reflect his image and bless mankind in a spiritual point of view.

I will tell you in advance what a true missionary man will do. He will get acquainted with the people, and bring himself down on a parallel with their understandings. He will notice all castes of society, as becomes an humble Christian gentleman. He will talk with the poor man in his round of daily toil; he will obtrude himself into the shops of mechanics and find business men there; he will preach small sermons upon the corners of the streets, and avoid all questions that gender strife; he will speak kind and gentle words to passing boys and girls, and make them the objects of his solicitude; he will carry food to the sick and suffering in the poor man's house, and point out to philanthropists the humble huts of the widows and fatherless; and delight to "strengthen the hands of the poor and needy"; and to lift up the desponding and give them assurance of a brighter day; and to inspire hope and courage in the fearful, and tell the timid they may be men; he will correct the erring, and rebuke the ungodly, and speaking the truth in love, will indicate the ways of peace and pardon, and weep with those who weep and mourn with those who mourn.

If, with all these indispensable powers and qualifications, he can weave in the graces and accomplishments of oratory, and embellish by a knowledge of science and history, so much the better. But he must know that after having delivered a thousand of the most diversified and brilliant discourses, he must still preach a thousand more little ones to people in their own little homes, and explain, and illustrate and enforce there, around the humble hearthstone, and find access to hearts, in a way and style, that with all his pulpit tactics and flourishes, he can never attain to on the public rostrum. Just at this point is where scores of preachers fail. They study books more than men; search into ancient lore more than into the hearts of the people; scan poetry more than the passing events of the day; visit palaces of arts oftener than the "cheerless hut of poverty;" seek the scenes of hilarity more than the bedsides of the sick and the dying.

Let our missionary boards sustain the kind of a missionary, already suggested, in one place, for one year, and, if within that time, he has moved society one peg from bigotry, prejudice and tradition, and his power has at all been felt, retain him another year. At the close of the second year you will note the visible fruits of his la-
bers, probably not large, but large enough to warrant the continuance of another year's toil and sacrifice. At the expiration of that time you may see a church, small it may be, but the nucleus of what may become, by culture and development, the radiating center of power and influence. We have labored hard, but with an ill-directed zeal. We have had spasms enough. Our efforts, it must be confessed, have been too spasmodic—too mercurial—too hurried and precipitate. To secure permanent good, requires a slow growth and a gradual development.

But as I have already dwelt upon this topic in a previous article, I will here to close for the present.  

JOHN F. ROWE.

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

THE CONVERTING POWER.

We have commenced a regular induction of all the passages containing accounts of conversions in the New Testament, after the reign of Christ was fully inaugurated, for the purpose of ascertaining precisely what the power was and how it was put forth, that converted the people, or turned them to the Lord in the time of the apostles. We have found that the act of turning, the people performed themselves. They were commanded to turn to the Lord. They turned to the Lord. But we are inquiring what that power was and how it was exercised that induced them to turn to the Lord. In our examinations, we had proceeded as far as the tenth chapter of Acts, and, in every instance, found the preacher and the gospel present, effective agencies, operating on the minds of the people, to induce them to turn to the Lord. But, in not a single instance, have we found an account of any direct power, or influence from heaven, of the Spirit, or of any other sort, exerted upon the heart, to turn the people to the Lord. Shall we, then, ascribe their turning to a power known to have been present and operating, as the preacher and the word, or to some power not known to have been present at all? We find an account of the preacher and the word always being present, but no account of any direct or immediate power, or influence, being present. Shall we ascribe their turning to an agency explicitly stated to have been present, or to an agency not said or known to have been present at all?

I. Acts xii: 24, we have the following: "But the word of God grew and multiplied." In this singular expression, the extension, spread and growth of the work of the Lord is ascribed to the word. The word occupied such a conspicuous place in the work of the Lord, that the word is said to grow and be multiplied, when, literally, the work had extended widely in the land. Where did the work ever grow, or extend, where the word of the Lord was not present?

II. Acts xiii: 48, we find the following: "And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as determined for eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region." How different this from an account of a modern "revival of religion!" Not a word in this truly evangelical account of the prosperity of the cause, of any "direct converting power," or "regeneration by the Holy Ghost." Not a word about "sending down converting power." But they "glorified the word of the Lord." They did not glorify the word of the Lord, by calling it a dead letter, or by denying that it contained power to convert a sinner, nor yet by declaring that they must have some direct power, or influence of the Spirit, to quicken the sinner, open his eyes and enable him to believe. Nor did they glorify the word of the Lord, by maintaining that it must be quickened by
some direct influence of the Spirit, before men could believe it. But when the Jews would not hear the word, but hardened their hearts and turned away their ears, thus showing themselves unworthy of eternal life, the Gentiles entreated the apostle that the words he had just uttered to them might be preached to them the next Sabbath day. Accordingly, the next Sabbath almost the whole city came together, to hear the word of God. Paul and Silas then became bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you, (the Jews) but seeing you have put it from you and thus decided yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. When the Gentiles heard this they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord, and as many as determined, or disposed themselves for eternal life, believed.

We invite the special attention of the reader to the prominence given to the word of the Lord, by the sacred historians and to the preaching of the word. The word was preached. The apostle says, It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken, and they glorified the word of the Lord. The only reason why "the word of the Lord" does not figure in the modern accounts of conversions, is that it does not thus figure in the conversions themselves. In many cases, the word of the Lord has nothing to do with the conversions. Hence they are not converted to the Lord, nor to the teaching of the apostles, but to systems not in existence for ages after Christianity was born. Where the word of the Lord is preached, "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both (Paul and Barnabas) into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the Greeks, believed." Verse 3rd, we find the following: "Long time, therefore, abode they, speaking boldly in the name of the Lord, who gave testimony to the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands." In this latter passage, we have the testimony which the Lord gave to His
word—the "signs and wonders" done by
the hands of the apostles. In the former
passage, the believing is ascribed to the
preaching, which is the same as ascribing
it to the word. Paul and Barnabas so
spake that a great multitude believed.
The believing is not ascribed to any direct
power, or influence, from heaven, quick-
ening the word, or hearers, but to the
speaking. They so spake that a great
multitude believed. Then, the historian
follows with an account of their speaking
boldly in the name of the Lord, and the
Lord bearing, witness to the word of his
grace.

In all these instances, we have the
presence of the preacher, the Holy Spirit
in the preacher, and the word, or the gos-
pel, spoken through the preacher. Or, to
set out the matter in full, God, in every
instance, spoke to them, through Christ,
by the apostles and the Holy Spirit in
them. The man, who believed the word
spoken, believed God, Christ, the Holy
Spirit and the apostles, through whom
the word was spoken, and the man who
rejected the word, rejected the apostles,
the Holy Spirit, Christ and God.

IV. The next account we have of Paul
and Barnabas, in their introduction into
Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and
to the region lying round about. The
historian sets out the power brought to
bear upon the people there, to turn them
to the Lord, in one brief line, as follows:
"And there they preached the gospel." See Acts xiv: 7. Here, also, a miracle
was done, in healing the man impotent in
his feet, which arrested the attention of
the people and gave Paul an opportunity
to preach to them, and for which they
renumerated him by stoning him till they
thought he was dead. The apostle, with
Barnabas, returned to Derbe, preached the
gospel to that city and taught many.
Whatever effect was produced, must be
ascribed to the power known to be pre-
sent, and to which a similar work is else-
where ascribed, not to an agency not
known to be present and to which a sim-
ilar work is not ascribed in the New Tes-
tament at all.

V. Acts xv: 7, we have the following:
"And when there had been much disput-
ing, Peter rose up, and said to them, Men
and brethren, you know how that a good
while ago God made choice among us,
that the Gentiles by mouth should hear
the word of the gospel, and believe." To
what is the believing ascribed in this
instance? It is certainly to hearing the
word. The means by which they were
made believers, was evidently the means
by which they were converted, or turned
to God. The word was preached to men
that they might believe. They believed
that which was stated in the word. The
power that induced them to turn was in
that which they believed. It was a
power that operated on their minds, their
understandings, that induced them to
turn. No matter how many providential
circumstances have operated, on any oc-
casion, to bring the people to hear the
word, to lead them to investigate, candid-
ly and honestly to consider the power
which induces a man to believe and turn
to the Lord, is put forth through the word.
Hence, with all the providences, most
favorable surroundings and affecting cir-
cumstances, where the word of the gospel
does not come, men do not believe and turn
to the Lord. No providences, direct power
or influence of the Spirit, or any means,
ever makes a believer, or turns one soul
to the Lord, where the word of the Lord
does not go. This is the reason why the
Lord sent the apostles to preach the gos-
pel to every creature, the reason why the
first disciples, when dispersed abroad
got everywhere preaching the word.
This is the reason why the word of the
Lord should be circulated by missionaries,
Bible societies, periodicals, tracts, books
and every other imaginable means
throughout the whole world. But if the
converting power, or influence, comes
directly from God, enters the human
heart, quickens man, makes him a be-
liever and turns him to the Lord, we
have no use for all these expensive instrumen
talities. We stand, therefore, on the only con-
istent missionary ground and must in the nature of the case be a missionary people.

FAITH AND INFIDELITY.—NO. III.

INDIFFERENTISM.

"Because sentence against an evil work is not
executed speedily, thereupon the heart of the sons of
men is fully set in them to do evil. Eccl. viii: 2.

There is in the natural world, or under the
physical government of God, a very
close connection between cause and effect;
between the transgression of a law, and the
infliction of the penalty that God has con-
nected with it, and that he has made con-
sequent upon it. No man can thrust his
hand into the fire, and not be burned in-
stantly. No one can project himself from
a lofty eminence, under the influence of
gravitation, without being at once dashed
into pieces.

But under the present administration of
God's moral government, the case is some-
what different. Here, the penalty is often,
in a great measure, suspended for a time.
And hence it is that the liar, the thief, the
profane swearer, and even the murderer,
may escape the full measure of their
desert, for weeks, and months, and years
together.

This is no doubt a most benevolent ar-
angement. Indeed it is the only arrange-
ment that is possible under our present
state of probation. God is now long-suffer-
ing; not being willing that any should perish, but that all should be brought to
reformation. But like every other Divine
blessing, this forbearance of God has been
miscostrued and misinterpreted by thou-
sands to their own ruin and condemnation.
Because sentence against their evil deeds is

not executed speedily, their hearts are fully
set in them to do evil. Some of them seem
to imagine that there is really no such
thing as a moral government over the
universe. They suppose that every thing
happens merely as a matter of chance or ac-
cident. Others seem to admit the existence
of God's moral government. But then they
allege, that its administration is altogether
uncertain and capricious. They seem to
think indeed that it is a matter purely
arbitrary with God, whether he should
punish any one; or whether he should per-
mit all transgressions of his law to pass with
impunity. Others, again, suppose that God
is so very kind, merciful and benevolent,
that he will surely make all his creatures
happy in some way.

The tendency of all such theories and
speculations is very obvious. Though dif-
fering much in their details, they all lead to
the same ruinous consequences. They all
serve to weaken, if not indeed to destroy
our sense of responsibility to God; and, of
course, to make us indifferent to the claims
of the Divine government.

This then is the second stage or form of
infidelity, to which I wish to call the atten-
tion of my readers. The first, as I ex-
plained it in my second article, is called
Formalism. It consists in a form of godli-
ness, without its power. But the species
of infidelity, now under consideration, has
neither the form nor the power of godliness.
It consists, as I have said, in the denial of
man's responsibility; and in the consequent
indifference which all who are under its in-
fuence show with respect to the claims of
the Divine government. And hence for the
sake of distinction, we shall call it Indif-
f erentism.

This is perhaps the most common form
and species of infidelity known in this
country. It is not like Formalism, con-
fined to professors of religion; nor like
Atheism, is it limited to non-professors.—
On the contrary, it pervades, more or less,
all classes of society. It is owing to its in-
fuence, for example, that many neglect the
command to search the Scriptures; to be-
lieve on the Lord Jesus Christ; to repent of their sins; to confess the name of Jesus; and to be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.—And it is for the same reason, viz: the influence of this species of infidelity on the soul, that a large number of those who enter the church, give no farther diligence to make their calling and their election sure. Most of this latter class of persons have no intention of rebelling against God. They never expect to hear the anathema, "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire." But for the reason assigned, they have become stupidly and alarmingly indifferent, with respect to the one thing needful.

In attempting then to expose the errors and sophistries of this species of practical infidelity, it may, I think, be fairly assumed that the Bible is the Word of God. This much is generally conceded by this class of skeptics. Their error consists not so much in denying the Divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, as in practically neglecting what is therein contained. Like the ancient Sadducees, they err in not understanding the Scriptures, nor the power of God. And hence it is, that their whole system, (if indeed views so vague, so heterogenous, and so discordant, can be called a system,) rests on a false assumption. They assume, contrary to all evidence, that the world is now in its natural and normal condition: that the Divine administration is the same now that it ever was, and that it ever will be. And hence they infer, that as many escape here the just reward of their deeds, so it is probable that many will in like manner escape it hereafter.

This assumption, however, is plainly in opposition to both the light of nature and the evidences of Divine Revelation. Conscience makes no separation between the crime and its just and merited punishment. And though this is often partially done under the present administration of God's moral government, the Bible assures us that it is owing entirely to God's forbearance and long-suffering toward mankind in their present state of probation; feeling anxious, as he does, that as many as possible should be brought to repentance. But the same authority also assures us, that the period of our probation is limited; and that at its close, all men will be strictly and impartially judged for the deeds done in the body: Romans ii: 1-16, so that every man shall finally have to give an account of himself to God. Romans xiv: 12.

And hence it follows that the connection between moral causes and their effects, in other parts of God's universe, may be as close and as intimate as the connection that exists between physical causes and their effects. And this would seem to be the case even in our own world, whenever our state of probation shall have ended.

But after all, the most convincing and satisfactory way, of settling this question, is by an appeal to the Divine administration itself. For although, as I have said, it has been somewhat modified by the circumstances of man's preternatural condition, there is nevertheless enough in it to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that all men are held responsible for every thought, and every word, and every action of their lives. And to this source of evidence, I therefore now respectfully invite the attention of my readers.

What then, let me ask, has God done for the punishment of transgressors? What has he done to suppress rebellion; to maintain the honor of his throne and the majesty of his government? What has he done by way of vindicating the rights of his subjects; and for the purpose of promoting peace, happiness and prosperity, throughout his vast dominions?

Or perhaps I should rather speak in the first place of what he has not done. And judging from his works and from his Word, I presume that my readers will all concede, that God has never inflicted any unnecessary pain or suffering on any of his creatures. A being, that has displayed so much benevolence in all the works of creation and providence, and that so loved even a rebellious world as to give his own Son for its redemption, would certainly inflict...
no unnecessary pain on any thing. And if so, it follows, that whatever penalties men or angels have endured, have resulted from a necessity as profound as the being of Jehovah, and as fixed as the throne of his holiness.

This, then, being conceded, as I presume it will be, by every thoughtful and reflecting person, I again ask, what has God done in the way of punishing transgressors of his law, and for the purpose of showing to the universe that his moral creatures are responsible to him for all their actions?

He has done much—very much; enough, one would think, to silence all vain speculators; and to secure the most perfect allegiance from every man who has an eye to see, an ear to hear, and a heart to understand the revelations of his will. He has cast angels out of Heaven and thrust them down to Hell. "The angels," says Jude, "who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgments of the great day." And all this, be it remembered, he has done from the necessities of his own nature and government; and with a full appreciation of all that these fallen seraphs will have to endure throughout the endless cycles of eternity.

How then, O impenitent sinner, do you expect to escape the righteous judgments of God? If God spared not an angel, a favourite angel, perhaps at that time or rather previous to that time, the archangel, why do you imagine, O rebellious man, that you will escape the execution of his just and righteous vengeance?

But perhaps Satan whispers to you that you are not an angel but a man: and that to man God has always shown peculiar favor; and therefore, that after all, you will not surely die.

If this is the ground of your hope, then let me remind you that this same archdeceiver made a similar suggestion to our first parents in Eden; and that that evil insinuation has deprived mankind of the pleasure of Paradise; that it has separated them from the Fountain of life and happiness; that it has infused the poison of sin into their whole constitution; that it has affected their body, soul and spirit, with ten thousand maladies; that it has laid one hundred and forty generations in the dust of death; that it has clothed the Earth with mourning, and cursed the very ground from which we seek our daily bread. And remember, moreover, that it has done all this, by simply inducing man to sin; by leading him to disobey his Maker; to eat

"Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe."

Now if one sin, and that too in the estimation of most skeptics, quite a venial sin, has done all this,—has brought all this ruin upon mankind, under the government and administration of a just, and righteous, and merciful God, then I ask, O sinner, what must be the legitimate and necessary consequences of all the sins that any one of us has committed, unless indeed they be washed away through the efficacy of that blood which alone can take away our sins! You that make a mock of sin; that speak of it as a light and trivial matter, go to the death-bed of the old, and of the young, and behold what sin has done. Go into the graveyards and cemeteries of Earth,—go among the skeletons and scattered fragments of the dead, and behold what sin has done. Lift up the curtain that separates Earth from Hades; the visible from the invisible; look upon the agonizing souls of the damned, and behold what sin has done.

But it may be said that much of this is the consequence of sin committed before the promise was made that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the Serpent; that we now, however, live under a dispensation of peculiar favor and mercy; and consequently, that we may still reasonably hope for some other way of escape than through the obedience that the Gospel requires.

If any of my readers are disposed to build on so uncertain a foundation, then let me refer you to the history of the deluge; to
the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and
the other cities of the plain. Let me refer
you to the history of God's chosen people;
to their punishment in the wilderness and
in Canaan; to their captivity in Assyria and
Babylon; to their subjugation by the
Romans; to the destruction of their city and
their temple; and to their captivity and op-
pression in all nations for the last eighteen
hundred years. Let me remind you of the
ruins of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Greece,
and Rome; and of the woes pronounced by
our benevolent Redeemer on those cities in
which most of his mighty works were done,
because they repented not. "Woe," said
he, "unto thee Chorasin; woe unto thee
Bethsaida; for if the mighty works which
have been done in you had been done in
Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented
long ago, in sackcloth and ashes. But I
say unto you it will be more tolerable for
Tyre and Sidon on the day of judgment
than for you. And thou, Capernaum,
which art exalted unto Heaven, shalt be
brought down to Hell. For if the mighty
works which have been done in thee, had
been done in Sodom, it would have remained
until this day. But I say unto you, that it
will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom
in the day of judgment than for you. Matt.

This does not sound much like universal
salvation. This is not a license to continue
in sin, because grace has abounded. But
it is a very plain illustration of a principle
that has ever been recognized and adopted
by all just governments, human and Divine:
that wherever much is given, there much
should also be required.

What, then, careless and impenitent sin-
er, will be your doom, when all men shall
be judged according to this principle for
the deeds done in the body? When the in-
habitants of Chorasin, Bethsaida, and
Capernaum, shall be banished with an ever-
lasting destruction from the presence of
the Lord, where will you stand. You have
enjoyed, it may be, the full evidence of our
Saviour's mission. You live under the
full-orbed glory of the Sun of Righteous-
ness. There is now no obstacle in the way
of your obedience; no enemy to terrify you;
no persecuting arm to bind you to the
stake. You have an open Bible; and in it,
you have all things pertaining to life and
godliness. What, then, must of necessity
be your portion if you neglect this great
salvation.

I acknowledge, with thankfulness, that
the Gospel is a dispensation of mercy; that
Jesus Christ has by the grace of God tasted
death for every man; that God has set him
forth as a propitiation for our sins to demon-
strate his righteousness in passing by the
sins committed, both before and after the
coming of the Messiah; and also to open up
a new and living way through which God's
mercy might freely flow to penitent sin-
ers.

But while the gift of Jesus Christ is the
fullest exhibition of God's love to the
world, it is also at the same time the very
highest demonstration of his justice, and of
the absolute inflexibility of that law which
would be satisfied with a sacrifice of no less
value. It presents to us a view of the
majesty, the purity, and the holiness of the
Divine government which has called forth
the admiration of angels. It enables us to
understand why it is that the heavens and
the earth should pass away, rather than
that one jot or one tittle of the law should
fail; and why it is that the Gospel is a savor
of life unto life, or of death unto death, to
all who hear it. And while it is said, that
Jesus Christ has become the author of
eternal salvation to all them that
obey him; we can now comprehend why the Spirit
should add that the same merciful Saviour
shall be revealed from Heaven, in flaming
fire, taking vengeance on them that do not
acknowledge God, and that obey not the
Gospel of his grace.

Better, then, O careless sinner, that you
had never been born; that you had never
heard of Jesus; that you had lived in some
dark recess of this sin-stained Earth, where
the light of the Sun of Righteousness has
never shone, than that you should live and
die in this land of Bibles, neglecting the
solemn warnings, admonitions, and precepts of the Gospel.

This, then, is a subject in which every man has a deep and abiding personal interest. It is a matter that concerns us all for time and for eternity. If it does not, like the known love of God, fill the soul directly with heavenly peace and holy joy, it may do so at least indirectly, by restraining us from the commission of many crimes, that might otherwise lead to our ruin. If it takes away all hope from the wilfully and pertinaciously disobedient; it, at the same time, gives to the humble, consistent, obedient followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, a pledge of safety and security that never could be enjoyed under a government that is carelessly and imperfectly administered. To all such, it is an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast.

R. MILLIGAN.

THE PURITANS DISCRIPION OF DR. ANTI-CHRIST.

The Puritans of England, in their reply to the Queen's Commissioners, say they considered the Romish hierarchy as a system of political and spiritual tyranny, that had justly forfeited the titles and privileges of a true Church; they looked upon its Pontiff as Anti-Christ, and its discipline as vain, superstitious, idolatrous and diametrically opposite to the injunctions of the gospel, and in consequence of this they renounced its communion, and regarded all approaches to its discipline and worship as highly dangerous to the cause of true religion. Mosheim, vol. 3, p. 291. By the testimony of all Protestants then the Pope is the Anti-Christ. John in the Revelation speaks of the Lamb's wife, not wives, but wife. For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife has made herself ready. xix: 7. Come hither, and I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. xxii: 9, 10. What party or sect in Christendom is the bride of Christ, the Lamb's wife? If we may believe all of them, is not our Savior a spiritual bigamist? Let us enumerate his wives or some of them. There is His wife. The Greek or Russian Church. There is the bride, the Lamb's wife, the Church, the Roman Catholic Church. There is His Armenian Church or wife in Asia. There is His Lutheran bride, the Lamb's wife. There are all His Protestant wives, His Episcopalian bride. The Church, His Presbyterian bride, His Methodist bride, and His Baptist wife. In what a ridiculous and abominable light does this place our Savior? Is he the husband of one of these wives?—Which is His Scriptural bride? Is he the husband of all these brides and many more? Which of all these brides answers to the Christian Congregation in Acts 2? Is he the husband of all these political establishments? Is not the capital mistake of these and all sects, the substitution of these meretricious sects for the congregation of Jesus Christ in the Acts and in the New Testament? They substitute their sects for the Church of Jesus Christ, exactly as the papists substitute the papacy for the Church of Christ. These Protestant brides of His are temporal, worldly and civil institutions, a strange mixture of things secular and religious, nearly as much so, as is His Roman Catholic bride. These ladies ought to settle it among themselves which is the Scriptural bride, the Lamb's wife. They must see how abominable it is to make our Savior the husband of all these religious ladies. One of our bards has described the above state of things in the following manner:

Inventions added in a fatal hour,
Human appendages of pomp and power,
Whatever shines in outward grandeur great,
I give it up—a creature of the state.
Wide of the church as hell from heaven is wide,
The blaze of riches and the glare of pride,
The vain desire to be entitled Lord,
The worldly kingdom, and the princely sword,
But should the bold, usurping spirit dare,
Some object in his countenance is

Peace to my faith and conscience to maintain,
Falsehood with truth confound, and wrong with right.
But should the bold, usurping spirit dare,
Some object in his countenance is

Shall I submit, and suffer it to reign?

If the gospel of Christ gave encouragement to such a state of things as this, who would reject all its pretensions, as a Divine scheme with indignation? What a pity men will not distinguish between the gospel of Christ and its abuses? Between the gospel itself and the additions that have been made to it by interested men.

Rome itself scarcely ever had a more bloody licentious and detestable head of the church than was Henry the Eighth, the Seeferated Pope of the Church of England our Saviour’s English bride. God who judges the earth will not look upon such abominations with indifference. Such things are indefensible and make one blush for such things to be called the Church of Christ. The following things are Anti-Christian.

1. Religious establishments.
2. All sects are Anti-Christian in their nature, origin and tendency.
3. The different orders of clergy are so many marks of the beast.
4. Creeds are Anti-Christian.
5. Images are Anti-Christian.
6. Infant baptism is Anti-Christian.

The leading characteristics of Anti-Christ are apostacy from the simplicity, the purity and the humility of the gospel. 2 Thessalonians ii: 3, 1 Timothy iv: 1-2. A second mark or feature of Anti-Christ is opposition to Christ, not open as though he denies Christ, but secret opposition; hence his apostacy is termed the mystery of iniquity or sin. A third feature which is strongly portrayed on his face is great pride, he exalts himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. 2 Thessalonians ii: 4. A fourth feature is his countenance is foul Idolatry, whence his seat is usually pointed out by the name of harlot and mother of harlots. 2 Thessalonians ii: 9. Revelation xiii: 13, 17 chapter. A fifth and strongly marked feature in his countenance is miracles and lying wonders. 2 Thessalonians ii: A sixth feature in his portrait and character is cruelty, violence, murders, massacres, persecutions, martyrdoms, butcheries. Lastly the number and mark of the beast is given by John, Revelation xiii: 16, 17. Apostasy can never be attributed to one who never acknowledged the true God. It is absurd, therefore, to attribute all these strange features to Simon Magnus, to Caligula, to Barchocab. Anti-Christ may, therefore, be regarded in his successive stages, as conceived from the days of the apostles. Satan was even then preparing his way. He was born and revealed in the year 606, under Boniface the third, as growing up to maturity from that period to the reign of Benedict IX. and Gregory VII.; from thence growing to manhood, flourishing in his prime and vigor to the period of the Lutheran Reformation. Boniface aspired with great eagerness to the title of Universal Bishop, which title Gregory I. had so abhorred as boldly to declare that he who calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Bishop, was in his pride the forerunner of Anti-Christ, and every one knows that Gregory VII., called Hildebrand or Hellbrand, reached such a pitch of audacity, as to say, that the Roman Pontiff alone use the imperial insignia; that all princes must kiss the feet of the Pope only; that it was lawful for him to depose kings; that his opinion ought not to be controverted by any one; that he could absolve the subjects of bad princes from their allegiance; and that the Roman Pontiff alone could justly claim the title of Universal Bishop. This was in the seventh century. He was then an impudent and brazenfaced youth. In my
youth I read in my father's library a work entitled the Trial of Anti-Christ by Mr. McGowan, a Baptist minister of London, author of the Dialogue of Devils. I should be glad to peruse this work, and if any brother can inform me where I can obtain a copy of it, I should be obliged to him for such information. It is a most instructive and valuable production. That was the only copy I ever saw and that was more than fifty years ago.—

Substitution and opposition are the two legs of Anti-Christ.

JACOB CREATH.

---

A PLEA FOR THE REFORMATION.

THE CONVERTING POWER.

In our previous article, in our regular induction of all the cases of conversion in the New Testament, we had proceeded to Acts xv: chapter. The next case, in course is Acts xvi: 13-15, the account of which reads as follows: “And on the Sabbath we went out of the city on a river side, where prayer was wont to be made, and we sat down and spake to the women who resorted there. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, who worshipped God, heard us, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended to the things that were spoken of Paul. And when she was immersed, and her household, she besought us, saying, If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there.” The reader will remember that we are passing through this examination, in search of the converting power, or the power the Lord exercises in turning men to God. The above passage has been quoted more frequently and relied upon more confidently to sustain the theory of abstract and direct converting power, than any other passage in the New Testament, and, therefore, demands more special attention.

What then was the influence, or power, brought to bear, in this case, to turn Lydia to the Lord?

I. The apostle was present, and his agency, or instrumentality was employed. That is a matter of undeniable fact.

II. The word of the Lord was spoken. This is also a matter of fact.

III. It is also a matter of fact, that Lydia heard what was spoken.

IV. This word of the Lord, which was spoken and heard, on this occasion, was the gospel, the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes. This is a truth that is undeniable.

V. It is stated, in the narrative, that the Lord opened Lydia’s heart, that she gave heed, or attended to the things that were spoken of Paul. There are several things to be observed in this item, as follows:

1. We are not told how the Lord opened the heart of Lydia. To say, then, that her heart was opened by an abstract or direct inference, is at best to assert a mere inference, which finds no support in the case.

2. The only result ascribed to the opening of her heart, was that she attended to the things spoken by Paul. The opening of her heart was not conversion, regeneration, or any thing of that kind, but simply disposing her to attend to the things that were spoken. The Lord has a vast variety of means by which He induces, or disposes, in His providence, persons to attend to the things spoken by His servants, without any direct or abstract influence of His Spirit. Thousands of instances occur, in His providence, that lead persons to attend to the preaching of the word, such as sickness, loss of friends, loss of property, distress, &c. Again, what we regard as mere accidents, or incidents, all in the providence of God, bring us unexpectedly in the range of the preaching, and cause us to attend to the things spoken, or to
the gospel, and a writer, without mentioning what incident, or circumstance, or even without knowing, ascribes it to the Lord, saying; that he opened the heart, that the person, or persons, attended to the word. In the time of miracles, the attention of many was arrested by miracles, so that they attended to the things that were spoken. But the miracles converted no one. They simply opened the hearts of the people, or disposed them to hear the gospel, the power of God unto salvation. So of sickness, the loss of friends, or any of the incidents, throwing us in the way of the gospel, causing us to hear, &c., they convert nobody, but bring us in the range of the gospel, the power of God, by which men are converted, turned to God. The power is not in the mere incident, or providence, that may have brought them in contact with the gospel, or opened their hearts to hear, or attend to the things spoken, but in the gospel. Hence, we read of words whereby a man and his house should be saved, of the washing of water by the word. We must, therefore, ascribe the conversion of Lydia to that which is stated to have been present, and elsewhere to be the power of God for salvation to every one that believes, and not a kind of influence not said, or known to have been present at all, or to have operated, especially when that is all based upon the simple statement, that "the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended to the things that were spoken by Paul." This very thing, which the Lord did, and concerning which we are not informed how he did it, resulted in attending to the things spoken, the gospel, or the word, and shows that if it be maintained that it was a direct operation, it did not dispense with hearing the word, but tended to it, and not to a conversion without the word, or independent of the word.

In connection with the passage here commented upon, the expression, "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase," 1 Cor. iii: 6, has often been quoted, to sustain the theory of abstract or direct, influence, or power, in converting men. But we think this a great mistake. The question is not whether God gives the increase. We all agree that, after the planting and watering, God gives the increase, or attends with his blessing. But the question is, does God ever give the increase, or attend with his blessing, where there has been no planting or watering? Is it not true, that God has never given the increase where there has been no planting or watering? Is it not true, that the word of God must always be planted in the hearts of men by human instrumentality, before God gives the increase, or attends with his blessing? Is it not infallibly certain, that when the word of God is faithfully preached and honestly believed and obeyed, that the blessing of God will attend? Did not Paul commence in the case of Lydia, with preaching the word? Was any one ever converted without the word? "I pray for them," says the Lord, "who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one."

The next case in order is that of the Phillipian jailor, Acts xvi: 25-34. In this case, we find the command to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and in order to this end, Paul and Silas proceeded to speak to him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house. Here we find the same influences present named all along, viz: The preacher and the word of the Lord, the gospel. Nothing is said of any direct or abstract influence or power, being present, or operating upon the jailor. Which is the more rational, to ascribe his turning to a power known to have been present and operating, or to some power not known to have been acting or present at all? That which is, in Scripture, declared to be the power of God to salvation, is said to have been present, and we must ascribe the work done to it and not to something to which a conversion is never ascribed in the Scriptures at all.
Acts xvii: 1-5, we have a brief account of the introduction of the gospel to the Thessalonians. It is said here that "Paul, as his manner was, went in to them and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." The result is there mentioned, in the following words: "And some of them believed and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." Here, as in all the previous cases, we have the preacher and the word, through which God operated upon the people to induce them to believe, and no account of any direct or abstract power. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them who believe." 1 Cor. i: 21. We are for the manner of operating which pleases God, and leaving spiritual doctors to their own way.

THE GOSPEL--A GRAND INDUCTION

The true mode of interpreting the Scriptures is the Baconian, "not to take for granted any thing that needs to be proved." No system of religion or any theory of the plan of salvation should be first adopted, and then proved. This was the Aristotelian system, which kept the world in ignorance from the day of its reception, down to the times of Lord Bacon; and its influence is still felt in all parts of Christendom. It is the foundation of the whole system of creedism, in all the ranks of the Protestant and Catholic communities.

The true system is to ascertain all the facts in the case, examine all the proofs, gather all the principles, and then from these premises draw your conclusions. This is the method pursued by the Inductive School, as applied to all the departments of natural science and to the arts, and which has led to such happy and satisfactory results. To adopt any other, only indicates the mind of an enthusiast instead of a lover of truth. This is the only method to be used in the study of the Scriptures, and is generally employed by the disciples and with the most happy results. We wish to illustrate and vindicate this rule.

For the want of this method, the huge and undigested systems of theology, so current in our day, have had their origin. Their falsity and folly will be shown by the application of the true system of induction. This, alone, will bring out in all its fair proportions and admirable symmetry, the teachings of the Savior and his apostles.

We lay it down as a law, which should prevail universally in the study of the Scriptures, "That all the connections of any given subject must be taken into the account before we can arrive at any safe and just conclusions in regard to it.

The lawyer, in examining any case brought before him, adopts this method before he can arrive at any conclusions in regard to it. However clear it may seem to his client and ready he may be to pass judgment in his own favor, the intelligent jurist requires time and an intimate acquaintance with all the facts in the case to understand it. This is not merely so with regard to subjects admitting of positive proof, but also those which depend on circumstantial evidence. The omission of any one fact, may prove fatal to his argument, and will break the chain of evidence, and destroy the whole fabric of reasoning, built upon his defective premises. Many a good cause has been lost from not attending to this, and many a culprit has escaped punishment from similar causes, by the adroitness of his advocate.

The physician adopts the same method.
in the investigation of disease, and in making out his diagnosis; any error on his part will prove fatal to his patient. He will confound one disease with another, by not observing all the symptoms; and the remedies applied will not be suitable to the condition of his patient, and may injure where he attempts to cure. Before he can reach any satisfactory conclusions, he must have all the symptoms of the malady before him, and his treatment must be regulated by them.

The chemist, in the prosecution of his work; does not neglect any of the conditions necessary to reach the results desired: A single base, or the use of a false one, or an undue use of the proper proportions, will produce results altogether different from what he wished. In experimental philosophy, mistakes are soon perceived and easily remedied. But it is not so in regard to moral science, as to the results are not perceived by the senses, and are more subtle and liable to deception; and, therefore requiring a more careful analysis and synthesis. And yet, strange to tell, men have been far more exact and diligent in the use of the means to reach the appropriate ends, in the former case, than in the latter; and the success has consequently been more satisfactory.

In the arts, the same plan has been adopted and, therefore, the extraordinary results, in all the mechanical trades, and the application of new and well ascertained principles to the different departments of human labor, in the perfection of machinery, and for the reduction of human labor. The Patent Office shows the amount of successful labor bestowed on this subject, and the vast accumulation of valuable materials, to the constantly increased contributions, made by the hand of genius.

In all the fields of labor and of human thought, in regard to the affairs of this life, the inductive system has been applied, with the most astonishing success, and nothing has quickened the energies of the human mind, to such an extent, or yielded such abundant fruits, as the knowledge and use of this great system.

The neglect of this law has been the fruitful source of innumerable evils to the cause of Christianity, and the proper knowledge and interpretation of the Scriptures. It has resulted in the formation of all the different and conflicting systems of theology, which exists in our day, or has given birth to the numerous creeds, which exercise such a baneful influence over the public mind.

It has also prevented that unity in the faith and worship, which is so essential to the peace, harmony and success of the Church of Christ, and on which depends the conversion of the world. It has been the fruitful cause of the abounding skepticism of the age. The opinion, obtains to a large extent, that the Bible is responsible for the adverse and contradictory opinions found in the different denominations in Christendom, and the deduction is certain, that if so, then, it cannot have come from God, as essential unity in all his thoughts, purposes and plans must be regarded as an ultimate truth. The evil from this source is incalculable, and the only remedy is to be found in reducing the great principles of Christian teaching to their own true and divine standard; and this can only be done by a clear and comprehensive understanding of all that the Bible teaches on every given subject, which it presents to the reader.

The Bible is a book of facts containing great principles. The things said and done on the part of God and man constitute its materiel.

Calvinism, Armenianism, Unitarianism, Materialism and Universalism, and indeed all other isms have grown out of the neglect of this rule, to which we have referred, or from a partial recognition and use of it. A few passages of Scripture without regard to the subject and context, in which God is said to choose us
from the beginning, have been received as the basis of one system, while the working out our salvation and "free will," have laid the foundation for the other. Certain passages, which speak of the Messiah as the Son of Mary, the Son of Man and His death as a witness for the truth, constitute the third, and the dead, knowing nothing, and dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return, a fourth; and God's love to the world, His irresistible power, and the universality of His will, are sufficient for the last, and thus in the entire circle of denominationalism a few salient points, without regard to their connection and meaning, and the rejection of any thing that seems to militate against the favorite theory, churches have been formed and bodies of divinity (soulless) have been built up, which, by the faithful application of the law of induction, would fall to the ground, as a house built upon the sand when the shock of the tempest falls upon it.

JAMES CHALLEN.

FAITH AND INFIDELITY—NO. 4.

SPIRITUALISM.

It is a fact generally conceded by students of nature, that God has given to all animals inferior to man a perfect guide. They have all in the gift of instinct, a perfect rule of action. Under the influence of this mysterious principle, every species perfectly fulfills the object of its existence. Thus, for example, the bee constructs its comb, and distills its honey, with a degree of accuracy, that baffles the skill of the most profound mathematician and the most skillful chemist. And just so it is with most other species of animals, whether living on earth, in air, or in water. They all work with the most perfect accuracy in accomplishing the object for which they were created.

But to man God has given no such natural powers or faculties. The infant is the most helpless and dependent creature on earth. It learns everything by the slow process of experience; and even as it grows up to manhood, it is wont to commit the most serious blunders and mistakes in the gravest, as well as in the most common concerns of life. Thus, for instance, while all bees are laboring incessantly towards one and the same end, one man is pursuing wealth as his chief good; another is seeking after power; another, after political or military distinction; another, after knowledge; and a few only are earnestly striving to attain to celestial honor, and glory, and immortality.

The reason of this distinction between man and the inferior animals, has long been a question with naturalists. But it is a question to which the natural man has never given a satisfactory answer; though it is a subject of which he has often sorely complained. The elder Pliny, after contemplating and examining this subject as far as the light of nature and philosophy could carry him, concludes his reflections in the following melancholy strain: "A being," says he, "full of contradictions, man is the most wretched of creatures; since the other creatures have no wants transcending the bounds of their nature. Man is full of desires and wants that reach to infinity; and which can never be satisfied. His nature is a lie, uniting the greatest poverty with the greatest pride. Among these so great evils, the best thing that God has bestowed on man is the power to take his own life."

The light of divine revelation is therefore necessary to the solution of this problem. With its aid, all is plain, clear and satisfactory. In it we are taught that God designed that he himself should be man's guide; and that for this purpose, and with this view, he formed him after his own image, and after his own likeness. And for a time, it seems that he admitted him into his own immediate presence, and spoke to
him with all the kindness, and love, and fami-
larity of a father. That was the golden age of humanity, when God conducted Adam and his lovely bride through the green pastures of Eden, and led them beside its still waters.

But sin soon broke off this happy union. It very soon interrupted the familiar and agreeable intercourse that originally existed between man and his Creator. God no longer conversed with him, face to face, as friend to friend. He very justly and very benevolently withdrew his presence from erring man. But even then he did not leave mankind without a guide. He gave us the Bible—the Holy Bible—to lead and direct us in the way of holiness; till re-admitted into the presence of our God, we shall see as we are seen, and know even as also we are known.

Happy, then, is the man that makes the Bible the guide of his life. It has already conducted millions of our race within the vail, whither the forerunner has for us entered, even Jesus who is made a High Priest forever, after the order of Melchizedeck.—And, guided by its precepts, many others are still on their way to glory. Wherever its influence is felt, like the river of God, it gives life and health to every thing. Blessed flowers do spring where'er it flows, and deserts blossom as the rose.—How glorious, then, and how delightful, would be the effects and consequences, if all men would take the Bible as the guide of their lives. How soon would enmity be removed from the human heart; how soon would man be reconciled to his Maker, and peace and good-will abound among all the tribes and families of this sin-stained earth.

But poor, weak, fallen man has ever been prone to seek a guide of his own. Deceived by his disordered affections, his blinded reason, and many false analogies, he has always been inclined to follow the instincts of his own perverse nature as the guide of his life. This is the rule that was generally adopted by the ancient philosophers; and it is the same rule that is now followed by the modern Spiritualists. This class of religious sophists maintain that every man has a guide of life within himself; a guide that is as unerring in its object, as is the instinct of any species of animals; a religious guide, by means of which the mind takes as direct cognizance of God, and of our relations, duties, and obligations to him, as it takes of things material through the medium of the senses.

This is the fundamental and characteristic doctrine of the Parker school in America, and of the Newman school in England. It is also held by many of the so-called philosophers of France and Germany. The power or faculty of which they thus speak, is variously designated as the Reason, the Pure Reason, the Intuitive Faculty, &c.—But by whatever name they may see fit to call it, they all agree with Theodore Parker, that its office is to give us direct knowledge of all that is essential in religion. They maintain that Christianity proper, or religion absolute, consists in a system of spiritual philosophy founded in the nature of things; and that the mind perceives it intuitively, just as it perceives color by means of the eye; and sound, through the medium of the ear.

The absurd consequences of this theory are very obvious. If all true religion is but a system of spiritual philosophy, founded in the nature of things; and if this is really perceived and enjoyed by all men simply through the exercise of Reason or the Intuitive Faculty; then, of course, it follows that we need neither a Bible nor a Redeemer: And this indeed is the avowed creed of the most distinguished advocates of modern Spiritualism. Theodore Parker, in his Discourse on Religion, says: "Our theology," meaning Christianity as it is taught in most modern churches, "has two great idols—the BIBLE and CHRIST." These Mr. Parker and his colleagues would cast to the moles and to the bats, just as they would cast aside the carved images of pagan worship. And with them they would, of course, reject as old wives' fables, all that is taught in the Bible respecting the fall of man; the
incarnation of Christ; his atonement for sin; his resurrection from the dead; his ascension into heaven; and his glorious reign over all the created powers and principalities of the entire universe. This is the religion of many of the self-styled philosophers of England, as well as of continental Europe. And this is one of the boasted reforms that are now spreading like a moral pestilence over our own once prosperous and happy country.

To refute all the errors of this pretended scheme of philosophy within the narrow limits of one short article, is of course, practically impossible. To do this would require the space and labors of at least a very respectable octavo. But to attempt this would only be a work of supererogation.

It would be giving far more time and attention to the system than it really merits. And I will, therefore, for the present at least, confine my remarks to a single point. I mean the very bald and naked hypothesis or assumption on which the whole system rests. Remove this, and the scheme falls like the baseless fabric of a vision.

How, then, let me ask, does Mr. Parker know that there is no difference, except in words, between Natural and Revealed religion? How does he know that there is a natural supply for all our spiritual and corporeal wants? How does he know that there is a natural connection between God and the soul, just as there is between light and the eye; between sound and the ear; between food and the palate; between truth and the intellect; and between beauty and the imagination? How did Mr. Parker make this great discovery? Was it by means of this Intuitive Faculty, which he says is possessed by all men? If so, then why do not all men make the same discovery? Why do men differ so much in their views of God, and of their relations, duties and obligations to him? They do not so differ in their views of color, sound, taste, touch and odors. All the world will say, with Messrs. Parker, Newman, and Mackay, that the sky is blue; that grass is green; and that flowers are variegated. But not one in a thousand, or even in ten thousand, will agree with them in their religious philosophy. Why is this? If there is but one absolute religion, and all men are able to perceive it naturally and intuitively, then, I ask, why do men entertain so very different views concerning it? Why does the Atheist, for example, say, There is no God? Why did the ancient Hebrews worship but one; the Persians, two; and the Greeks, thirty thousand? Surely there must be something wrong in this hypothesis. A theory that is opposed to the experience of all mankind must be false. And such a theory is modern Spiritualism.

But our objections to Mr. Parker's theory of religion do not rest wholly on observation. It is as much opposed to the consciousness of mankind, as it is to their experience. How many, for instance, will acknowledge that they are conscious of having such a faculty as that described by Mr. Parker? and of having such a knowledge of divine things through it, as his theory implies? We are all conscious that we have the faculties of seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting, smelling, judging, reasoning, and willing. Or, to speak more accurately, we are conscious of those states of mind that necessarily imply the existence and exercise of these faculties. But how many will acknowledge that they are conscious, either directly or indirectly, of possessing a faculty by means of which they intuitively know God, and the absolute or only true system of religion? None, I apprehend, but a few visionary fanatics, whose minds the god of this world has blinded, lest the light of the glorious gospel of the grace of God should shine into them.

Ah, no; these are not the matters of which we are conscious. We are all conscious that we are sinners; and that we need to be pardoned. But how to attain to the blessed state of that man whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered—this is a question that no powers of the human mind, unassisted by Revelation, have ever yet answered. It is the Bible, fully authenticated by many infallible proofs,
that reveals God to man, and man to himself. It is the Bible that teaches us that God so loved the world, even when it was dead in trespasses and in sins, that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. It is the Bible that makes known to us God’s plan of enlightening, justifying, sanctifying, and redeeming our poor fallen race; of making us holy here, and everlastingly happy hereafter.

Let us all, then, beware lest any man spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. Let us cling to our Bibles, as the wisdom of God and the power of God, through Christ. They will guide us like a pillar of cloud by day, and like a pillar of fire by night, till, having crossed the Jordan, we shall enter that blessed land, where we shall see as we are seen; and where we shall know even as also we are known. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may may enter in through the gates into the city."

R. MILLIGAN.

REFLECTIONS AT MIDNIGHT.

A NEW YEAR'S OFFERING.

BY W. T. MOORE.

I sit on meditation's dreamy couch,
Listening to the night wind's wail, which breaks
And ruffles up the quiet breast of night,
Which otherwise seems wrapt in silent dreams.
I'm thinking of the year that's gone. And, as
That cold, gray light streams through my window pane,
And seems to chill the cheer of light it brings
With freezing wavelets from the boreal climes—
I ask my soul this truth: Was not the year,
Which now sleeps in the tomb of ages past,
Mixed half with bright and cheerful rays of hope,
And the cold darkness of despair? Each heart
That's felt the trembling discords of death
Pass o'er the sweeter strains of music, in
The soul's grand oratorio of life,
Knows well how much of truth I speak.

How calm
And beautiful is Nature's sleep! Yet time
Moves on, nor stops, nor stays for aught. All round
I hear the moments creep with stealthy tread,
As on the mournful, silent past they lift
Their fairy foot, while back the echo comes:
Gone from the earth forever. But oh! how strange,
And yet how true: these moments all have felt
The soft impress of life in passing by,
And on their fragile forms a picture deep
Is made—o actions true or false, for weal
Or woe, in that great day when God shall judge
The sons of men, and give to all a place
According as their works have been. 'Tis true,
These moments, now in crystal form, will then
Appear as jewels in the starry crown
Of him, to whom is said: "Well done, thou good
And faithful child of God!" But oh! what dark
And gloomy spectres will arise from out
The dismal Oortens of the past, to him
Who hears the awful doom: "Depart; I know
You not."

Every moment, then, while trembling
In that midway poise, which holds the future
And the past, should feel the light of holy
Virtue on it fall, reflected from the great
And noble acts of lives well spent.

We say
That years are many days well measured off;
That life comes up within these years, and fills
A space in time, and, therefore, time is life.
If truth does speak in that, then her own voice
Truth does not hear. Else must not life with time
Lie down to sleep, and rise no more? But who
Does not within his own soul feel the weight
Of life immortal pressing on the outward
Edge of finite being? Who does not sit
And listen to the hymn of consciousness,
Which from the darkest hour of death rings out
The clear, sweet notes: We live—life can not die!
But life as measured here, by time, is short
Indeed. What is a year? 'Tis but a breath
Of weary life breathed from the heart of vast
Eternity. Our mortal state is but
An ebbing wave rolled from the tide of time.
I stand between the future and the past,
And try to estimate the worth of both.
One, in history, points to tears and blood,
And shows a rent in human faith, which God's
Own word can scarcely keep, o'en hope itself.
From falling through. The page of prophecy
Thro's a light upon the other, and hangs
The lovely robes of white, which saints shall wear,
So high above the world, now dressed in black,
No matter how the storm may beat and blow
Against the onward rush of better days,
We feel like God will keep them there, unbonched,
Unstained by mortal strife. And when the day,
For which all other days were made, shall come;
When time shall be no more; the past, with all
Its dark background of woe, will make our robes
But whiter still; our joy the more complete.
For every tear will show the place it washed,
And every pain will make a sad, sweet note
Within our song, which none but suffering souls
Can ever reach; for none know how these notes
To make, but those who learn in bitter grief.
Future and past words of immortal fame
How can the finite mind reach to thy length?
I'll not attempt a task so sure to fail;
But in the light of compromise, (which seems
The light of heaven,) I'll take the ends of each,
And welding them together, make the hour
Which now is passing by, and meekly strive
To use it so that God will say, "Thou good
And faithful servant, just and true,
Well done."
But as I lay one hand upon the head—
The hoary head of trembling by-gone years;
And feel the other pressing close the warm,
Bright cheek of coming days, all full of life;
I think my heart is quickened by the thought,
That light comes out of darkness deep, and youth
Is always tripping close within the shades
That age throws back upon her mournful path.
And as I thus hold on to each, in prayer
And praise, I alternate my soul's deep love
To Him, who in the present
doth keep
My fitful, wayward life half reconciled
To hope and fear. While thus my ardent soul
Does homage to its parent and its love,
There come bright gleams of light from future years
That deck the dim horizon with the rays
Of life beyond the tomb. And then I think
I catch the perfumes sweet of flow'ry fields,
Beyond the swelling flood, as, floating on
The wings of faith, they come from new born life,
Where resurrection morn unveils the past.
Now let me, in this reverential mood,
Close up the page on which my musings look;
And, shutting Nature down beneath the doors
Which night has thus far kindly left ajar,
I'll wait for that great day when present, past
And future joys shall be complete in Him.

FRANKFORT, KY., Dec. 31, 1862.

The difference between true and false repentance, is as great, as that between the running of water in the paths after a violent shower, and the streams which flow from a living fountain. A false repentance has grief of mind, and humiliation, only for great and glorious offences; or until it supposes pardon for them obtained: true repentance is a continued war against sin, a permanent, inward shame for its defilements, until death sounds the retreat.—Vann.
"Go to the grave thou dying year," said an old man once, with intensity of feeling. His career had been marked with severe misfortunes, yet they had not driven him to the good man's refuge—to the "sure retreat"—and at the last hour of that expiring year, a faded remnant of an entombed generation, he stood forth with the blighting stamp of unbelief upon his soul. Said he, "I believe not in the popular dogmas of these latter days, which not only make men fools, but keep them so; away with the idle tale of dying to live again; 'tis a mere phantom of the imagination."

"But," continued he, with deep emotion, "I feel strangely sad to-night; it is the last of the old year; I can but dwell upon the sunny spots once upon life's landscape, and the rough places in my journey through this world. In my days of romance I used to spend this evening with a lovely, bright-eyed, mirthful maid; but a rolling wave of life dashed her forever from my view, and to-night I can but recall her voice, her eye, her form! Heavy and severe disasters fell upon my riper manhood, turning the future into a gloomy and unpromising wilderness, and I feel it bitterly at such a time as this. It may be I shall not live to see the close of many succeeding years, for I am an old man. I have seen all who shared my blood or owned my affections, fall to the ground like dead leaves in autumn, and all I can do is to call their dead shadows around me. I wish myself a shadow." Then, with a deep sigh, resting upon his staff, he exclaimed, in the language we have quoted, "To the grave, thou dying year."

These were the musings of one professedly an unbeliever. But why this ebullition of the most painful feelings in connection with time's unceasing flight? Ah! the mysterious tenant, enshrined in clay, gave indubitable evidence of its origin, and its power to endure when time and death are dead. If immortal, then accountable; the annual expiration of his rolling years gave him eloquent assurance that he was hastening to the retributions of eternity. In spite of all his boasted powers of skeptical reasoning, these fearful truths, unbidden, riveted upon his soul. Miserable indeed the condition, and cheerless the prospects of that individual, who, at the close of 1862—above the middle of the nineteenth century—is seeking to demonstrate the falsity of the gospel! Equally misguided and misjudging are those who yield a theoretical assent to the grand principles of revealed religion, and remain practical unbelievers. If the changeless bliss of the unseen world is bartered away for the pagentries of earth, it is a voluntary relinquishment; the quitting all that an "everlasting heaven" means, for "empty shadows."

"Spend this evening with me," said a young lady once to her friend; "it is the last evening of the old year; will you spend it with me, Alice?"

"Ah!" said she, "I fear your conversation will be too grave, it is a serious evening, the most horror-stricken of the whole year; to-morrow night I can banish gloomy thoughts at Mrs. G.'s, where all will be gaiety; to-night I have no such resource; and if you will promise not to be sad, and will moralize little, I will come."

Her friend smiled, and she hastened away. Alice and Mary were play-mates in childhood, and friends in youth. Once they were alike volatile and unreflecting; but Mary, becoming concerned about her salvation, was determined to seek pardon of God at her earliest opportunity. Accordingly, she paid a visit to Bro. L., an excellent preacher, who was then holding a meeting at the place where Mary lived; she disclosed to him her feelings, and wished to know if he could do anything for her. The man of God told her to go home and read the Acts of the Apostles, carefully and prayerfully, and attend church at night. That evening she listened with undivided attention to an able discourse on the text, "What shall I do to be saved?" And "hearing," she believed and was baptized, thus turning her feet unto the testimonies of the Lord, while she gave indisputable evidence to all, that heaven was her fixed resolve.

She had said very little to Alice on the
subject, save by the preaching of example, which had not failed to have its influence, though not acknowledged either by words or actions. But the last evening of the old year, Mary thought peculiarly favorable for a conversation with her friend; and with this in view, she said: "Alice, spend this evening with me."

Evening came, and the two were side by side, sitting by a cheerful fire in Mary's own apartment. Alice felt solemn, she knew not why; but solemn as she felt, she determined to prevent a serious turn to conversation during the evening. Hours passed away; she had as yet been but too successful. At length, said Mary, glancing at the time-piece, "One hour more, Alice, and we enter upon a new year. How many such seasons have we passed together," she continued; "but never one before with different views and feelings." She then spoke of the change as affecting herself, faithfully expostulating and entreating her friend to turn away from the fascinating circles of fashion and amusement, in which she so often mingled, and go more frequently to the house of God, and by a candid investigation of truth, seek to bring her feelings and her judgment to bear upon the important point, viz.: a preparation to meet God. Alice sought in vain to conceal her emotion; she perfectly accorded with her friend in sentiment, but, said she:

"I have five successive years, upon this very evening, resolved amendment. I dare not to-night, lest I add another broken promise to my list of offenses."

Mary became more urgent, referred her to a very near friend, who, during the past year, with prospects of long life and happiness before her, had been called suddenly to the companionship of the worm; said she:

"You are not more secure than our lamented Viola. Then why do you thus obstinately war against your own interests? The world has no resources from which you can draw one ray of comfort in time of distress. Its pretentions to its votaries are fair but false. You know it, Alice. Al-

ready have you grasped its visions of delight, and found them but receding phantoms. Why then cling to such a feeble prop? Promise me now that you will do so no more. Before the storm gathers thick and dark, O, Alice! turn to God! Good night."

Alone in her chamber, Alice sought relief in tears. Morning came, and from a sleepless pillow, she arose to receive the salutations of the new year; her heart was troubled; ah! it was the workings of the eternal and all-powerful truth, spoken by Mary, that caused so much concern and unrest.

The above cases, of the old man, and the two young lady friends, are merely hypothetical, it is true, yet, they serve to elucidate, and convey an excellent moral. And let me ask, how many have made the noble resolve to-night, that Alice made, and repeated for five successive years? Alas! many more, I fear, than will keep that resolve until 1863 shall have "rolled its ample rounds." And alas! alas! many more are there, who will pass out of the old year into the new, without a solitary serious thought, either of the past or of the future. Why will they not reflect? Look! Listen! Though the earth rings hollow beneath their every tread, they will stride on, in their usual non-chalant way, as if no danger threatened them!

Time is flying, friendly sinner, and heaven is inviting; death will soon urge his claim; and though the pathway from the cradle to the tomb is one of vicissitude, beyond the confines of that dark repository, change is unknown. O! the solemnity of this thought. 'Tis not the phantom of a night-vision; it is gospel truth—"He that is holy, let him be holy still; he that is filthy, let him be filthy still."

Since the close of last year, how many glowing prospects have been overcast by misfortune and sorrow! Cruel have been the triumphs of the fatal messenger, and mournful the parting of friend with friend; the family prop has been moved, the mother has been taken from a group of children...
too young to feel the force of their bereavement; the child has perished in the dawn of its existence; youth and beauty have been deprived of their charms; they of the sparkling eye and ruddy lip, have found a lodgment in the cold earth, with dust and corruption for covering.

"Tell our gay triflers, there is no such thing as a trifle upon earth. Can any thing be a trifle that has an effect eternal? Every moment is immortal. Every moment shall return and lay its every thought, its every whisper, before the throne of Him who sent it to man on that commission, and commands it back at the stated period, to make its report, to be registered in eternity, for the perusal of angels, and the justification of their King!"

It is not improbable this solemn evening may be the turning point in the moral history of thousands. The knell of time sounds in their ears its impressive admonitions; and by the awakening influence of God's Holy Spirit, through his inspired word, they are made to feel that the decisions of to-night may settle the question—eternal life or eternal death? Some will cast themselves, as weary sinners, into the arms of everlasting Love, others will turn away their hearts, banish their reasonable fears, and to-morrow night repair to festive scenes, to the sparkling wine cup, or thread the merry dance, at the sound of the harp and the viol; and thus the time that should have been devoted to higher, purer and holier purposes, will be consumed, as Wordsworth expresses it—

"In dressing for conquests, and flirting withal."

Reader! where art thou, immortal as thou art? Dost thou yet linger in the flowery paths of ruin? Knowest thou not that it is at the peril of all thine interests? The voice of that beseeching visitor, against whom thou hast so often steeled thine heart, thou mayest hear no more, until he says to thee, "Because I have called and you refused, when your fear cometh as a desolation, and your destruction as a whirlwind, then shall you call upon me, but I will not answer!"

To the Christian, especially, is this evening of solemn interest. He looks back upon the past year, and upon his past life; with the inspired patriarch he is ready to exclaim, "My days are swifter than a post." He views in retrospect the unmerited loving-kindness of his God, who has been "gracious, slow to anger and plentiful in mercy." When he recounts his wandering, wayward steps, his feeble exertions in the cause of his divine Master, he cries out from the fullness of his soul, "It is of the Lord's mercies that I have not been consumed." In the strength of Jesus, he resolves to arm himself with an invincible armor, and maintain the contest until sin is dethroned, and "faith is turned to sight, and God is all in all."

And upon an occasion like this, the humble, faithful and devoted minister of God's Holy Word, with reminiscences of alternate pleasure and pain, reviews his efforts to subserve the interests of his divine Lord. He goes back, in vision, to the endearments of home and youth; recalls the loved ones, now no more, from whom, with bitter feelings, he tore himself away, saying; "I have laid myself upon the altar; henceforth, with the world in my rear, I must gather sheaves for the bundle of eternal life." Since that eventful period, deep and frequent have been his conflicts; innumerable discouragements have encompassed him about; but beating winds and swelling surges have only driven him nearer the immovable Rock of his help! His soul has been cheered with "visitations sweet," while he carries the testimony of an approving conscience that he has not "shunned to declare the whole counsel of God." Has he been successful? he lays his trophies at the feet of his adorable King. The world may have whispered to him of wealth, fame, personal ease and comfort, but the language of his heart is, to-night, "Had I a mind that could grasp truth like a Newton, and make an appeal powerful and effective as that of Cicero, when he drove Catiline from the Senate and made Caesar tremble, I would rather be privileged of God to bear the tidings of mercy
to a lost world, find my death-couch in
some lonely hut, on a barbarous shore,
without a kindly hand to fan the fever of
my brow, than with regal honors to yield
up my breath beneath a canopy of gold!"—
The misery and wants of a revoluted world
press heavily upon his soul, and he nerves
himself afresh, inspired with a holier zeal,
to execute the great commission, "Go into
all the world and preach my gospel." He
takes a general survey of the church in her
extensive range of action. Some of her
lights have been extinguished; her day of
conflict approaches; but the "Lord of hosts
is with her—the God of Jacob is her ref-
uge." In spite of the combined powers of
earth and hell, the car of her triumph rolls
onward, from "conquering to conquer." A
few more determined struggles, and the
voice of a great multitude shall go forth as
the voice of many waters, and the voice of
mighty thunderings, saying, "Alleluia, for
the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!"
And who that is privileged with life and
reason, at the commencement of a new
year, but will bring their offerings to his
blessed shrine? Its inscriptions are, "Peace
on earth; good will to men." What have
been our efforts during the past year for the
universal diffusion of these gracious tokens?
What has been our example toward those
whom we influence for eternity? In this
region of moral derangement, from a com-
mong origin, alike we must bow to the irre-
vocable destiny, "Ashes to ashes, and dust
to dust." Sorrow and decay attend us in
our course, but the Christian religion meets
us with her cup of blessings. The specula-
ting sophist, when anxious days come on,
and the grave shuts in upon his sources of
hope and joy, can but invoke their departed
shades, and wish himself a shadow. But
Christianity, with unerring finger, points
her votaries to light beyond.

"My years roll on; but here's my hope
And this my everlasting prop:
Though seasons change, and I change, too,
My God's the same; forever true!
My years roll on; my soul, be still;
Guided by love, thy course fulfill.
And, when life's anxious voyage is past,
My refuge be with Christ at last!"

C. J. KIMBAL.

FAITH AND INFIDELITY.—NO. V.

NATURALISM.

Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy
and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the
movements of the world, and not after Christ. Col.
ii. 8.

It is very obvious, that in the creation of
the universe, God has established certain laws
for its regulation and its government. Every
creature, whether in heaven or on earth,
whether material or immaterial, has been
made subject to law. Thus, for instance, the
little seed as it is developed into the vine,
or the oak, or the cedar, does not grow up
at random, without form and proportion.—
Nay verily. Its entire development, from
its first buddings to the ripening of its fruit,
is in harmony with the most exact, definite
and unchangeable laws. The size of the
flower, its form, its color, and its chemical
constitution, are matters that are almost as
fixed and as definite, as are the properties
of a triangle, a square, or a circle. And
just so it is with every species of the ani-
mal and of the mineral kingdom. Water
is always composed of hydrogen and oxygen
united in the ratio of one to eight. And
all the chemists of earth, cannot combine
these elements so as to form water in any
other proportion. Observe, too, with what
regularity the heavenly bodies move under
the laws and influence of gravitation. We
all anticipate with confidence, the ordinary
changes of day and night, summer and
winter, seed-time and harvest. And the
astronomer foretells, with the most unerr.
ing certainty, the rarer and more extraordi-
nary phenomena of eclipses and transits,
even for coming ages. And thus it is, that
the heavens declare the glory of God, and
that the earth shows forth his handy work.

Nor is this all. God has not only placed
every creature under law; but he has also,
to a certain extent, made it a depository of
his power. It is true indeed, that all power
is of God. The powers that be, whether
intellectual, or moral, or political, or religious, or physical, are all in a certain sense ordained of God. And thus it is, that he creates and establishes what we call second causes. The mind of man, for example, has in itself no inherent or absolute power. But nevertheless, God has endowed every man with a certain amount of power and energy, which he uses in a great measure according to his own will and pleasure. The sun has no inherent power in and of itself. But God has given to it an influence that is sufficient to keep all the planets of the solar system in their own proper orbits.

This is certainly a beautiful arrangement. It detracts nothing from the glory, or power, or wisdom, or goodness of the Creator. On the contrary, to the eye of all enlightened reason, it but serves to illustrate more and more fully, his infinite perfections.

But all men have not this faith. And some of them have not even the perspicacity that is necessary to enable them to look up through and beyond these second causes, to Him who is himself the cause of all causes. They see, or think they see in these delegated laws and powers of nature, enough to regulate and govern the whole created universe. And hence it is, that they separate God wholly and entirely from his works. They allow him to have no longer any care or concern in the government of things celestial, terrestial, or infernal.

Second causes, are now, in their judgment, abundantly adequate and sufficient for all practical purposes. Indeed, some would go so far as to say, "There is no God;" no First Cause. But it is of Naturalism, and not of Atheism, that I now speak. And the Naturalist professes to recognize in nature the foot-prints of the Creator. He admits that there are evidences of design all around him. But he sees no evidence of God's presence in existing phenomena; nor of his energy or power in the present operations of nature. And hence he infers, that nature is a sort of self-adjusting machine; and that God has retired from any and all participation in its government.

The consequences of this theory are numerous; and some of them are pernicious and ruinous in the extreme. Carried out to its legitimate results, it of course ignores every thing that is supernatural in the administration of the universe. Miracles are impossible, for the simple reason, that there is no power left either to suspend, or to change, or in any way to modify any of nature's laws. Divine providence is also discarded and ignored by the very conditions of the hypothesis. And hence it follows that prayer, intercession, and all other religious observances, are to be regarded as wholly superstitious and altogether worthless. The Bible, too, according to this theory is a myth, if not a falsehood; and philosophy is the only rational guide of life.

Such is the form of infidelity that is now taught and industriously propagated by many of the most popular writers on both sides of the Atlantic. Combe's Constitution of Man is full of it; and so are some of the equally popular, but more ephemeral productions of Fowler and Wells. And such I, regret to say, is the tendency of much that has been written within the last half century, on almost every department of Natural Science.

But all such writing indicate a very partial and superficial view of nature. There is really nothing in the whole scheme of the universe, that, when properly understood has the slightest bearing in favor of Naturalism. But on the contrary, there is much that is evidently opposed to it. Geology is all against it. The mountains and valleys around us are witnesses, not only that God has from the beginning exercised a special care over the world, but also that at several different epochs of the earth's history, he interposed miraculously, and actually created many new species of both vegetables and animals. Professor Hitchcock says: "If we take only those larger groups of animals and plants, whose almost entire distinctions from one another has been established beyond all doubt, we shall find at least five nearly complete organic revolution on the globe."
This, then, is a complete refutation of Naturalism. These facts prove conclusively, that God has never forsaken the earth; that from the beginning, he has watched over it, and taken care of it; and furthermore, that he has even worked miracles, whenever the occasion and the circumstances required that he should do so. This, I say is evident from the facts reported by all Geologists. For as the universe originated in miracle, so unquestionably did every species of animals and plants originate in miracle. Second causes may indeed greatly influence and modify both animals and vegetables. But all the laws and powers of nature never did and never can give birth to a new species of either. And hence it is that the appearance of a new species of either animals or vegetables, just as clearly indicates the presence and energy of the Creator, as the fall of an apple indicates the existence of gravitation.

Geology then is clearly opposed to this infidel hypothesis. And I think, it may be affirmed with almost equal certainty, that the science of Meteorology is also opposed to it. For consider why it is, that the phenomena of each year are not invariably and uniformly the same. Why have we not the same amount of rain, and snow, and hail, and frost, and vapor, during each and every successive year? The laws of nature are the same; and so are also the second causes that serve to produce these phenomena. The same earth still exists from age to age. The same quantity of water and the same atmosphere continually surrounds it. The sun too is the same. Its relative positions to the earth, are the same throughout the successive days and nights of every year. The same amount of heat, and light, and electricity would therefore seem to be evolved during each successive year, causing the same or an equal amount of evaporation. And yet the quantity of rain, and snow, and hail, varies from year to year.

Why is this? There must be a variable power or energy some place. And if it is not in nature, it must be in the power that is providentially exercised, by the Author of nature. If it is not in the energy which God has imparted to the ordinances of nature, it must be in the energy which he himself puts forth, and providentially exercises in and through these ordinances. A man, for instance, may impart a certain amount of energy to a clock by suspending weights to the machinery. But he may very greatly increase this energy by laying his own hands upon the weights. In this case he works no miracle. No law of nature, nor even of the piece of machinery, is changed or suspended. Nor does the agent exercise his power against, above, or in any way contrary to the laws and forces of nature. He merely, by his own personal agency, adds to the force and energy of causes already acting in harmony with the established laws of nature.

This is human providence. And when God so acts, it is Divine Providence. This energy he can of course increase or diminish at pleasure. And hence, it seems to me, is the astonishing variety that we everywhere witness amidst the unchanging laws and forces of nature. And hence it is, that without working a miracle, sometimes gives us plenty of corn, and wine, filling our hearts with food and gladness; and again, when he withholds the rains and the dews and the sunshine of heaven, the flowers fade, crops die, and the whole face of nature seems to languish.

Geology then is clearly opposed to this infidel hypothesis. And I think, it may be affirmed with almost equal certainty, that the science of Meteorology is also opposed to it. For consider why it is, that the phenomena of each year are not invariably and uniformly the same. Why have we not the same amount of rain, and snow, and hail, and frost, and vapor, during each and every successive year? The laws of nature are the same; and so are also the second causes that serve to produce these phenomena. The same earth still exists from age to age. The same quantity of water and the same atmosphere continually surrounds it. The sun too is the same. Its relative positions to the earth, are the same throughout the successive days and nights of every year. The same amount of heat, and light, and electricity would therefore seem to be evolved during each successive year, causing the same or an equal amount of evaporation. And yet the quantity of rain, and snow, and hail, varies from year to year.

And hence it is also that Meteorology has never yet been reduced to a science. It is a very remarkable fact, that while the astronomer can foretell the exact time and duration of all the eclipses that will occur within the lapse of many centuries, he can not tell with any degree of certainty what kind of weather we will have to-morrow.

And the same is true, in some measures, of the phenomena of human life. The art of healing is still a matter of experiment. All the skill, and knowledge and experience of six thousand years, have so far failed to reduce medicine to a science. This is certainly a very remarkable fact. And it does seem to me, that this of itself is a refutation of naturalism.
But as I do not wish to multiply arguments and illustrations, I will only say finally, that the Bible is opposed to Naturalism. I assume here of course that the Bible is true. And in doing so, I am fully sustained by the common practice of mankind. The mechanic does not think it necessary, to prove that the square described on the hypotenuse of a right angled triangle, is equivalent to the sum of the squares described on the other two sides, every time that he attempts to square a building. It is enough for him to know that this truth has been once demonstrated to the entire satisfaction of all competent judges. Surely it is enough, or ought to be enough for us to know, that the genuineness and Divine authenticity of the Bible, have been proved a thousand times, by the most full, varied, and reliable testimony that was ever submitted to a court or jury on any question, since time began.

It being conceded then, for the present, that the Bible is the divinely inspired word of God, it is an easy matter to dispose of this infidel hypothesis. Almost every page of the Bible is against it. Almost every page of the Bible shows, that God is ever present in all his works, directing, controlling, and governing all things for his own glory, and also for the greatest good and happiness of the whole creation. Let us take one or two cases, for the present, merely by way of illustration. Let us take, for instance, the history of Joseph. How think you, courteous reader, the Naturalist would on his hypothesis, explain this remarkable chapter of Sacred History? How, without the presence and agency of God, could he account, not for one event merely, nor for two, but for all the events that led to the promotion of Joseph; to the enslavement of the Israelites; and to their final exodus from Egypt, according to the promises which God had before made to Abraham? On his hypothesis, how could the Naturalist explain the eventful biography of Moses, or of Mordcai, or of Daniel? How could he account for the emancipation of Israel by Cyrus, and their restoration to their own land? And above all, how could he explain the history of our Redeemer, and the fulfillment of the many prophecies that relate to his birth, his early education, his ministry, his death, his resurrection, his ascension, and his glorious reign and government?

But it is unnecessary to multiply arguments and illustrations. The problem is solved and the truth fully revealed, in the few inimitable words of our blessed Redeemer, in which he assures us that God takes care of everything; that he clothes the lily; feeds the young ravens; allows not a sparrow to fall to the ground without his knowledge and care; and that, in a word, he numbers the very hairs of our heads. This is enough. This is a foundation broad enough and strong enough on which to rest our faith and hopes forever.

Let us then “beware lest any man spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.” And let us ever rejoice that in God we live, and move, and have our being; and that in him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

R. MILLIGAN.

THE GOSPEL—A GRAND INDUCTION.

NO. II.

Macauly has said, that “during two hundred and fifty years no great society has risen up like one man, and emancipated itself by one mighty effort from the enthralling superstition of ages.” He was fully posted up with all that had been done in England, by Wesley, and on the Continent by Protestants and Catholics, and stated what he knew to be true. Many attempts had been made to reform abuses, and to correct errors in the Church, but no vital or radical changes were contemplated, and
none were effected. Some branches were lopped off, which gave place to others, which finally grew to huge dimensions, and which need excision, now, as much as those they displaced. The ax was not laid at the root of the tree; and throughout Europe, State-religions and petty sectaries still hold their influence over the public mind, and forbid any attempt to introduce among them the faith once for all time delivered to the saints. The status of the religious systems remains the same now that it has done for centuries—if indeed the changes produced are not for the worse.

It is well known that rationalism and rank infidelity pervade the English Church at this time, and that Bishops and clergy and professors in their leading Universities, who have charge of the religious education of the priests and the people, are rotten to the core. The celebrated “Essays,” so much lauded by the Westminster, are the productions of the English clergy—some of them of high rank, and are full of the most deadly hostility to the inspiration of the Bible, and to all that characterizes it as a Divine Revelation. A simultaneous attack has thus been made, not upon the abuses of Christianity, but upon the institution itself, and the fewest of the clergy have either the ability or the will to come to its rescue. How much is there needed, in England, a second Alexander Campbell, to pull down over the heads of its abettors the huge English Hierarchy, and to restore true Christianity to the clergy and the people!

If Macaulay had lived in America, and had known what has been attempted with such success by the labors of A. Campbell and others, he would have spoken with less confidence on the subject to which we have referred.

The Disciples of Christ, in the United States, have done what the celebrated historian said was so much needed, but which no one had attempted, and which no people had risen up as one man to accomplish. They have not only effected a revolution in favor of the ancient Gospel, and raised up a powerful community to advocate and sus-

tain it; but they have all the elements of unity and strength to send it to the world. They have talents, learning, zeal, and constantly increasing numbers. Whole churches have been reformed. Numerous additions have been made to them of ministers from both Catholic and Protestant Churches; and converts from the world are daily being added to their number by the power of the Gospel of Christ. The religious press systematically ignores their existence, and the pulpit fulminates its wrath against them, but they are becoming a mighty power in the earth, and destined to occupy a most influential position in sight of the nations. They readily accept and appropriate to their use the labors of the Fathers—of Wyckliffe and Huss; of Luther and Calvin; of Wesley and the Haldanes; of McKnight and George Campbell; of Dwight and Stuart; and all the great lights both among the ancients and moderns, but they bow not to the authority of any or all of them, and “call no one Master but Christ.”

Their grand and special objects have been to disenthral the religious world from the tyranny of the past—the dogmatism of an old, effete and parti-colored theology; and by the practical application of the laws of the inductive system, to subject the language of Scripture to the same rigid test of interpretation which have produced such happy results in the fields of science and of art. The results have not only proved satisfactory, but they promise much for the future, in restoring the old foundation, which was from “the beginning, which the apostles saw and heard and handled of the Word of life.” The false and partial creeds of human device have been exposed and exploded, and shown to be divisive and heretical in their tendency and operation. Their influence over the Christian mind has been proven to be oppressive and tyrannical; and whether true or false, they are unauthorized, and evil, and only evil. They are but “the Blue Laws” of colonies and plantations, made up out of law and Gospel, as they have passed through the alembic of the limited reason of men, and wholly in-
adequate to meet the wants of a world "dead in trespasses and sins," much less to bind together the Church of the living God. However faithful they may be to the Scriptures, they bear no more proportion to them than a photograph does to the original. They are wholly destitute of life, and wanting in authority. If an epitome, they have no more perfection than a planetarium has in comparison with the system it designs to represent. Who ever lived in a planetarium, or was fed and clothed by one? It neither has light nor life. It is not a creation of God, but the work of man.

It has been the design of "The Disciples" to show a better way, by a return to the original fountain of all authority, to the exclusion of all that has been said or done since the times of the apostles. They neither accept the teachings of the Eastern or the Western Churches—the Church of Luther nor of Calvin—of Henry the VIII.—of Wesley or of Swedenborg. They do not adhere to the primitive, but to the Apostolic Church. They have no affinity with the Sinaitic Institution, much less with a Church founded by Abraham! They have no respect for the rabbis, either of Judaism or of a corrupted Christianity, and only so far as they teach what is in the Bible, do they affiliate with them; as for their authority in matters of faith and obedience, they do not for a moment entertain or respect it. "Thus saith the Lord" is all that they regard of any value in religion, and to this they adhere.

It is no marvel that they are looked upon with suspicion and treated with scorn, as they are neither understood nor appreciated. So unlike the modern adherents to party, they seem to have grown up in a world of their own—or belong to an age which is past and forgotten. They are the lawful prey of all who see them, and deemed to be the pirates on the ocean of life, which every one is at liberty to hunt and destroy. They sustain the same relation to the modern Churches that Christianity did to Judaism—a pestilent sect, everywhere spoken against; or as the Apostles to the Pagan world—iconoclasts, breakers of idols and robbers of temples. Peculiarities and eccentricities, however, are no marks of truth, but they have always characterised those who have nobly and fearlessly stood up for it. So the first Christians were looked upon, and so all the leaders in science and art have been regarded. Harvey and Jenner, Galileo and Columbus—all were deemed to be fanatics, and incorrigibly singular in their opinions. No age has ever been reconciled to its reformers—if it had been, they were not worth the attention the world might have paid them; and no great blessings have ever been secured without much suffering and reproach. These are the prices paid for any and every change for good that have been exacted by an ignorant and self-satisfied world.

JAMES CHALLEN.

MATERIALISM.—No. 1.

We have been satisfied that the various Materialistic theorizing, philosophising and speculating obtaining in the past thirty years is becoming sufficiently mischievous in its tendency to demand, at least, a few articles. A pamphlet lying before us, styled "Pauline Theology, or the Christian doctrine of future punishment, as taught in the Epistles of Paul, by H. L. Hastings," has put us in mind of the matter, and called our attention to the subject afresh. We shall, therefore, the Lord willing, take a look at the almost marvelous discoveries the wonderful advocates of the new theory are making and divulging to the world. If the men alluded to are likely to prove benefactors of their race, the sooner the world know it, the better. If they should turn out otherwise, we should know that also.

I. What name shall we use? We cannot call it "Pauline Theology," for this it is not. We cannot adopt even the more nar-
row and limited title, "Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment," for this it is not. What, then, shall we call it? Materialism is the mildest, least offensive, and probably most appropriate name we can employ. Soul-sleeping is only an item in the theory, and scarcely an important item at that. No soulism is objectionable on a similar ground. Destructionism is not appropriate, as all who believe the Bible believe that the wicked will be destroyed. Annihilationism is inappropriate, as they do not plead for the annihilation of the wicked, but simply for the termination of their conscious existence. But, as the most fundamental item for which they plead is, that man is a mere material being, or that he consists wholly of matter—that man has no immaterial nature—that he consists wholly of flesh, blood, bone and breath, we shall, without intending the least stigma, style the new philosophy Materialism. The new philosophers we shall style Materialists.

II. What new discoveries do Materialists profess to have made? The following:
1. That man consists wholly of matter.
2. That when a man dies, he ceases to exist, as a man, and no more exists than he did twelve months before he was born.
3. That from death till the resurrection, man no more has a conscious existence than he had before the Lord created him.
4. That after the judgment, the punishment inflicted on the wicked will be, striking them out of conscious existence, and thus terminating their being, except in the original elements of which they were composed, or the matter of which they were made.
5. That the kingdom of Christ has not been established—that the reign of Christ has not come, but is yet to be looked for and prayed for.
6. That the Sabbath, or seventh day, is to be kept as required in the law of Moses, and not the observance of the Lord’s day, as now practiced by Christians.
7. That the ten commandments, being written by the finger of God, are really the Law of God, and for our observance.

These, as near as we can gather, are the principal items on which a new sect is trying to found itself. What its success is to be, is yet to be determined.

III. What has the new system, or philosophy, done? It is certainly legitimate, when a new invention comes to hand, to inquire into the work performed by it. What, then, have the advocates of the new philosophy done, and what are they now doing? What are they accomplishing with the new philosophy? They theory, or, at least, a principal part of it, has been advocated for the past thirty years. What has it accomplished in this time? Has it built up anything? or has it only been pulling down? We know where it has divided Churches; engendered strife, schism, and discord; scattered, pulled down and destroyed Churches; but we know of no place where they have built up a Church and sustained it. The very blight of destruction and death appears to follow in the track of the system wherever it goes. This work of pulling down, scattering and destroying is an easy thing done. The Old Book says, “One sinner destroyeth much good.” One incendiary can destroy more property than many thousand can build up. It is an easy matter for a man whose very mission is destruction, ruin and death, to create dissension, trouble and distress. But to heal the wounds he may inflict, to restore the confidence he may have destroyed, and mend the breaches he may have made in the work of God, is no small work. It is an easy matter for irresponsible men to go through the land, sowing the seeds of strife and contention, wasting Churches, and discouraging the best men in the land, in their holy efforts to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace and keep up the regular worship of the true God; but woe betide the man who does this work. The Lord will call such men to a speedy account.

What is the use to study, reason and try to understand the speculations, philosophies and theories of men, when the work in their entire train for years, is but a demonstration of their capacity to spread desolation, waste and ruin? By their works, says the great
Teacher, shall they be known. Their works as manifestly testify of their pernicious tendency, in all their operations, as the works of the great Teacher testified of the good tendency of his holy mission. What is the use for any people to try to have patience with any set of men, or the system they advocate, when in their whole train nothing is to be seen but a series of dissension, alienation, disaffection, waste and ruin? How can credulity be so imposed upon as still to hope that any good will arise from the operations of a class of men, the perpetuation and propagation of a theory, while in all their course they cannot point to a single prosperous and happy Church built up by their entire efforts? All that is necessary to see that what we have said is true, is to stop and think. Nothing prevents their spreading ruin and desolation throughout the brotherhood, only the fact that the Churches are invulnerable to their attacks. They are manifestly not of us, and if they will teach their schismatical theory, they must stand out where they belong. Let the Churches wash their hands of all responsibility in the matter, by requiring all men who speculate upon such empty vagaries to stand upon their own footing, the merits of their empty and deceitful philosophy, and their own influence, as men, and not upon the influence of the congregations of the Lord. If they will ride hobbies, let them ride and depend on them, and not upon the influence of sound men, to carry them through the world in their work of desolation.

IV. Is Materialism worth anything, if true? All men of reflection know that truths are not all of the same importance. It may be as true that some insignificant insect was killed as that a man was killed, but not as important. It may be as true that a man died as that Christ died, but not as important. Suppose it could be clearly and satisfactorily proved that human beings do not exist, as human beings, in a conscious state, or in any way, except in the original elements, or matter of which they were composed, from death till the resurrection of the dead, of what importance would it be to any human being? What good would such proof do the world? None under the shining sun. Suppose it could be proved, that, after the judgment, as the final punishment of the wicked, they would be stricken out of conscious existence forever, what good would it do the world? Would any body be more likely to love and serve God? Would men be any more likely to reform? Would it give preachers of the Gospel more power to save men? Would it impart to the Churches any more zeal, earnestness and devotion? Certainly not. There is not one particle of life, inspiring influence, or animating power in all such empty theories in the world. There is nothing in them to save men, if preached with the eloquence of Apollos or the zeal of Paul.

V. Is there anything in the theories in question for the saints? Not one thing except the gloomy prospect that it shall be with them precisely as it shall with the wicked from death till the resurrection of the dead, or, in other words, that God shall inflict upon them, from death till the resurrection, precisely the same punishment as he will inflict on the wicked forever—that is, to terminate their existence!

The theorists in question have two ways of commenting on this subject. When we press them in reference to millions of the righteous being stricken from conscious existence, in many instances for thousands of years, they explain that to be a matter of but little importance, maintaining that it will be like falling into a calm and sweet sleep at night and waking in the morning, when it will only appear to have been a few minutes. But when they talk of the wicked being stricken out of existence the second time, they explain it to be a most awful and fearful punishment. Indeed, we have known them try to show that it was more terrifying than endless torment. But if the first death puts all, both good and bad, into a sweet sleep, where some of them remain for thousands of years, without anything horrifying in it, then when the wicked die
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the second time, they enter into the same kind of a sweet sleep of unconsciousness, to remain forever! Therefore, the only idea of annihilation there is in it, after all, is the idea of the annihilation of the punishment of the wicked!

We intend this simply as preliminary, and shall, in our next, enter upon a review of the pamphlet to which allusion is made at the commencement of this article.

AN ARGUMENT ON THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

With all consistent persons, theory and practice stand to each other as cause and effect. So it is true that as people, or bodies of people, called churches, think differently upon certain subjects mentioned in Scripture, their practice respecting those things will correspondly differ.

We will mention one subject in this paper—that of Remission of sins. It is known and understood that a class of people, called Christians or Disciples of Christ, believe that baptism, preceded by faith, repentance and confession, is for the remission of past or alien sins; and it is well understood that those churches styling themselves Protestant Evangelical (it matters not what is written in their books or standard works) do neither preach nor believe it. These two classes in their practice, in respect to ungodly men and women, act in entire accordance with what they profess to believe.

A Christian preacher preaches to induce men to believe and repent, and then invites and exhorts them to confess the Lord Jesus and be baptized. And inasmuch as he believes that baptism is for the remission of sins to believing penitents, baptism is not delayed, but attended to immediately. For, with him, if salvation from sin is now, the means to the end should be immediately applied. This practice is simply consistency.

Those who do not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins preach and exhort, and pray for the out-pouring of the Spirit upon sinners, telling them at the same time to repent and believe, assuring them that upon these conditions they will "obtain a hope," "get through," "be converted," or have their sins forgiven them; the evidence of which is their own feelings. As for baptism, it is thrown far in the shade in all "revival seasons," and comes up as a matter for after consideration. It is always deferred to a more convenient season, of course. Why should it be mentioned in times of conversions, when it has nothing to do with conversion? This practice of saying nothing about it at such times is clearly a matter of consistency. And moreover, if men must give an "experience," or relate to the church or a Session, his evidence of pardon, there is necessarily a delay in his baptism; besides, he has to wait till he obtains this evidence (which if often a long time) before he can relate it.

In respect to baptism, then, both classes act perfectly consistent with their teachings upon the subject. Now if a Methodist, a Presbyterian, or a Baptist, should practice as do Christians, baptize people immediately upon their confessing the Lord Jesus without waiting for them to get the evidence of pardon and relate it to others, he would cease to be a Methodist, a Presbyterian or a Baptist. It would be a practical ignoring of the teachings of his party; and the party would ignore him. His conduct would say, "I believe baptism is for the remission of sins."

If a man should become deaf and be placed in a community where he was a stranger to the different churches, and he should visit the meetings of different bodies of people in times of religious excitement, he could tell whether the respective parties believed that baptism was for the remission of sins or not. The eye, without the ear, could settle the matter. If he should see a man preaching to a large crowd,
and he should discern evident emotion among the hearers, and then see a great many baptized the "same day," as at Pentecost, and that without waiting till they could each relate a hope, he would say these are not Baptists; they are not Presbyterians; they are not Methodists; and he would probably say, "this looks like Campbelliteodings." Nor would he say any signs of Presbyterianism, Methodism, or Baptismism, in the proceeding of Philip at Samaria, nor in the conversion of the Ethiopian; nor in the proceedings of Paul at Corinth; nor in the case of Lydia or the Jailor of Philippi.

In all these cases baptism was immediately attended to, which consistency requires of those who believe in baptism for the remission of sins.

Now if practice infallibly indicates the belief of different parties upon the subject of the design of baptism in these days, the apostolic practice just as certainly indicates what was taught by the apostles and believed by the primitive Christians. As those who baptize straitway believe in baptism for remission now, so the apostles who practiced the same, believed and taught the same. The parties who assume to be evangelical at the present day, do not observe the apostolic practice, for the reason that it does not correspond with their teaching; hence, the teaching must be anti-evangelical.

Let one be transported back to Pentecost, and hear the question, "What must we do to be saved?" and the preacher's answer, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins," would he imagine himself at a Methodist revival, a Presbyterian awakening, or where there was a work of grace among the Baptists? Never! These parties never deal in such answers. The man who gives such answers to sinners in these days is spotted as a heretic. Again: Should one, in these days, say to a weeping penitent, as did Ananias to Saul, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," what would he be called? A Methodist? A Presbyterian? A Baptist? None of these.

Their preachers lip no such words to sinners; they cannot; they dare not; for the simple words of Scripture would annihilate their theory.

A. C——N.

THAT SERMON!

O what a sermon! I never heard anything more eloquent. From first to last, it was a complete success. Each sentence seemed a pearl strung on a silver thread; each had a golden clasp, and the thoughts "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." 

"Why, Mary!" replied her father quietly, "you are getting more eloquent than the preacher, and a little extravagant in your praise. What was the greatest excellence of the sermon?"

All excellent, father; first, the text,—Solomon's Song, iv. 15, A fountain of gardens, a well of living waters, and streams from Lebanon. Is not that beautiful? Then how he described a flower-garden, with a jet d'eau in its center, throwing its silvery spray over the plants; and an outgushing well, or fountain, surrounded by drinking flocks; and the streams from Mt. Lebanon, now leaping in cascades, now sleeping in cool basins, and now laying their silver threads across the fertile plains! Such a garden, he said, reminded him of the Garden of Eden, watered by the river of God; such a fountain, of the depths of his overflowing goodness; and such streams, of the multiplied channels of his love!

And then, he remarked, that garden is an emblem of heaven! That fountain an emblem of the head-spring of salvation! And those streams emblematical of the streams which unite in the river of life!

And having lifted us to heaven, he kept us there half an hour, beholding its beauties, and listening to its songs. And when we came down by the "Milky Way," he explained that to be the jeweled sash which girds the shoulder and loins of the Almighty; the moon to be but the sapphire pavement for his feet; the sun the radiant glory of his brow; lightning the flash of his eye,
and thunder but the whisper of his voice! Wasn't it a splendid sermon?

"My daughter, the preacher ran away with your fancy, and in the flight you lost your usual good sense. His was the responsible duty of preaching the Gospel, but he has given you a compound of poetry, natural scenery, and fancy. What doctrine did he derive from the text? What duty enjoin? What did he make of it beyond a bridgel-post for his imagination? The great business of a preacher is not to amuse, but to instruct, impress, and persuade his hearers to lay hold on eternal life. Christianity does not reject ornament. Jesus drew lessons from the lilies of the field, the clusters of the vine, and the crimson glow of the sky. So may the preacher for the same purpose—to impress truth and duty. But saving men with sermons composed of rhetorical flowers and poetical fancies, is like keeping them from starvation with the painted bread and fruit of the canvas which hangs on the wall.

A person on hearing such a preacher with equal force and justice, remarked, "He snowed on the congregation; he snowed on them beautifully."

How many such sermons, do you suppose, it would take to awaken one sleepy conscience, and convert one sinner from the error of his ways? Could that sermon you call so eloquent, multiplied by a thousand, ever reach the heart of our neighbor Roscoe? You remember his was a hard case. At first he refused to go even into a school-house to hear a sermon, and was not persuaded till I promised him a bushel of wheat, if the preacher did not tell him the most wonderful story he ever heard. It was that story—the story of the cross—that went to his heart. And now for eighteen months he has been a praying, godly man.

The poet speaks beautifully—

"Tis when the cross is preached,
And only then,
That from the pulpit
A mysterious power goes forth,
To renovate the moral man."

Away, then, with Christless sermons.
Let the hungry and thirsty have the bread

and the water of life. And away with that pulpit eloquence which flashes like the Northern light on a polar sky, but sends no flaming bolt to the sinner's heart. And, Mary, go to the Sermon on the Mount for a specimen of real eloquence, and to the feet of Him who preached it, for pardon in having sacrificed your good sense on the altar of fancy.

J. S.

"MIGHTY IN THE SCRIPTURES."

Summerfield's aptness in the quotation of Scripture, and his constant reference to the Bible, both in conversation and in his public addresses, were doubtless one of the secrets of his great power over men. His familiar and happy use of the Word of God is thus noticed by a correspondent:

In the contemplation of Mr. Summerfield's life and labors, I have often been reminded of what has been said of Apollos. "He was an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures." A great and distinguishing feature of his mind was, it was saturated with the Word of God. Its very language seemed to come to his lips like household words. No subject could be brought forward, no incident could occur in public or private, but he found something to say on it in the words of the Bible, or made it the occasion of reference to some incident in the Bible. I may refer to an instance of this happy talent which occurred at a meeting of a missionary society in one of the Methodist churches. The speaker who went before him remarked that he would be brief, as he was to be followed by one whom they were anxious to hear, and who would bring forth from his ample stores what would be of itself a rich feast for the evening. Mr. Summerfield arose, expressing his regret that such allusion had been made to him, assuring the assembly that he had no such stores as had been described. "On the contrary," said he, "I come before you simply a lad with five barley loaves and two small fishes. But," he added, "If the Lord will be pleased to bestow his blessing on the supply, scanty as it is, all the people will have as much as they would, and besides, we will have twelve baskets full of fragments taken up." The effect of this allusion, and of others with which he followed it, was, I am told, a collection that far surpassed the expectation both of himself and his friends.
FAITH AND INFDIENCY.—NO. VI.

PANTEISM.

Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men; after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ. Colossians ii: 8.

One of the first forms of idolatry known and practiced among men, was the worship of the heavenly bodies. The great influence of some of these bodies, and especially of the sun and moon, upon the earth, was observed by many of the ancient philosophers. They observed too that these bodies were continually changing their position in relation to the earth, and some of them, in relation to each other. And hence many inferred that the stars and planets were living beings endowed with the power of locomotion; that they were in fact real divinities, each one of which was constantly exerting an influence on the fortunes and destinies of mankind.

But modern science has completely exploded these notions of ancient astrologers. By the aid of the telescope, the calculus, and other means of investigation, it has been discovered that these bodies are composed of inert matter; that they are but parts of one great system, called the the universe; and that their motions and influences are all essential to the stability and harmony of the one grand and universal scheme.

This, to the eye of enlightened reason, is a most convincing and glorious demonstration of the unity of the God-head. If creation is a unit, so also is its Creator a unit. If all created things are but parts of one stupendous whole, then indeed it follows that to us there is but one God, the Jehovah Elohim, who in the beginning created, out of nothing, the heavens and the earth, the seas and the fountains of water.

This seems to me to be a fair and legitimate conclusion from the premises. But all men do not think so. As we have no direct sensible evidence of God’s existence some have thought and argued that it is more reasonable and more rational to transform all the innumerable imaginary divinities of the ancients into one divinity; to merely change Polytheism into Pantheism; and thus to identify God and the universe.

Indeed this is not, strictly speaking, a modern notion. It has always prevailed in India; and it is substantially the same doctrine that was taught by Pythagoras, in his celebrated school at Crotona, about 500 years B. C. But it was reserved for Germany to bolster up this monstrous absurdity by all the lights and evidence of modern science. The attempt was first made by Benedict de Spinoza, an apostate Jew of Amsterdam, about the middle of the 17th century. And more recently, this system has been defended and variously modified by Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Strauss and other German philosophers. And even now in the year 1863, while we are anxiously endeavoring to mould the minds and the hearts of the rising generation in the Holy Bible, many of the Professors in the German and French Universities, are laboring to disseminate this form of infidelity among all ranks and classes of European society.

I do not feel therefore that I need offer any apology for introducing to the notice of my readers, even so absurd a scheme of the philosophy of religion as that of Pantheism. If some of the most profound thinkers of Europe have been deceived by its plausible pretensions, the American youth may not be wholly out of danger; they too may be deluded by its undue assumptions and by the pretensions of science falsely so-called. Indeed all history proves, that without a knowledge of Divine Revelation, a man may be induced to believe almost any religious creed, and to worship almost any idol. He must, and he will worship something. If he cannot worship the Creator, he will worship the creature, even in its lowest and most degraded forms. If his soul does not find rest in the religion of Jesus, he will seek it in Spiritualism, Pantheism, or any thing else. And hence it is im-
important to guard the young against all the prevailing forms of Infidelity, and especially to expose their errors by frequently contrasting them with the very plain, simple, and rational truths of the scheme of redemption, as these are revealed and presented to us in the Living Oracles.

I trust then that I shall have the attention and indulgence of my readers, while with this object in view, I attempt to discuss, very briefly, the claims of even so absurd a system as Pantheism.

This whole scheme then, as I have said, is nothing more nor less than Polytheism generalized. It simply reduces the universe to a unit. This unit is God; and God, of course, is the universe. This one dogma is the basis of the whole system.

But from this assumption, there follow of necessity many very grave and serious consequences. These of course, constitute a part of the scheme, and must stand or fall with it. It may therefore be interesting and instructive to notice a few of these very briefly, by way of illustration.

In the first place then it is evident, that on this hypothesis, God is not a person but a thing, a mere thing, having no self-government and no self-control. He makes nothing; and he does nothing. But he is himself subject to constant changes and modifications, owing simply to the inherent, eternal, and immutable laws of his own nature. And hence we see why it is and how it is that Strauss and other Pantheists argue so confidently against the possibility of all miracles. On their assumption, a miracle is indeed an evident impossibility. Admit their premises, and their conclusion follows of necessity.

Another consequence of these premises is the denial of man's personality, freedom of will, and immortality. If the universe is God, and God is the universe, then indeed, properly speaking, man has not even individuality, and much less has he personality. He is a mere mode or manifestation of the Divine existence—a phenomenon that appears for a little while and then vanishes forever. Like baubles that rise from the ocean, and float and glitter for a few moments on its surface, and are then lost forever in the abyss of waters: even so, by a fatal necessity, man rises for a little while out of the abyss of the Divine essence; appears for a few days in the beauty of youth and the glory of manhood; and then sinks into a state of unconsciousness,—forever absorbed and lost in the fulness of the Divine existence. And this is the repose of Pantheism. This is its heaven. This is its boasted glory and felicity.

One more thought, and I have done with this part of my subject. It is evident that Pantheism obliterates all moral distinctions; all supposed differences between right and wrong, between moral good and evil. It is incredible to suppose that one part of a Divinity under the dominion of an absolute necessity, can ever transgress against another part. As well might we suppose that the human hand would transgress against the human foot: or that the head would violate its moral obligation to the heart. But this is impossible; for the simple reason, that no such moral obligations exist or can exist between different parts of the human body. And just so it is on the Pantheistic hypothesis: there being no moral relations there can, of course, be no moral obligations; and where there are no moral obligations, there can be no moral wrongs or injuries inflicted.

Many other consequences of a similar and equally absurd nature, necessarily follow from the assumptions of Pantheism.—But the points already explained and illustrated are sufficient for our present purpose. And I simply wish now in conclusion, to say a few things in relation to the merits of the whole system.

1. And the first remark that I wish to make is, that the evidence of design, taken from the structure and mechanism of the universe, is all against it. No man in his senses thinks of indentifying a watch and its maker. The evidence of design seen in its structure and arrangement, is proof positive to all soberminded persons, that it had a designer. And just so it is in the vast
empire of nature. The nicely adjusted mechanism of the heavens, and the more delicately wrought structure of every species of vegetables and animals, clearly indicate to every sound and well balanced mind that the universe is not eternal; that it did not make itself; and that it is not the result of chance; but that, as the Bible assures us, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth out of nothing." In this respect, then, the evidence of Nature and the evidence of Divine Revelation harmonize most perfectly. And the evidence of both is irreconcilably opposed to all the claims and assumptions of Pantheism.

2. My second argument against this modern scheme of infidelity, is derived from the evidence of our own consciousness. We are all conscious of our own individuality; of our own personal identity; and of our ability to will, and generally to act as we please. We need no evidence beyond that of our own consciousness to prove that we think, and feel, and act for ourselves. Any scheme of philosophy, therefore, that makes man a mere passive machine, or that ignores the highest principles and attributes of his nature, by reducing him to a mere phenomenon or mode of the Divine existence, must be false, if there is any reliance to be placed in the evidence of our own senses and consciousness. And if we cannot rely upon these witnesses, then most assuredly we can rely upon nothing. Then indeed Pantheism and every other ism becomes a mere chimera of the brain, and universal skepticism is the inevitable result.

Let not, then, the youth of our country be deceived by such mild and extravagant speculations. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." How much more rational and consistent with the testimony of our own consciousness, is the account which God has given us in the Holy Bible, respecting man's powers and capabilities. After Jehovah Elohim had created everything else pertaining to this world; after he had filled its mountains and its valleys with coal, and iron, and other precious minerals for the good of man; after he had covered its surface with fruits and flowers and all kinds of herbage; after he had filled the waters with fishes, the air with birds, and land surface with quadrupeds, he said within himself, "Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; a male and a female created he them." This is the first lesson that God has taught us concerning man. And the second is that in which he informs us that by the abuse of this freedom, man sinned, and thus brought death into the world and all our woes. Indeed in every chapter of the Holy Bible, man is represented, just as he appears within the domain of his own consciousness, as a voluntary agent, free in all cases to refuse the evil and to choose the good. Here then again we have the most perfect and entire harmony between Nature and Revelation; and as in the first instance they are both in opposition to the claims and assumptions of Pantheism.

3. Another objection to this hypothesis, is that it is irreconcilably opposed to the dictates of conscience, or to the impulses of man's moral nature. If it is true, as Pantheism always implies, and as it sometimes affirms, that human actions have no moral qualities; that they are but the legitimate effects of causes as immutable as the Divine nature; and that they are therefore all equally good or bad,—then I ask whence and for what purpose is this inward monitor that we call Conscience? Why was this lying witness ever placed within the human breast, to torment man by its falsehood? Why does a man feel remorse for one action, and the highest degree of complacency on account of another? Surely there must be something wrong just here. Surely there must be some error in a scheme which is so contrary to every man's experience, and to every principle of human government and social order. And what must be still more
perplexing to the Pantheist, is the very remarkable fact, that here again the testimony of Nature corresponds exactly with the testimony of Divine Revelation; and that both these witnesses are opposed to his favorite hypothesis.

My fourth objection to Pantheism, is that it is opposed to some of the strongest natural desires of the human heart; and particularly to man's desire to live forever; to preserve his own personal identity amidst the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds. That this is true of every man, I presume no one doubts. I can conceive of nothing but the fear of everlasting torment, that could induce any man to desire annihilation, or to seek for eternal absorption in the Divine essence. But why was the desire to live and to preserve our own personality, ever implanted in the human breast if it is not to be gratified; if in a few days or years, we must all sink into a state of absolute unconsciousness never again to see the light of heaven, nor to hear the sweet melodies of nature; nor to feel one more emotion of sympathy, or of friendship, or of love? Surely a theory must be greatly at fault, if so contrary to nature, and which is so directly opposed to many of the strongest and most elevating impulses of the human soul.

How much more rational and consistent is the doctrine of Divine Revelation. How consonant with our desires and our happiness is the assurance given in that blessed volume, that man was made for immortality, that though in Adam all die, yet that in Christ Jesus all shall be made alive; that the hour is coming, when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of our Savior, and shall come forth,—they that have done good to the resurrection of life; to a state of honor, and glory, and immortality in the presence of our God. Then, there will be fullness of joy; and then there will be pleasures forevermore.

"No chilling winds, nor poisonous breath
Can reach that healthful shore;
Sickness and sorrow pain and death,
Are felt and feared no more."

"Beware," then, my dear readers, "lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit; after the tradition of men; after the rudiments of the world; and not after Christ." O never give up your Bibles for any such baseless and unsatisfactory hypothesis as Spiritualism, or Naturalism, or Pantheism. They have not the shadow of evidence to support them; and they can only fill the soul with darkness and doubting. But the Bible is full of light, full of joy, and full of comfort. Follow its precepts, and they lead will you safely through your earthly pilgrimage; through the dark valley of the shadow of death; and finally, through the gates into the everlasting city of our God.

R. MILLIGAN.

THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

NO. II.

It always seems like a pity, when a man thinks he has achieved something great, to spoil it all. In our charitable nature, where we see a nice cob-house built by a child, we dislike to see it destroyed. We feel somewhat moved by the same benevolent feeling toward the little castle built by Mr. Hastings, especially as he cherishes it so fondly and seems to feel that he has done a clever thing. Still, we have reasons which we deem sufficient for capsizing this little castle over his head.

I. Why does Mr. Hastings confine his argument so much to the writings of Paul? There appears to us to be a little artifice, if not sophistry, in this. Again and again he tells his reader, that Paul shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God and kept back nothing that was profitable! But did Paul say this of what he had written, as it appears in the New Testament? or of his teaching and preaching in a Christian congregation? Paul never said nor intimated that he had shunned not to declare the whole
counsel of God, in his writings, as they appear in the New Testament, or that he had kept back nothing that did not appear in these writings. He never said, nor intimated that he had declared the whole counsel of God in these writings, but he had done this in his preaching and teaching in a Christian congregation. The fact that Paul should not to declare the whole counsel of God to the disciples, in his preaching and teaching from house to house, where he labored among the people in person, by no means proves that the whole counsel of God is contained in his writings, as they appear in the New Testament. This takes the wind out of our author's sails.

II. If Paul's writings contain the whole counsel of God, why does Mr. Hastings quote so largely from other portions of the Bible? His plan appears to be to shut others off from all the Bible, save the small portion written by Paul, while he is to be left free to quote at large! We cannot afford this. We do not agree that our hands shall be tied, while our antagonist shall have both hands free.

III. Mr. Hastings gives us quite a dissertation on the candor of Paul, his learning, knowledge, &c., arguing that we should believe him. This endorsement of Paul by him, and eulogy, are useless, so far as we are concerned. Paul needs no such endorsement at this office. "Paul we know; and Jesus we know, but who are you?" Paul we believe, Jesus we believe; all the scriptures we believe; but Mr. Hastings' theology, we do not know. It is in doubt—on trial.

IV. Three times on one page we find the word "doctrines," and once the word "teachings," used in a sense never found in the New Testament. The word "doctrine" occurs frequently, but always minus the s, except where we find "doctrines of men," or "doctrines of demons." We never read of the "doctrines of Christianity," nor "Christian doctrines," in the New Testament. So to speak, is not "Pauline Theology," nor Christology.

V. The first word our author calls to his assistance, to prove that the punishment of the wicked shall consist in the termination of their existence, is perish. To make some display of variety, perhaps, he makes a separate argument on the word, destroy. The same original word, however, is translated destroy and perish, so that if there is any argument, at all, it is but one, and not two. That the wicked will perish—be destroyed—is clearly set forth in scripture. What then, is the meaning of the original word translated destroy and perish? Our first recourse, in getting the meaning of a New Testament word, is to trace it through and examine its use in every place. The first question we start with is the following: Is the original world, appollumi, translated perish and destroy, ever used, where the connection shows, that it does not mean, the termination of conscious existence? We maintain that it is. Now for the examples:

1. Matthew x. 6, the Lord said, "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Here the word lost represents appollumi. These lost, perished, or destroyed sheep of the house of Israel, were certainly not exterminated, or their conscious existence terminated, when the Lord sent the apostles to preach to them. They were certainly in existence and conscious, though lost or destroyed.

2. Matthew xviii. 11, we have the words, "Christ came to save that which was lost." The same word here is translated lost. Their existence was certainly not terminated. Still they were lost, perished or destroyed.

3. "What man of you having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness and go after that which is lost." Luke xv. 4. The same word here is translated lost in two instances. Certainly the sheep, though lost, or destroyed, was in existence as much as any of the ninety-nine not lost. In the same way, a lost man may be in existence as really as a saved man, but in a very different state of existence.

4. The prodigal son, Luke xv. 24, was lost, and afterward found. The same word is here translated lost. Surely the prodi-
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5. The piece of money the woman lost, was afterward found, and was certainly in existence while lost, as much as when found, though in a different state. See Luke xv. 8, where the same word is translated, lost.

6. "None of them is lost but the son of perdition." John xvii. 12. Here the same word is translated lost. By implication, it is said, Judas is lost. Still, he was as much in existence as any one of the twelve, though in a vastly different state.

7. 2 Cor. iv. 3, the gospel is said to be "hid to them that are lost." They were lost, but as actually in existence as those not lost.

VI. We now deny that apollumi, translated lost, destroy, and perish, when applied to the condition the wicked, ever means, the termination of their conscious existence. We have already found where it is applied to men in this life, while they were alive and in a conscious state of existence. There is, then, nothing in this word, in itself, teaching the termination of conscious existence; for where the word is used, in reference to the wicked, any person can see, or cannot help but see, that it does not have that meaning. We find that not only a portion of men were lost, or destroyed, but that the world was lost or destroyed when Jesus came to save it, though alive and in a conscious state. But where different words are applied to a thing, we are not to give one of these words an arbitrary interpretation, which will contradict the obvious meaning, and the only meaning which another word applied to the same thing must have.

Matt. xxv. 46, the Lord says, of the wicked, "these shall go away into everlasting punishment." In the same verse, as revised by the Bible Union, we have the additional words, "but the righteous into everlasting life." Here is a perfect antithesis. At the same time the righteous go into life, the wicked go into punishment. To go into life, is not to go into existence, for they were already in existence. Then, to go into punishment, is not to go into none existence, or out of existence, but into punishment. What is it that is everlasting? Not merely the consequences of punishment, but punishment itself. The very thing affirmed to be endless here, Mr. Hastings maintains shall terminate—punishment. A man in punishment, is destroyed, but a man whose conscious existence is terminated, is no more in punishment than he was before he was created. The same original word (Kolasin) translated, "punishment," Matt. xxv. 46, is translated, "torment," 1 John iv. 18; and it matters not which way it is translated, for there can be no punishment, or torment, after the termination of a man's existence any more than before he was created. The punishment with which Mr. Hastings threatens men for disobeying the Gospel, is precisely the same as we were all in before we were created! non-existence!

A CONTRAST
BETWEEN THE TRUE CHURCH AND FALSE CHURCHES, AND BETWEEN JESUS CHRIST AND ANTI-CHRIST.

Bro. Franklin—Dear Sir:—It is fortunate for us that we have the teaching of Christ and the Apostles in the New Testament. Their religion consists of two parts; teaching and practice; a very simple religion. The first seven chapters of the Acts of the Apostles gives us the history of the first Christian congregation ever organized on earth, in the city of Jerusalem. The twelve Apostles were members of it. They organized it under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This congregation is the mother, mistress and model of all Christian congregations; of pure origin and heaven descended Christianity. It is the measure or standard by which we are to try every thing called Christianity. There were 8,000 Christians in it. These 8,000 went
every where preaching the word or gospel. That one verse is a death blow to the kingdom of the clergy, who claim to be called overseers and deacons as the officers in Christ's kingdom, all beside these are anti-christian. I mean permanent officers. Why is not Jerusalem invested with the supremacy, where our blessed Lord, by his death and resurrection, laid the foundation, not of a particular church only, but of the universal congregation? It was here that the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles to guide them into all truth. It was from Jerusalem they were to commence their ministry, from whence faith was diffused as from a fountain, throughout the whole world. They were commanded to begin at Jerusalem. Luke 24. The finger of prophecy pointed to Jerusalem, as the place from whence the word of the Lord, or gospel, was to go forth. Isaiah ii: 1, 2, 3. Micah iv: 1-4.

The Lord Jesus Christ was the founder and the foundation of the Christian congregation in the city of Jerusalem. Isaiah xxviii: 16. Therefore, thus says the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion a foundation stone. 1 Peter ii: 1 to 10. Psalms 118. This stone was Jesus Christ, laid by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and built the souls of men on it by faith and obedience. What have we in opposition to all these Scriptural facts. We have an uncertain tradition that Peter was once in Rome, and that he was a bishop of that congregation. Rome is mentioned in the close of the Acts. The superstructure of the first Christian congregation was not the work of one Apostle, but of the whole College of Apostles. Whenever we wish to know what anti-christianity is, all we have to do is contrast it with this congregation in Jerusalem, and we can know it. Contrast this congregation with the Roman hierarchy in all its ramifications for the last 1200 years, with its popes, cardinals, massacres, inquisitions, persecutions, cathedrals, churches, priests, mummeries, masses and traditions. Contrast this mother congregation, her purity, her simplicity, her unity, her spirituality, her disinterestedness, her liberality, her faith, her hope, her love, her laws and her institutions, with Protestantism and her sects, her traditions, her creeds, her language, her corruptions, or with any branch or sect, and you have Anti-Christ as large as life, in the difference between this congregation and Romanism and Protestantism.

After all our boast of the Lutheran Reformation, and the Wesleyan and our own Reformation brethren for forty years; is there no Anti-Christ among us? which of our congregations equals this one in Jerusalem, brethren? which of our congregations will compare with this one in letter and spirit? If they will not they are Anti-Christian. See, brethren, what an amount of Anti-Christ there is in the world! If our congregations are Anti-Christian in part, what shall we say of Romanism, Protestantism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Lutheranism, Baptism, &c. Christ and Anti-Christ may be clearly seen by contrasting the Jerusalem congregation, with all that passes for Christianity in this world. By contrasting Jerusalem and Rome, we can see the deficiency. Jerusalem the fountain of pure Christianity, Rome the mother of sects and abominations, the symbol of heathenism, whitewashed heathenism, a mixture, a Judaism, heathenism, traditions, architecture, with a small sprinkle of Christianity.—Protestantism is a compound of Judaism creeds, human philosophy, creeds and Christianity. Jesus Christ is the foundation and the Head of the Christian congregation. St. Peter is the foundation and head of the Roman hierarchy. The Christian congregation is governed by the New Testament, the Roman hierarchy is governed by the laws of the Pope, and by the fathers. I believe that the Roman hierarchy is built on St. Peter, as much as I believe the Christian congregation is built upon Jesus Christ. The Catholics believe this too. But here lies the awful mistake, in supposing that Peter and Jesus Christ are the identical same persons, in supposing that Romanism
is Christianity, that because Peter is the Head of Romanism, that therefore he is the Head of the Christian congregation. It would be as reasonable to suppose that Jerusalem is Rome, and that Jews and heathens were the same people, as to suppose that Catholicism and Christianity are the same religion. We had as well call Mahomet and Christ the same person, as to call the pure gospel of Christ, and its corruptions the same thing. To call the Papal yoke the yoke of Jesus Christ is a species of madness that borders on insanity. To call St. Peter's hierarchy the congregation of Jesus Christ is next to the unpardonable sin. To call national establishments Christianity, is to call day night and night day. Peter's sermon was a model sermon—it was Jesus the Christ, the Son of God his death for our sins, his burial, his resurrection, his ascension, his coronation in heaven. It is an ancient sermon, it is orthodox, it is an infallible one. He promised to those who obeyed it pardon of all past sins, the Holy Spirit and eternal life. Do modern gospels promise these to their subjects? No, they do not. Were there any infants in the mother church? They that gladly received the gospel were immersed—were saved or pardoned, were added to the congregation. They separated themselves from an untoward generation; and all that believed were together. Every person in this first congregation was a professed Christian, an immersed believer. They continued steadfastly in the apostles, teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, in prayer and praise, having favor with God and all the people. This is a model for all revivals of religion. Let us, brethren, imitate this model sermon, this model congregation, and this model revival of religion. Yours truly.

J. CREATH.

A resolution was passed in the General Missionary Meeting, recommending churches to aid worthy young men, who are striving to qualify themselves for the work of the ministry, by sending them to some one of our colleges and paying their expenses, or some portion of their expenses, accruing while they are taking a regular course of instruction. We do not remember the precise wording of the resolution, but think we have the substance of it. We were urged by several persons, during the meeting, Sister Campbell among the number, to write an article urging the importance of the resolution. This we thought we would do immediately; but one thing after another, pressing on our attention, has prevented our doing so till now. And even now, we fear we can not give the subject that careful consideration which its importance demands.

As is well known to many, we have for many years taken great pleasure in doing every thing in our power to encourage and bring young men into the field as preachers of the word. Nor are we any less disposed to do so now than we have been heretofore. We are assured that a vast amount can be done, by training, educating and encouraging young men who are striving to become faithful and devoted preachers of the gospel. We are also well convinced, that a noble work can be done for the assistance and encouragement of faithful young men in the manner contemplated in the resolution alluded to above. Worthy young brethren have written us, requesting us to make appeals to the brotherhood to aid them, in obtaining a regular college course. We have declined making any appeals, upon any plan suggested, because such appeals would be unavailing and useless. The brethren would suppose that benevolent persons would, in this way, be induced to make appeals in cases where there was no sufficient evidence that young men would,
or could, make preachers. The brotherhood generally would pay no attention to appeals made for persons whom they never saw, simply upon the recommendation of a few brethren. If any thing of importance is done in this matter, it must come before the brethren in such a form as to assure them that there is some thing to be depended on. A few things must be understood, before the brethren will do anything. The following matters must be pretty clearly settled:

I. That the person proposed is a good man, possessing the piety, devotion to the cause and character indispensable to the faithful preacher of Christ.

II. That he has the natural endowments and gifts for the work.

III. Brethren should have assurance of his stability, decision of character, and determination to persevere and accomplish the work he undertakes. They do not want a man who is one week talking of practicing law, the next week of practicing medicine, then of merchandizing, and then of preaching, but who does nothing. They want a man whose purpose is to preach, who is bending his whole course to that end and never intends to give up his purpose, nor to be foiled or discouraged in it.

IV. He should already have given some evidence, by exercising publicly, of natural ability for the work.

These things can be best judged of, in the communities where the man is known. The brethren must themselves select their man, and then if he does not turn out well, they have no one to blame but themselves. Where a young man is thus known, has gained some reputation, evinced ability for usefulness, in the great and good work of preaching the gospel, some three or four churches of ordinary ability, without opposing themselves in the least, can furnish him the means to take him through a collegiate course, and we know of no other way in which they can accomplish so much for the cause, with so small an amount. In a brief space, he may turn round and give them a rich reward in noble acquisitions to the cause.

Now is an important time for such a work, on several accounts, as follows:

1. Young men, who are now striving to preach, studying the Bible, and devoting themselves to the work, while there are so many attractions all around them, to draw them aside, and diversions to attract their attention, are giving evidence of their integrity to their Lord and King, and their genuine devotion to the cause; and they will not be likely to be led away by the devices of the world. Young men who stand, without wavering, in these times, will be likely to stand in almost any kind of times.

2. The colleges need assistance now. Every student is needed that can be found, that our colleges may be kept in lively operation. Perhaps we will not find another time in this generation, when additional students will be of so much importance to the interests of the colleges. It is of the very highest importance, that all of our colleges be kept in motion. The action, we are urging, on the part of congregations, if put in practice, would make an important item in supporting and keeping in motion our noble colleges. This is an item well worthy of our consideration.

3. Young men now in the colleges have superior advantages. There are comparatively but few students and the Professors can bestow greater attention upon those in attendance. This is, especially, important to young men, who are qualifying themselves for the ministry. Not only so, but there is quietude, composure and an opportunity for concentration of mind on the various studies, such as is rarely enjoyed. Now is the time to enjoy superior advantages in colleges, and young men desiring to become great and good should not let this golden opportunity pass.

There is also now a special reason why we should make the greatest effort possible, to prepare ourselves for what is before us.—We have a wonderful work before us. There are more than a million of men in our
country now exposed to all the demoralizing influences of active operations in civil war. Many of these, who were once in good standing in churches, will return home backslidden. Others will be dissipated and wrecked in character. Their children are growing up neglected. The whole land is more or less being demoralized by the influence of war. Churches are being broken down, schools of all sorts limited in their moral influences. All these demoralizing influences are to have their effect upon society. These effects must be counteracted. What an army then we should have in the field, fully equipped and qualified for the great work of saving the thousands on their way to ruin. What an immense work this will be for the Christian ministry! Shall we not, as children of the light, and of the day, make ample preparation for this vast work? Every effort possible should be made, to bring good men of talent into the field and arm them for this wonderful work.

We know of no higher calling to which a noble hearted man can aspire than the great and good work of saving men. There is no truer nor higher honor than that arising from a God-like effort to save poor fallen men from ruin and death—snatching him as a brand from the burning. We know of no higher or more noble calling, to which man can be invited than to the Christian ministry. There is no truer nor higher honor than that arising from a God-like effort to save poor fallen men from ruin and death—snatching him as a brand from the burning. We know of no higher or more noble calling, to which man can be invited than to the Christian ministry.

What college should a young man attend? A Christian college, of course, and not a Sectarian college. Go to a Christian, college, under the influence of sound, good Christian men, giving their attention strictly to their work, and acting in harmony and union with their brethren. We want no hobbyists, hobby-riders, nor factionists to teach young men preparing for the ministry especially. We want men of sound minds, consistent and true, as professors in our colleges, and we must, and will have them. The brotherhood will not sustain any others. Men who desire to occupy high positions must hold themselves level. We have the colleges and the instructors, thank heaven, and they are improving every year. Let us send the young men, and thus keep the work of educating moving.

THE PARDON OF SIN AND GOD RECONCILED TO MAN.

Bro. Franklin—Dear Sir:—It is well-known to you and our brethren that we have opposed the idea of God being reconciled to man, and that we have belabored the Methodist Discipline awfully on this subject. I send you some extracts from Pearson’s Exposition of the Athenasian and Nicene Creeds that you may see it, and if he is wrong, that our people may correct him. So far as I am concerned, I stand corrected. On page 544 he says, This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; for all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Christ Jesus, (2 Cor. v. 18,) and that by virtue of his death, for when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, (Rom. v. 10,) making peace through the blood of his cross,
and by him reconciling all things to himself. (Col. i. 20.) In vain is it objected that the Scriptures say our Savior reconciled men to God, but nowhere teaches that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of Scripture, to reconcile a man to God, is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is, to cause him who was before angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the princes of the Philistines spoke of David, wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master?—should it not be with the heads of these men? (1 Sam. xxix. 4.) Wherewith shall he reconcile Saul who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favorable, but by betraying these men unto him? As our Saviour advises, if thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, (Matt. v. 23, 24,) that is, reconcile thy brother to thyself, whom thou hast injured, render him, by thy submission, favorable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended at thee. As the apostle advises the wife that departs from her husband to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband, (1 Cor. vii. 11,) that is, to appease and get the favor of her husband. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto God, when God is reconciled, appeased, and becomes gracious and favorable unto us; and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God, when he hath moved and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favor. Thus, when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God, that is, notwithstanding he was offended with us for our sins—we were restored to his favor by the death of his Son, (Rom. v. 10.) Whence appears the weakness of the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God; but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expression it is to be understood that he which is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures is restored unto the favor of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled. As when David was to be reconciled unto Saul, it was not that David was to lay down his enmity against Saul, but that Saul should become propitious and favorable unto David; and therefore, when the language is that David should be reconciled unto Saul, the sense is, that Saul who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased and so reconciled unto David. Nor is it any wonder that God should be thus reconciled unto sinners by the death of Christ, who while we were yet sinners died for us, (Rom. v. 8,) because the punishment which Christ, who was our surety endured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God—the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. (Matt. xx. 28.) He has much more to the same effect, from page 143 to 149. If we have been in an error on this subject let us acknowledge it like men and Christians, or let us refute Bishop Pearson. Now I want the attention of our opponents, if they please. “Being therefore assured that the preaching remission of sins belongs not only certainly, but in some sense peculiarly to the Church of Christ, it will next be considered how this remission is conferred upon any person in the Church.” For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable; one relating to the initiation, the other concerning the continuation of a Christian. For the first of these it is the most general and irrefragable assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the baptism of the same person. For the second it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptism are remissible, and the person committing these sins shall receive forgiveness upon true repentance at any time, according to the Gospel.

First it is certain that forgiveness of sins was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ, and it cannot be doubted
but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving of the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefit of that ordinance, which is remission of sins. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. (Mark i:4.) And St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. (Acts ii:38.)

For how will these shifts agree with that which Ananias said unto Saul, without any mention either of repentance or confession. Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins. (Acts xxii:16,) and that which St. Paul, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the church, that Christ doth sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water. The apostles and the Christians for the first four centuries after Christ said, we believe in one immersion for the remission of sins—on this subject there was no division.

1. This is the teaching of the true and ancient Christian Church for four hundred years immediately succeeding the apostles. The apostles and the Christians for the first four centuries after Christ said, we believe in one immersion for the remission of sins—on this subject there was no division.

2. As a general rule all parties immersed for 1300 years. This is what the people now call heresy or Campbellism. As a Baptist once exclaimed who heard one of his preachers preach in Kentucky, one more dip and he will be a full blooded Campbellite.

3. All that these Episcopalians need is to practice what they teach, and leave off infants who have no sins—and they will be on apostolic ground.

4. Let me ask our opponents if Socinians are all that oppose baptism for remission of sins? If baptism is necessary to pardon sin, as the Episcopalians teach, and pardon of sin is necessary to salvation, how many sects in Christendom will be saved? Who ever read in the book of the conversion of the ancient Christians, the Acts of the
Apostles, of the remission of the sins of an infant? If any man will show me in the Acts of Apostles, the conversion of an infant or babe, he shall have ten dollars for his trouble. Infant baptism and Sectarianism have done more injury to the religion of Jesus Christ than all the infidels on earth. It was opposition to infant baptism that drew upon the ancient Baptists all their untold sufferings. From what I have read in history and seen with my eyes, it does appear to me, that a large portion of profess-ed Christians would surrender their Bibles sooner than their sectarian names, creeds and infant baptism. 

Yours, truly, J. Creath.

FAITH AND INFIDELITY—NO. VII.

ATHEISM.

"The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Psalms xlv. 1.

This is Atheism: the greatest extreme of infidelity; the most monstrous and absurd negation that was ever uttered by human lips. All other forms of infidelity concede something to Christianity. But Atheism concedes nothing. It dogmatically obliterates from the Bible, as a falsehood, every thing that is said in it respecting God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and the scheme of redemption.

It is true, there is one form of Atheism, now perhaps more commonly called Secularism, which does not go so far in its affirmations. It is rather more modest and unassuming in its pretensions. It is satisfied with doubting in regard to these matters. It does not pretend to decide positively whether there is or is not a God. There may be, or there may not be. This is a matter that does not concern the Secularist. It is enough for him he thinks, to attend to the affairs of this world: to things of the present life. All beyond this, he regards as uncertain and unimportant. And hence his motto is the old Epicurean maxim revived: "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."

But the Atheist of which David here speaks, dogmatically affirms that there is no God; no Christ, no Holy Spirit, and no redemption from death and the grave. With him, nature is every thing; and every thing is nature. Whether the universe is eternal, as Aristotle taught; or whether it is the work of chance—the mere product of matter in motion, as many of the disciples of Epicurus supposed; or whether it is the result of an infinite series of developments from primordial and uncreated monads, as most modern, Atheists affirm, may indeed be a question. On this, and also on many other kindred subjects, some of the most enlightened of the school still entertain doubts. But that there is no God; no moral government over the universe; and no future state of rewards and punishments, are matters clear as sunshine, if we may believe the testimony of such men as Diogoras, Bion and Lucion among the ancients; and d'Holbach and Compte among the moderns.

I presume then that I need not consume more time in explaining what Atheism is. It is all summed up and told in the affirmation of the fool; "There is no God." But as young persons particularly, are very liable to be misled by the mere authority of names, I wish, for their sake, to say a few things on the merits of this so called system of infidelity.

And in the first place, I wish all my readers and particularly the young to consider how very reckless, and unauthorized is this assertion of the Atheist. How does he know that there is no God? Has he seen all the parts of the universe? Has he explored its infinite dimensions; and does he comprehend everything pertaining to its structure and organization—material and immaterial? You see at once, that nothing short of infinite knowledge can justify any one in making this assertion. And yet it is made by a creature that does not know himself: that does not know the powers and capacities of his own soul: that does not comprehend many things pertaining to the little clay tabernacle in which his spirit has its present abode—a being, to whom every blade of grass, and every leaf the forest, and every particle of the earth is a mystery.
being who does not know one in a hundred of the creatures that inhabit this world; and who knows almost nothing of the ten thousand times ten thousand other worlds that compose the vast empire of Jehovah.

What would you think of the man who would stand up in a court of justice, and testify that there is no gold, nor silver, nor iron, nor copper in the moon; though he has never set a foot upon its surface, nor examined a single particle of the vast masses of which it is composed? How much would such testimony weigh with the court and jury? And yet that testimony would be reasonable compared with the dogmatical assertion made by any man, however learned, that there is no God.

There is also another circumstance, which I think detracts very much from the force and credibility of this assertion. You observe that it is not given as a logical deduction from premises, either duly or unduly assumed. On the contrary, it springs from the common source of all infidelity, the desires of the heart. The fool hath said, not in his reason, nor in his understanding, but in his heart, "There is no God." He first wishes it were so; and then he believes it to be so. Such, I think, is the testimony of all infidel experience; and such is certainly the testimony of that Spirit which tries the hearts and reins of the children of men. In speaking of Gentile idolators and Atheists, Paul says, by the Spirit, Romans i: 28, "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind—i. e. to a mind void of judgment—to do those things which were not becoming?"

It is not then because men are forced by any fair course of reasoning, that they become Atheists: but it is because, that not liking to retain God in their knowledge, and loving darkness rather than the light, God has given them over to believe a lie, that they all may be damned who obey not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.

And hence you see, in the third place, the bitter fruits and consequences of Atheism. "As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge," says the Apostle; or in other words as they desired to become Atheists, God gave them up to this disposition of mind. And the consequence was, that they became immoral and impious just in proportion as they advanced in Atheism. "Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; being full of envy, murder, deceit, malignity;" and at the same time they became "detractors, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

It was a question of dispute among the ancients, whether a community, leavened throughout with atheistical principles, could possibly, subsist. But as a majority of both statesmen and philosophers were always on the negative side of this question, the experiment was never practically made and fairly tested, till the time of the French Revolution. True, indeed, the natural and necessary tendencies of this form of infidelity, were very plainly indicated long before that ever memorable epoch. This was particularly the case, during the decline of the Greek Republics and the Roman Empire. But in A. D. 1793, the reign of Atheism commenced in France; and with it commenced, simultaneously, the reign of Terror. France was like the troubled sea: it was in fact a sea of blood. For a time, every species of iniquity prevailed to a most alarming extent. But in a little while, there was a reaction in the public mind. The people soon recoiled from a system so impious and so horrible. And the very same convention that had publicly disowned the Most High, ignored his authority, and proclaimed death to be an eternal sleep, was compelled by the immense increase of crime, to revoke their edicts; acknowledge the immortality of the soul; and bow, though reluctantly, to the government of the King eternal immortal, and invisible. Surely then a system of such tendencies cannot be a system of truth. Let us either make the
tree good, and its fruit good; or else, let us make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by its fruit.

How beautifully and how gloriously Christianity contrasts, in this respect, with this form of infidelity. Its fruits are all light, and life, and love. Its tendencies are all, "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth, peace and good will to all men."

I am aware that much wickedness has been committed in the name of Christianity. I know that "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like," have been practiced and tolerated within the very pale of the so-called church of Jesus Christ. But I also know that these crimes have no proper connection with Christianity. They are the legitimate offspring of infidelity; and can never, with any propriety, be ascribed to the teachings and workings of that blessed Spirit, whose fruits are all "love, and joy, and peace, and long suffering, and gentleness, and goodness, and fidelity, and meekness, and temperance."

Let these virtues become universal, and the very highest state of civilization of which the human race are susceptible, will soon become universal. Man will cease to hate and to annoy his fellow-man; and all the kindreds, tribes, and families of the Earth will be united in one harmonious and delightful brotherhood.

My fourth ground of objection to Atheism is, that it is directly opposed to the evidence of design and contrivance so clearly and so abundantly manifested in every department of nature. If it is true, that every effect must have had a cause, that every design implies a designer, then verily this great universe must have had an Almighty Framer and Architect. Let any man, for example, carefully examine the structure and the mechanism of the human eye, and he will say with Newton, that the study of this one organ is a cure for Atheism, if indeed it is a curable malady. Or let him look up to these beautiful stars and he will be constrained to say with David, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the earth showeth forth his handiwork."

I do not say, that without the aid of Divine Revelation, any man could have derived a correct knowledge of the character and attributes of Jehovah from the mere works of nature. This is not the question before us. There is a difference as wide as the poles between the discovery and the proof of a proposition. And it is therefore enough for our present purpose, that the truth respecting God's existence and character, first communicated to Adam and Noah by direct revelation, and afterwards transmitted to their posterity by oral and written tradition, is now corroborated and sustained by the light of all nature: so that "God's eternal power and Divinity are now clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Rom. i: 20. This, it would seem, ought to be sufficient. If the heavens and the earth, the seas and fountains of water, with all their varied and multiplied tenantry, are opposed to Atheism, then what farther need have we of witnesses? Surely we might rest the matter just here, and allow the voice of nature, which is now distinctly heard in all the earth to proclaim its Maker's praise.

But after all, it is in the Bible, and from the Bible, and through the Bible, that we have most convincing and satisfactory evidence against Atheism and every other species and form of infidelity. Indeed the evidence is perfectly overwhelming. We need no other. And the man who is not convinced by this, would not be persuaded though one witness or one thousand witnesses should rise from the dead, to testify to the world the existence of God, and the gloriously realities of the spiritual universe.

How, for example, can the Atheist, or the Pantheist, or the Naturalist, or the Spiritualist account for the fact, that the promise made by God in Paradise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the
serpent, has been so exactly fulfilled in the person of Jesus of Nazareth? How can he account for the fact, that the prophecy of Noah respecting his three sons and their posterity, has been illustrated and confirmed by the history of more than 4000 years?—How can he account for the fact, that in and through the seed of Abraham, all the nations of the earth have been blessed? How or can he account for the fact, that Jesus appeared as the Shiloh or Prince of peace, just a little while before the sceptre departed from Judah, and that to him has since been the gathering of the people? How can he account for the fact, that every type of Moses has its exact counterpart in the Christian Institution; and that without the latter, the former would be as empty, and as worthless, and as inexplicable, as a shadow without a substance? How can he account for the fact, that just at the beginning of the 70th week after the date of the decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, the Messiah appeared; confirmed the covenant with many for one week, or part of a week; and that in the midst of the week, he was put to death as a malefactor, though acknowledged by most modern skeptics to be the greatest and best reformer that ever lived? How can he account for the fact, that soon after this as predicted by Daniel, the City of Jerusalem was swept away as by a flood; that the Jews were then scattered among all the nations; and that their present condition, as well as their history for the last 1800 years, exactly corresponds to what Moses and Christ predicted concerning them? How can he account for the fact, that soon after the death of Christ, as has been acknowledged even by Tacitus and other profane historians, a new institution was founded by his few humble and despised followers; that this Institution has flourished despite the opposition, and hatred, and malice of Jews and Gentiles; that it now claims as its advocates and supporters the most enlightened, the purest, and the best portions of the human race; and that judging from the signs of the times, this institution or kingdom, which was at first indeed but as a grain of mustard seed, or like a little stone cut out of a mountain without hands, is itself likely to become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth?—How can he account for the fact, that the Bible, composed as it was by so many authors, and under so great a diversity of time, place, and other circumstances, should be perfectly harmonious within itself and correspond so exactly with the most recent developments of modern science in any and every department of nature to which it refers? And finally, how can he account for the fact, that when the doctrines and sentiments of this Blessed Volume, are received into the head and heart of any man, and developed in his life, they change his whole nature, character, and disposition; filling his heart with love, and peace, and joy; and at the same time, inspiring him with an earnest desire to do good to all men as he may have opportunity?

Ah, my dear readers, there is but one way to answer these and ten thousand other questions of like import. And that is by conceding the fact that the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth, and that the Bible is a revelation of his will to fallen man.

And after all, this is just what every good man desires. To the morally impure and corrupt, the idea of God's presence and governement, is of course full of terror and remorse. For to all such, God is a consuming fire. But to the pure in heart, nothing can be more delightful and consoling than this thought. To know that though we are weak, and erring, and helpless, yet that our Father is omnipotent; omniscient and omnipresent; kind, and merciful, and good; that if we are only faithful and obedient for a little while, he will cleanse us from all our sins, purify our hearts, and lead us safely through the dark valley of the shadow of death, to the joys, and honors, and pleasures of his everlasting kingdom;—this, I say is just what every child of God desires. And nothing short of this can ever satisfy the desires of the human soul. "Beware, then, lest any many spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

R. MILLIGAN.