

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

American Christian Quarterly Review

Scholarly Quarterlies

1863

American Christian Quarterly Review, Volume 2, 1863

Benjamin Franklin

American Christian Quarterly Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/americanchristianquarterlyreview>

Recommended Citation

Franklin, Benjamin, "American Christian Quarterly Review, Volume 2, 1863" (1863). *American Christian Quarterly Review*. 2.

<https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/americanchristianquarterlyreview/2>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarly Quarterlies at Digital Commons @ Disciples History. It has been accepted for inclusion in American Christian Quarterly Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Disciples History. For more information, please contact jmcmillan@discipleshistory.org.

T H E

AMERICAN CHRISTIAN

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. II.

CINCINNATI, 1863.

No. 1.

MODERN REVIVALISM.

No. I.

In our time there are three systems of accumulating members in churches, as follows :

1. By "dedicating" unconscious infants to the Lord, as it is styled, making them members of church before they know any thing, and growing them up in the Church.
2. By excitements, brought on by any means or appliances which the genius of modern inventiveness can introduce.
3. By preaching the gospel of Christ, making rational, sensible and consistent appeals to the reason, understanding and judgment of the people, to turn to the Lord that they may be saved.

The time has come, in this country, when the merits of these systems must undergo the most rigid scrutiny. The spirit of investigation is abroad and while the great civil commotions and upheavings are shaking the institutions of the world, from their centre to their circumference, the searching eye of investigation is penetrating into the depths of the corruptions, innovations and perversions which have been destroying the glorious religion of our Redeemer and opening them up to the gaze of an intelligent and thinking population. The time has come when deception and imposture of every sort, in the name of religion, must be ferreted out.

I. Touching the first means of accumulating members in churches, mentioned

above, we have but little to say now. It is not the main subject we are aiming at. We only have space for the following observations now :

1. We give the infant membership system credit for being successful beyond any human expedient, in augmenting the numerical strength of churches. In this respect it has thrown all others into the shade entirely.
2. While this system has succeeded so well in augmenting the membership of churches it has set aside regeneration or conversion, almost entirely where it has prevailed, making *flesh* and not *spirit* the *first* birth and not the *second* the *old* birth and not the new the basis of membership. A mere fleshly relation entitles a person to membership. Instead of the old doctrine of Paul, that the *flesh profits nothing*, in the new order of things, inaugurated by the man of sin, the *flesh profits much*.
3. It destroys the line of demarkation between the Church and the world, so that no one can tell where the one ends and the other begins. It has united the world and the Church, as well as the Church and state.
4. It is an easy system of proselytism. The minds of the little helpless infants yield to the mother's will, as the mother's will yields to the will of the priest. It requires no argument, knowledge or learning; no talent, piety or zeal to proselyte the little

fellows before they can believe or disbelieve, yield or resist, but are subject to the will of the mother and the priest. This is truly a light work—proselyting these tender little fellows! Great men are they who do this work! Well do pontifical robes, crosses, mystic signs and badges suit these men! Great is the mystery of the system that not only makes Christians of human beings by sprinkling a few drops of water on the forehead or, as is now the more fashionable way, laying moistened fingers on the forehead, without faith, the influence of the Spirit, a change of heart, or even the volitions of the persons, but before they know it, or that there is a God or a Savior!!! This is the climax of absurdity, the most wonderful imposture practiced before high and holy heaven in a land claiming to be enlightened.

II. *Modern Revivalism* is the theme claiming our attention now. We are not speaking of the sound, sensible and wholesome influence of gospel preaching, the influence brought to bear upon society by preaching Christ, the impression of truth upon the souls of men, the deep and thrilling interest produced by a rational forcible and powerful exhibition of the word of God. This is all right. This was the kind of influence exercised by the apostles and all the first preachers of the gospel. Our business now relates to the modern revival and of course, including all the elements that enter into it. Is that thing called revivalism a good thing or an evil? Is it right, or wrong? The time has now come to look into it.

For the past two years we have scarcely heard of an old-fashioned revival, or revivalist. The revivalists had quit their work of revivalism, turned politicians, stump orators, army officers, and, where they could, legislators, or attained to other posts of honor or profit, for which, for the time being, they gave up the *divine call* to preach, and accepted a *call from mammon or the world*. During their absence, the converting power did not "come down," sinner did not get "under conviction" and revivals

did not occur. The spirit of revivals departed, the number of Church members diminished most fearfully. But more recently we hear accounts of a few revivalists being *called* and *sent* back to their former work. A few revivals are heard of and we feel like taking a peep into their work.

1. The first thing we shall look for is a suitable man for a revivalist. What are the requisite qualifications for a modern revivalist? Reader, are you thinking of the qualifications pointed out by Paul for a Christian overseer or deacon? In vain do you think of these. Paul was not there speaking of the office we have in view. He was there speaking of officers in the church of Christ. We are speaking of a different kind of officer. Are you thinking of a grave, dignified and profound man? If you are, you are greatly mistaken. That is not the man for a modern revivalist. Are you thinking of a man of learning, knowledge and erudition? Then you are deluded. Are you thinking of a man familiar with his Bible, with the prophets, Jesus and the apostles? If so, your thoughts are all vain. Are you thinking of the polite, accomplished and polished gentleman? If so, you have never studied the subject. What, then, are the requisite qualifications of a modern revivalist? They are the following:

1. A man with a flashing eye, who can give significant looks, and almost speak with the expression of the eye. Indeed, this is advantageous for any public-speaker.
2. A fine melodious voice, under good command. This is also of great advantage to any public speaker.
3. A good share of conceit, self importance and brazen-faced assurance.
4. Well posted in the lowest order of newspaper literature, all the passing events around, the catch-phrases, crank sayings and big words of the hags on the streets.
5. Strong lungs, impulsive and passionate, with large hands, which, when brought together in a certain way common to the revivalist, will produce a concussion equal to the explosion of a pistol. This latter is an *essential* qualification for a revivalist.

6. Not extremely modest, not especially scrupulous nor conscientious; willing to risk a prophecy, that some one present will meet a sudden and unexpected death, that a pestilence will rage, or that a great revival of religion will take place.

7. One who can suddenly descend from sublime to the ridiculous; who can maneuver in a hundred little ways to get the people committed, such as requesting all who believe the Bible to be true to rise to their feet, or all who desire to be saved to rise, or all who desire sinners to be converted to rise.

8. A man who can "uncap hell" and describe the blue blazes, the writhings and wailings of the damned.

9. A man who is in the habit of kneeling on the steps of the pulpit, as he is about to enter it, and praying in secret before an audience!

10. Not a man who, in his public exhibitions, orders his words in his prayers with discretion, prudence, judgment and moderation before the Lord; but a man who resembles in his prayers the prophets of Baal, as "they cried aloud and cut themselves with lancets till the blood gushed out upon them." No matter about the sense of the prayer. The sound is the all-important thing. Suplications for the kingdom to come, eighteen centuries after it has come, for a "baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire," or for the Lord to "come down" —to "come quick"—"come now"—"to fulfill his promise," &c., &c, uttered in screams, will answer the purpose as well as anything else.

Such is a brief outline of the principal qualifications of a revivalist.

II. *How to "get up a revival."* "Hold," exclaims the reader; "you don't think that man can get up a revival!" Certainly we do. We most deliberately declare that nobody but man does get up revivals. They are as certainly of man, human, and only human, as spirit-raping, mesmerism, the shaking of the Quakers, or the dancing of the Shakers. "They are certainly produced by the power of God, and the work

done is a work of grace," says the reader. Then, the work of which we read, performed by our Lord and his apostles was not from God—not a "work of grace;" for their work and the work done in a modern revival are not the same. They are as different as day and night, different in manner, preaching, doctrine, name, practice, and results—in a word, different throughout.—If the apostle Peter would rise from the dead and enter a revival meeting and preach such a sermon as he did on Pentecost, and when penitents would inquire, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" if he should give the same directions he did on Pentecost; "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," it would brake up a modern revival, and the leaders in the revival would put him out of the meeting.—Or should Annanias enter a modern revival and find persons praying, as in the case of Saul, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" and give the same answer he did in that case, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," the leaders in the revival would hasten him to the door and advise him to lose no time in finding the way out.

That men "get up revivals" is evident to all who reflect, and the churches in which revivals occur *know that men get them up.*—Hence, when they want a revival they send for a *revivalist*. Why send for him? They want him to get up a revival. Why do they not send for a man who can pray well, a good man, a man of piety, who can intercede with God and get him to "send down converting power?" Because they know that this modern converting power is *in the revivalist*, and they expect *him to get up the revival*. They want a man who can make an impression on the people, a *powerful man*, who can make a powerful impression, and bring down the converting power. If "the work of grace," as they style it, or "the converting power," is directly from God, why not any two or three true believers, or even one, intercede with the Lord and get him to send down the converting power and

convert whole communities without the revivalist? Why does not the converting power come down upon whole families at home and convert them without any revival or revivalist? Why is the converting power limited in its influences to the mere circle of the revivalists? Why does not the converting power go where there is no revivalist and do the work? But who is there in this land who does not know that the people themselves set the time, make the arrangements, select their man, commence meeting, all use their influence, go to work and get up the revival themselves? These things are clear to all.

This is sufficient for one paper. We shall explain the matter more fully in our next.

B. F.

A CRITICISM ON THE ENGLISH OF THE BIBLE UNION GOSPELS.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—I have just finished an examination of "The Four Gospels, as finally revised by the Bible Union." With others, I had long waited for the appearance of this version; and I, therefore, read with much interest these first fruits of many years' labor and study.

Since this revision is now the property of the "Society for whose use it is prepared;" and since by its publication, it has become the property, also, of the Christian world in general; it is certainly the privilege of any one, especially the "common reader, for whose use it is intended," to judge whether its merits are equal to its pretensions, and whether the work meets the expectations that have been raised.

There is but one thing, in my judgment, that can justify a public and organized effort to publish a new version or a new translation of the Scriptures; and that is the certainty that the proposed version shall be free from the admitted imperfections of the old one. The fact that these imperfec-

tions have, of late, been exposed with so much zeal to the popular eye, has made a revision necessary now, even had it been inexpedient to attempt it before. But to shake the confidence of the people in the received text, and to lessen their reverence for it, by severe and searching criticism, and then to fail in the attempt to expurgate that text of many of the errors on account of which the people had been persuaded almost to reject it, would, indeed, prove a serious injury to the church at large.

With respect to the REVISED GOSPELS just published by the Bible Union, this question, therefore, at once arises: *Is this version free from those imperfections the existence of which in the old version, caused us to desire a new one?*

These errors are either of translation, or of composition. They lie either on the Greek or the English side of the work.—The *construction* is faithful, where it simply gives the thoughts of the Inspired writer. The *composition* is perspicuous, where these thoughts are given in good English.—What we need, and what we have been led to expect, is a version of the sacred Scriptures at once *faithful and perspicuous* if not *elegant*. We desire a version that will yield the sense of the Spirit in good language—in the beautiful English sentence of the present day; for a version that our children and the people at large may read and study and commit to memory, and grow, not only wise in Heaven's wisdom, but at the same time, pure in native speech.

What, then, are the merits and imperfections of the work before us?—"The Gospels" as Revised by the Bible Union. Have the errors so frequently pointed out to us, and so generally admitted, been expurgated?

We make this enquiry in reference to those errors that affect its perspicuity and elegance, *as an English book*; leaving to others, or referring to a more convenient season, the consideration of its *faithfulness*.

We ought to feel that criticism has been somewhat disarmed by the very candid

statement made by the Revisers in their address "To the Readers," in these words :

"The Committee of Revisers have kept in mind, that their work is intended for the use of the common reader, and that many of the nicer distinctions of idiom and phraseology which are appropriate in a version for the learned or for use in the lecture-room, *would be out of place here.*"

Respectfully suggesting, however, to the candid Revisers that the "*unlearned*" and "*the common reader*" would, perhaps, have been as much aided by pure "idiom" and correct phraseology," in their study of God's word, as those who frequent the "lecture-room," or who are already "learned" in languages; we shall, consequently, forbear to notice, in this paper, every instance of that confessed neglect of those "nicer distinctions of idiom and phraseology," which, in a book designed for the "common reader," would be, as we are assured by the committee, altogether out of place.

1. There is a class of words in our language, the regular and proper use of which, is supposed by some to impart to an English composition a *solemn or grave style*, as our grammarians call it. These words are such as "thou," "thee," "thine," "they," and such verbs as end in "st" or "th." We say the *proper and regular use* of such forms, is said to solemnize speech; because when a careless or inexpert writer, by employing these contrivances, ceases to be natural, and would become solemn, the improper or contradictory use of these forms is apt to render his style ridiculous. We cannot agree fully with Dr. Latham in his judgment that the "words 'thou' and 'thee' are, except in the mouths of Quakers, obsolete;" but we believe that it would have been more agreeable to the taste of "the common reader," if this *solemn style* had been employed by the Revisers, only in the prayers and other addresses to the Divine Being. We would, at least, have had these forms scrupulously preserved in our literature, and, in some degree, sanctified as proper to the *devotional style*. But since they thought it best to retain or to reproduce this solemn feature of the

old version, we regret that they have sometimes caricatured it by what seems to be a careless or a capricious taste.

Matt. vii. 8, "For every one that *asketh, receiveth*; and he that *seeketh findeth.*"

Matt. vii. 17, "Every tree that *brings* not forth good fruit."

Matt. vii. 27, "Every one that *hears* these sayings of mine and *doeth* them."

The "*unlearned*" reader will be at a loss to know why the words, "*brings*" and "*hears*" in these passages, should have been modernized, and yet the obsolete verb "*doeth*" retained,—a word which seems to be unknown to his lexicographer. Or, if such freedom with the old version is allowable for sake of easy elocution, why not smoothen down such passages as this, where the euphonious seems to be sacrificed to the solemn?

Jno. xxi. 18, "Verily, verily, I say to thee, when thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldst."

2. Another class of words of common though irregular use in this version, have not the pretext even of an artificial style for their appearance; such are "oft," "oft-times," "sicknesses," "alms," "whatsoever," "from thence," "spake," "unwashed," "gathered together," "up upon," "cast out out of" "unto," &c., &c.

Concerning this word "*unto*," it is interesting to notice the apparent necessity that caused it to be retained. According to WEBSTER, it is a word not in our mother tongue, and ought to be rejected as obsolete and not legitimate. WORCESTER says that it is found in Scripture, "especially when motion towards an object is implied." But the Committee have retained it, not only in spite of its character as an obsolete and illegitimate word, but they have used it in most passages, in a sense different from that which WORCESTER supposes it to have been in Scripture:

Matt. xix. 14, "Suffer little children to come *to me.*" But in other passages generally, where "*unto*" is retained it is made to signify, "*till the time of,*" or "*till.*"

Matt. i. 17, "From Abraham *unto* David," &c.

Matt. xxvii. 8, "Wherefore the field was called the field of blood, *unto* this day."

Matt. xxvii. 45, "There was darkness over all the land *unto* the ninth hour."

Mark xiii. 13, "But he that has endured *unto* the end shall be saved."

The meaning of this useless word as employed by the Revisers, having been determined from such passages as those here cited, it is somewhat surprising to find it retained in the following:

Matt. iii. 11, "I indeed immerse you in water *unto* repentance." Is the "unlearned" reader to understand from this, that John immersed men *until* they repented? If not, does the word here, signify "motion, or progress towards an object?" Why is the common reader thus left untaught, by reason of inattention on the part of the Revisers to "the nicer distinctions of idiom and phraseology."? Would not a little more *faithfulness*, or a little more perspicuity, have required the use of the preposition *unto*, or *in order to*? or, as they sometimes render the Greek word in other places, *for*? A version for the *lecture room* would have, doubtless, allowed the Revisers to say: "I immerse you in water *in order to* repentance."

3. I fear that the class of readers for whom especially this version was prepared, will, in their want of learning, prefer the old text to the new in the following places:

Matt. xii. 10, *Revised Version*, "And behold there was a man having his hand withered."

Old Version: "And behold there was a man which had his hand withered."

Matt. xii. 42, *Revised Version*, "A queen of the south shall rise up."

Old Version, "The queen of the south shall rise up."

Mark iv. 29, *Revised Version*, "But when the fruit permits, immediately he puts forth the sickle."

Old Version: "But when the fruit is

brought forth, immediately he puts in the sickle."

Mark vi. 2, *Revised Version*, "And what is the wisdom which is given him, and such miracles wrought by his hands?"

Old Version: "And what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?"

Mark vii. 11, *Revised Version*: "It is Corban (that is, a gift) whatsoever thou mightest be profited with from me."

Old Version: "It is Corban, that is to say a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me."

Mark ix. 9, *Revised Version*: "He charged them that they should relate what they had seen to no one, except when the Son of man shall have risen from the dead."

Old Version: "He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead."

Luke viii. 15, *Revised Version*: "But that in the good ground, these are they."

Old Version: "But that on the good ground are they."

Luke xxi. 11, *Revised Version*: "Great portents and signs."

Old Version: "Fearful sights and great signs."

4. We regret that in a *Revision*, the only apology for which, is the imperfection of the old Text, such awkward expressions as the following should so often occur. Surely, it would not have been in violation of any principle of criticism and revision which they had adopted for their guidance, if the Committee had turned these expressions into fair English, instead of carelessly copying them into their own Version?

Luke xii. 33, "Sell that ye have."

Luke xiii. 4, "On whom the tower of Siloam fell and slew them."

Luke xx. 28, "Moses wrote to us."

Luke viii. 31, "To go away into the deep."

Matt. xv. 32, "They continue with me now three days."

Luke xxiv. 16, "Their eyes were holden."

The errors to which we have called at-

tention, lie wholly on the English face of the version. They are enough to satisfy an impartial reader, that the Revision has not been prepared with that care which the nature and importance of the work demanded. We hope, however, that more attention has been given by the learned Revisers to the ascertaining of the meaning of the Greek, than they seem to have paid to English "idiom and phraseology." But on this point we may have more to say hereafter. In the mean time we cannot forget the words of the Great Teacher: "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much." *

THE GOSPEL—AN INDUCTION.

NO. III.

Since the times of the apostles no such attempt has been made to restore the old paths and revive that which was "from the beginning" as in the present successful movement made by the Disciples of Christ.—Thousands have been redeemed from the slavery of opinion and the base surrender of their minds to the theories of uninspired men founded upon detached members of the Scriptures. The deep and eternal foundations of the "truth as it is in Jesus" have been discovered, as they were found in the oracles of God, but buried beneath the rubbish of ages. The superstructure of that divine Temple erected upon it, has been displayed in all its original beauty and just proportions in contrast with the pagodas and mosques of an apostate and Mongrel race. May no rude hands disturb again its divinely fashioned form, or introduce materials to mar its beauty. It needs no aid either from Egypt, Babylon or Rome. Jerusalem is the mother of us all! Sectaries and state religions, are, like the broken pillars and ruined arches of imperial Rome, wrought into the uncouth and temporary

dwellings of the apostate city on the Tiber. The traveler is shocked by the strange contrast, and asks what do they here. We had no ruins from Babylon, however grand and imposing, to build up the walls of the Temple of God, or to mock by their presence the goodly stones of the sacred Fane. The old foundations are still there; and the Temple now stands, as of old, polished after the similitude of a palace.

As a practical illustration of the workings of the law of induction, we will call attention to the subject of faith. We think it will be seen that without a careful consideration of all its conditions, no safe or sound conclusions can be reached in regard to it.

Faith, or belief, is one of the elements of the Gospel, and, is essentially demanded in the new life which christianity requires. Indeed, it is the foundation of all true religion, past and present; without it, no one can please God. It is everywhere demanded as a duty, not because of its virtue or abstract value, or as a positive act of obedience to God; but because of its necessity in our relations to the unseen and the eternal. By this principle, alone, can the saving truths of the Gospel reach the heart and control the will. Our character takes the complexion of the great fact revealed in the Gospel of Christ. This is the divine mould into which the soul is cast, and faith is the only hand by which the process can be effected. The constitution of our nature is such, that the distant and the unseen can only be brought nigh and become a living presence, by the exercise of faith. It is not, then, an arbitrary law, without reason and against the fitness of things; but a wise, just and necessary requirement, as much demanded by the things of this world as by those of the next. What, then, are the conditions of its existence in the heart of man? Does it depend upon one or more conditions; and do the Scriptures point them out to us? Nothing but a careful examination of the divine record will enable us to answer these questions.

Suppose, then, we lay it down as a basis

of argument, that faith is a gift graciously bestowed on the sinner, and that, in its reception he is perfectly passive. Will this condition account for its existence, independently of all others? If so, then we are compelled to admit it, and dismiss any other theory. Any thing else, would but embarrass the subject and vitiate the deduction we should draw from it. If this cause will account for its presence, we should not seek for any other. In other words, if the irresistible influences of the Spirit produce in us the faith of the Gospel, then all other causes are of no value, and must be thrown out of the account. But as we are dependent upon the oracles of God for all we know upon this subject, and as they direct us to other causes, we are bound to take them in and give them their true relative value or do violence to them and fail in reaching any solid results in our argument. Let us look, then, at those passages relied upon, to prove that faith is a gift, directly bestowed on the sinner by God. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. ii: 8. This scripture, apparently, more fully declares the fact, than any to be found in the Bible. But what is it, in the text that is called "the gift of God?" Is it grace, salvation or faith, or is it the whole system which brings salvation to men? The relative *it* must refer to some antecedent in the sentence, or to all that it contains. But as faith is in the feminine gender; and "*it*" in the neuter, faith cannot be the antecedent, but, by a well established law in language, the whole sentence must be. It will not do to adopt this as indispensable premise on which to found a law for the existence of faith in the human mind. There are two many difficulties connected with it. But even should faith be regarded as a gift from God, there are other assignable causes developed in the Scriptures; and, unless these can be taken into the premises they will be shut out of the record, as if they were not to be found there, or had no reason to intrude into the place of what already sufficiently ex-

plains the whole matter. But who has a right, thus, to sit in judgment where God has already decided? And why may not faith, as a gift, be as recklessly cast out, as faith "coming by hearing?" It is certain, then, that no just conclusions can be reached, but by a comprehensive induction which shall give full consideration to all that is said upon the subject, inasmuch as the conclusions should be as broad as the premises.

Again, it is said that the following passage teaches that faith is a gift,—“For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.” Phil. i: 29. This can hardly be relied on to prove that faith is a gift, only so far as suffering on account of his name is one; for in the same sense as it is the privilege of the christian to suffer in behalf of Christ, so it is his privilege to believe in his name. But the “adversaries” who occasioned this suffering will be doomed “to perdition” on account of it—of which indeed “it is an evident token.” No one will say that the persecutions which fell on the saints, came directly from the hands of Christ, and no one has a right to say that the faith which sustained them under it, was a gift directly bestowed on them. The gift of suffering and believing both belong to the same category. The christian profession had subjected them to persecution, just as the gospel had placed them in the power of believing. It would not be safe to depend upon a passage encumbered with so many difficulties on which to found such a theory. Both the sufferings and the faith are said to be given!

But again it is urged that Paul says “To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; and to another *faith* by the same Spirit.” 1 Cor. xii: 8, 9. But here, “*faith*” is classed among the spiritual gifts, bestowed upon the *brethren* in Corinth in the same sense that “*wisdom*” and “*knowledge*” were given, and, also, the gift of tongues. The faith spoken of as thus *given*, was not the faith of the gospel, for already in becoming disciples they had believed;

“Many of the Corinthians, *hearing* believed and were baptized.” Faith as a spiritual gift was bestowed upon them; after they had been saved. It was wholly supernatural and not designed for their own benefit but for that of others. It was a strong persuasion that they were able to work miracles in the name of Christ—a faith that could remove mountains. 1 Cor. xiii: 2. It was the *faith* that Peter and John had in the name of Christ, that drew the power that healed the cripple at the beautiful gate of the Temple. Acts iii: 16.

These are the passages on which, chiefly, is based the opinion, that faith is a gift; and it is seen, how inadequate they are to sustain it. But if they were to be accepted as parts of the premises (which we deny) they can not form the ground-work on which any absolute conclusions should be founded.

We shall now look at other passages which directly refer to the existence of faith; no generalization can be admitted that will not fully embrace these: “Isaiah saith, Lord who hath believed our report? So, then, faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.” Rom. x. 16, 17. Here faith is clearly stated to have its origin in hearing the word of God, or the report of which Isaiah spoke. Before the New Testament was written, or men had access to it, the word of God was preached by the apostles and others, and faith was ascribed to this cause. Mark xvi: 15, 16. Acts xv: 7. But in other cases faith is attributed not only to hearing but to reading “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word, (the gospel,) with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures (of the Old Testament) daily, whether these things were so. *Therefore*, many of them believed.” Acts 17, 11. Thus, they heard the gospel as preached by the apostle, and searched at home the prophetic Scriptures, to see whether what he said corresponded with what they read, and therefore many of them believed. The candor and honesty of the Bereans were worthy of all praise; and those virtues

must be taken into the account in making up our premises, or the subject of believing. If candor and honesty are wanting, there can be no faith in an unwelcome truth, no matter whether it is human or divine. They had that child-like disposition, which all should have, in accepting truth when supported and sustained by competent authority.

JAMES CHALLEN.

Davenport, Jan. 3rd, 1863.

PREACHING HELL.

MR. EDITOR:—With your permission, I will publish under the above caption several articles, the object of which will be to illustrate; *First*—*The necessity of a thorough conviction of sin previous to baptism; Secondly*—*The best method of effecting so desirable an object—that is, what Bible truths are best calculated to convict of sin.* In pursuing this purpose, I shall confine myself to the duty of preacher as the agent of the Holy Spirit without speculating as to other modes in which the Spirit might operate. I am well content to know that the Spirit does work through his word and that this is the instrument put into our hands as preachers. Bro. Campbell said in his debate with Rice, that, for aught he knew, there might be “other influences” brought to bear upon the sinner’s mind in certain specified ways which he would not discuss. As we can neither prove nor disprove a certain kind of assertions as to spiritual agencies, we should not discuss them, but confine ourselves to the work of the ministry under the magic of whose influence many a Felix has been made to tremble in view of the judgment to come.

By conviction of sin is meant nothing different from that state of heart designated by repentance. It is that condition of the soul which renders the sinner not only will-

ing, but anxious to obey the Lord; he not only acquiesces in the will of God but is very desirous to do it. The language of conviction is "Lord what will thou have me to do?" The necessity of such a state of heart previous to baptism will appear from the following considerations:

1st. *Without such conviction he will fail of remission of sins.* Remission is not promised to every one who is baptized. All who are buried in the water are not necessarily baptized into Christ. A preacher is occasionally found who carelessly puts the question; how do you know you are in Christ? Because you have been *baptized into Christ*. This is a correct answer provided the sinner has really been buried *with Christ in baptism*, but to be buried *in water* and to be buried *with Christ in baptism*, may be acts of a very different character. A man may be buried alone and not in company with Christ. If by faith and repentance, by a conviction of his sins, he have Christ in his heart, and is baptized, he is then buried with Christ, and will also rise from his mellow tomb with Christ. Christ the hope of glory must go with the sinner, in his soul, both into and out of the water. Then may remission be looked for. As the air rushes into every vacuum so Christ will occupy every tenantless house and fill every soul with his presence where sin has been expelled from the will; but if sin still occupy the affection we cannot induce Jesus to accompany us down into the water; and as the sinner is buried alone and rises alone, Christ has nothing to do with the performance, and will not, can not grant remission of sins. A baptism that does not take Christ down into the water and bring him up out of the water has no connection with pardon. As preachers we should be careful never to build upon the foundation such unconverted wood, hay and stubble, nor perform this solemn marriage ceremony over parties who have no spiritual affinities, lest by thus establishing a mere mechanical, instead of a chemical, union of the affections we deceive the sinner to his own destruction. Hence the necessity of conviction of sin may be

measured by the value of pardon, and this by the value of the soul itself.

2nd. *In the presence of such conviction it is very easy to bring men to open obedience.*—The world may oppose, sin seem too great to be forgiven and a timid heart may fear to venture; but when the high tide of conviction rolls over the soul, bearing off all opposition, the soul cries out, "I'll go to Jesus though my sins do like a mountain rise." "What shall I do, Lord?" becomes the true exponent of the feelings. How soon he is satisfied that immersion is all right. Never asks if sprinkling would do as well; never counts his beads of morality; never thinks himself as good as members of the church, nor props up upon hypocritical professors, but

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that my Savior died for me,
And that thou bidst me come to Thee;
Oh! Lamb of God, I come"

Yonder, in his pew, sits a gentleman of great respectability. He has heard every sermon throughout your protracted meeting; seems to feel uneasy at times; his good wife wishes him to join; sermons are prepared to suit his case; the minister visits him; he meekly bears, or gently parries every attempt to reach his heart; the meeting is approaching its close; the last night, the last exhortation, last song, and all hopes are disappointed. What's wanting? More knowledge? A better argument for immersion? Another sermon on the "terms of salvation?" No, no, he will not repent. Conviction, repentance, a contrite heart are wanting. His coat of mail easily turns the edge of your sword. But why will he not repent? Perhaps he has very inadequate views of what sin is—a very pardonable thing at the worst. He is therefore self-righteous, for as he is not a very bad man, he must be a pretty good one. Let him however be taught how loathsome a thing sin is in the sight of God, and be cut to the heart with a sense of his own transgressions, and lo, what a change!—

"In his hand no price he brings,
Simply to the cross he clings."

3. This humbleness of heart on account of sin *will dissipate all excuses for continued disobedience*. One of the commonest excuses is the divisions among Christians—sectarianism—don't know where to go. Some very good ministers have so failed to understand the human heart as to admit this plea in part. It should be remembered that whatever wrongs there may be in this direction, the objection is very seldom honestly made. If an impenitent heart has not this objection it will have some other. The church in apostolic times was essentially a unit, and yet how many, even then, rejected the gospel. A young Eclectic physician once parried my appeal to him with this objection. I replied, "How does it happen, Doctor, that among so many different schools of medicine you selected the one you now practice? Here are Allopathy, Hydropathy, Homeopathy, Eclecticism and the all the other systems. The confusion of claims in this case did not so distract your judgment. Why not study religion as you did medicine—study for truth and adopt a course." I soon discovered the poor man felt no load of sin, and found it convenient to shield himself behind this excuse. He seemed to desire more intellectual light, but a penitent heart was his greatest want.

Another gentleman, of much learning and some philosophy, had been for months regularly attending on the ministry of the Word, and on being approached as to his duty to God, said he had certain historical and philosophical difficulties in regard to the Bible, which, if removed, would open up to him the highway of his duty, which he would surely enter upon. A conference between him and the minister being held, and his troubles being removed to his professed satisfaction, his obedience was confidently looked for by the young preacher; but strange to say, (no, naturally enough) he was not afterwards found in the congregation once a month. The disease was not of the head but of the heart. He did not see himself a lost sinner. As headache often proceeds from a derangement of the stomach, so intellectual blindness may result from a

perverted heart. The quack often blisters the head when he ought to purify the stomach; but does a skillful physician not always apply the remedy to the part in which the pain is felt? He never poultices a red nose, nor applies a leech to the bloodshot eye. The preacher should not always be doctoring the well-enough-informed, but excuse-producing, head when the heart has never been pierced, the conscience roused, nor the will subdued.

4th. If the unconvicted are baptized they make but worthless members of the church. Seldom at prayer-meetings, an irregular attendant on preaching, takes a far back seat, except meetings of business, or discipline or of some church trouble when he is always there on a front seat. Don't read much; pray less; finds much fault and pays but little.

5th. Without conviction he *can have no religious enjoyment in his own soul*. Having never seen the pit whence he was taken, or was to be taken, he can never be thankful for a deliverance. And this is reasonable enough, for he has experienced a salvation to be thankful for. Much forgiven, much love; little forgiven, little love; nothing forgiven, no love; and no love, no heaven. The fallow ground should be broken up deep, the deeper the subsoiling the richer the crop. The hammer of the word of God must "break the rock in pieces," or the puny plant will soon die where there is so little earth.

6th. If baptized without feeling his sins, believing himself born of the Spirit he looks around for the promised bliss of the new state—does not find it, is *disappointed, discouraged, and forsakes the church*. He is legally in the marriage relation without its affections and pleasures. It is now next to impossible to convert him. It is difficult to ignite again the match that expired when only half-lighted. He is to be sympathized with, and patiently taught the first lessons of spiritual birth if ever saved.

From the above considerations may be seen the value of a thorough conviction of sin previous to baptism. How then shall

we most effectually produce this state of mind? A certain very popular error among both preachers and churches shall receive attention in our next.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

A POPULAR OBJECTION ANSWERED.

Our opponents sometimes undertake to show that the application of every term of the apostolic commission to sinners, in order to their salvation from sin, contradicts certain declarations of the Savior. These declarations are the following:

"He that believeth on him is not condemned." "He that believeth on the son hath everlasting life." Jno. iii: 18-36.—Again—"verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is past from death unto life." Ib. v: 24.

Now if Christ were speaking of belief, alone, disconnected entirely from its fruits or legitimate results, then it would indeed follow that the sinner is pardoned the moment he believes, without repentance, baptism, prayer, or any other condition whatever. That faith is a principle of action in man, all admit. Then it contains a moral obligation, and motives, to act. Faith finds its duty, and its motives to duty, in itself. I suppose that no Bible student, or any one of plain good sense, will deny this. Why, then, should it be taken for granted that, in the passages cited, Christ is employing the term faith, in the abstract? Why assume that in his usage faith is taken by itself, to the exclusion of its obligations and motives? And that what is affirmed of it, is affirmed of the *principle* of action, independent of any action that belongs to it? Now I ask, Is there such a use of this word in the Bible? I boldly answer that such an instance can nowhere be found.

Let us, therefore, examine the usage of this word in the sacred style. Paul gives us a definition of faith, and fortifies it with the usage of the entire Hebrew Scriptures. "Faith"—he says—"is confidence, as it respects things hoped for—conviction, as it respects things not seen." Heb. xi: 1. Here we have two elements: 1. Confidence in the divine promises; 2. Conviction of the reality of things that lie beyond the reach of the human mind, and whose existence is attested to us solely by the word of God.

These two elements constitute faith in the Scripture use of the word. The word of God is the subject matter of faith; and not theological dogmas and opinions. These logical formulas, together with their ideal systems, are but food for the imagination, and are no two objects of faith; and the soul that tries to live on them will be sickly and weakly, ever suffering innumerable disorders.

The salvation of Noah is assumed by the apostle as being strictly within the limits of the definition he had given, and as confirming it. The words of Paul are these—"By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by which [faith and obedience] he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Heb. xi: 7. Take another example: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out not knowing whither he went."

Every example furnished in the xi chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, illustrate and confirms the definition given in the first verse; and shows that faith is valuable and great only in proportion to its works or effects. So far, therefore, from being contemplated separate or apart from action, the very reverse is true, and in every instance faith is *only* faith, when issuing in unre-served, cordial obedience to the divine will. So true is this, that in all the oracles of God, no promise, no blessing whatever, is ever given or conferred upon faith in the

abstract, or upon the principle as a cause, disconnected from its effects. Faith only, or by itself, is only mentioned in the word of God to be pronounced dead. No eulogy is ever pronounced upon faith alone in the Bible. God has never honored it, and he never will. Faith alone, as a doctrine, is not apostolic; but it belongs to modern times, and to modern systems of religion.—It is one of the thorns of dogmatic theology—of speculative opinionism—a fruit—a sour grape, of sectarian controversy; and it ought to be abandoned as a thing of man, and not of God.

The following facts are of great importance: The word *apithia* occurs seven times in the New Testament. In four of these instances—Rom. ii: 30—also 32; Heb. iv: 4—11—in the common version it is rendered by the word *unbelief*. In the remaining three instances—Eph. ii: 2, v: 6—Col. iii: 6—it is rendered by the word *disobedience*. The word *apitheo* occurs sixteen times in the New Testament. This word means to *believe not*, or *unbelieving*. Nine times it is thus translated. But *seven* times it is rendered by the words *disobedience*, and *obey not*.—Some of those examples are specially interesting. Ro. ii: 8, “But to them that are contentious and *do not obey*—*apitheo*—the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first and also of the Gentile.”—1 Pet. ii: 7, “Unto you, therefore, which believe he is precious; but unto them which are *disobedient* (*apitheo*—unbelieving) the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense, even to them which stumble at the word, *being disobedient*, (*apitheo*.) iii: 1, “Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any *obey not* (*apitheo*—believe not) the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives.”

The apostle says of the antediluvians in the days of Noah's ministry that they “were *disobedient*” (*apitheo*—unbelieving)

Again, in the iv. chap., 17th verse of this same first letter of Peter, we have another striking instance of our translation using the words *obey not*, as equivalent to believe not. “For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that *obey not* the gospel of God?”

Here, then, we get fairly into the significance of the sacred style. To *obey not*, is, in the sacred style, precisely equivalent to unbelief, or to believe not; while to believe, or to obey, is equal. Now is it to be presumed that the Savior, in those declarations cited as the basis of the objection to our teaching, employs the term *believeth*, in a private sense—in opposition to the uniform usage of the word of God.” Such a position is absurd. But if he did employ the term *faith*, isolating it entirely from its legitimate fruit, then the entire eleventh chapter of Hebrews stands in bold contradiction to his teaching. And, indeed, this hopeless antagonism will be found to exist between his teaching and the current usage of the writers both of the Old and New Testaments, since everywhere in the sacred canon *faith* always implies obedience, as being the sign of its existence, and its perfection, as a victory-gaining principle. Any system that thus wrests the word of God is to be abandoned at once. Such is the system of *faith alone*. It wrests the word of God, perverts its true meaning and significance; and severs the conscience of the sinner from the obligation to obey God, thus proving and perfecting his *faith*, to the salvation of his soul. It calls off the mind of the sinner from the gospel in its facts and commandments, and substitutes for simple belief and obedience to these, an idolatry to an internal idea called *faith*. How many thousands are this moment worshipping an abstract *faith alone*, instead of the Lord of Life and Glory! Hence, with them *faith*, in its bare principle, as a cause, cut off from its effects—as a mere subjective state of feeling; an ideal, an abstraction, an imagination, a nothing—is everything, and can accomplish everything in saving the soul from

sin. Their entire fountain of experience and comfort is found in this idealism.—Hence they muse upon a faith alone, and narrate their feelings while under the excitement of contemplating this internal state, which they call faith, and these recitals are their religion and the proofs of it. If you undertake to oppose this idolatry of self, and refuse to go with them in their worship of it, then they will charge you with being destitute of saving faith—meaning their own ideal form of faith, and persecute you with a malicious spirit and with words born in hell.

When Jesus says—"He that believeth on him is not condemned"—he does not use the term in the modern technical sense of sectarians—but in the broad and well defined sense of the Scriptures. He uses it to denote a believer who promptly and cordially obeys God and thus submits in earnest to the divine commands or will. He denotes a believer who is willing to be saved on God's own terms, and who does not seek to install a plan of his own. He means a faith that works—not a pietism—born of oriental philosophy, which worships subjective faith alone, and scorns to follow in the path of the apostles. He means an obedient faith, or a faith immediately issuing in obedience—a faith that leads into the kingdom of heaven—that rejoices in the privilege of adoption into the family of God; and not that speculative belief which overlooks and rejects the terms of the gospel, continues in disobedience to the obligation and duty of baptism, it may be for years, or for life; and brings, as an effect to this disobedience, the self-consecrated virtue of internal faith—a pure idealism—and the ecstasies of meditation and imagination arising from a belief disconnected from the ordinances of Christ, and bearing no fruit except a mystic pietism. He means a believer in him, and not a believer in the technics of modern sectarianism. He means a true believer in God, and not a disciple of Methodism, Baptistism, Presbyterianism, or Popery. He means one who "hears his word" and "believes" on the Father, with the simplicity and natural-

ness of a child, and not one who espouses modern religious opinions, religious philosophies, systems of dogmatic theologies, and endless speculations. He means such believers as Peter, James and John, in the days of his ministry; and such believers as those who, on the day of Pentecost, "gladly received the word," and not such speculative believers as in this day reject the word of God, and follow a system of man's devising.

These declarations of the Savior are in deep and beautiful harmony with the apostolic commission as expounded on the day of Pentecost by the chosen Peter. There is no contradiction. In every age and under every divine dispensation of religion, from Able to the present day, the true believer, or the humble obedient man, has been accepted, blessed and saved. And such will the fact be till the end. The believer is begotten of God, is born of water, is justified or pardoned, sanctified and saved. All the promises of the gospel are his. He is thus said to have eternal life. God calls things that are not, as though they were. He is past from death unto life. He shall never come into condemnation. None is able to pluck him out of his Father's hand. His true life is hid with Christ in God; and when the Lord Jesus comes again, the life will be revealed, for the believer will appear with Christ in glory. The believer has obeyed the gospel, or he is in the act and progress of obedience to it. He has entered, or is entering into the kingdom. He is not isolated from the great ordinances of the gospel, but he is obedient to them, and in honoring them, honors Him who authorized them. The believer does the will of God; and, therefore builds upon a rock which no floods and no tempests can shake. Faith alone, builds upon the sand, and perishes in a stormy deluge. Faith and obedience are inseparably united; and he who tries to disconnect them, rebels against Messiah's Throne and Government, and deceives weak and ignorant souls to their eternal ruin. He that believeth on the Son of God is not condemned; but is past from

death unto life. This is the privilege of poor sinners to whom Christ is preached. They may obey God and live forever. Remission is fully offered to them. They can accept the gospel at midnight, as well as at mid-day, and as the shadows fly away before the clear morning sun, may rejoice, believing in God. The obedience of faith, and obedience to the faith, are the conditions of salvation; and they ought to be ever held up to the heart and conscience of the sinner.

It is with the heart that a man believes unto remission of sins; as it is from the heart that he obeys the gospel. How it is that a man believes the gospel with his heart is a mystery to our popular religionists. They say it is by means of a direct impact of the Spirit of God and the heart or spirit of a sinner. The gospel, as a spiritual system and instrumentality, appeals to the heart. It appeals to every aspiration, desire, hope and fear of man's moral nature. It is the very work of the gospel to rouse, quicken, develop into the greatest activity, the heart—the entire heart of man. It fastens upon its undying longings—its unsatisfied yearnings after life, and purity, and well being; and also upon its untold fears of death, guilt and punishment. It gathers up these moral instincts, and brings them under special and awful tuition. It carries them into a universe of light, life, beauty, and peace; and also into a universe of darkness, horror, misery and death. It breaks before them the great heart of love—and pours out, through dying agonies, the riches and glories of the God head, yearning over lost sinners. It pledges the Fountain of life to every thirsty soul. It transports the sinner to a land of pure delight, and as the waves of the chrystal river break in gentle murmurs at his feet, amid sunshine, and song, and unfading flowers, it bids him to seize upon it all as an inheritance, freely offered through the cross. Thus it engages the heart in faith—so that every one that believes at all, believes with *all the heart*. To such a one, obedience is delightful and sweet as a song of home. Nothing can give

to such a believer so much joy as the act of obeying the gospel in which he enters upon a new relation to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit;—a relation that speaks of sins forgiven, and of an inheritance that is incorruptible in the heavens. J. W. Cox.

NOTHING IS LOST.

Where is the snow?
'Tis not long ago

It covered the earth with a veil of white,
We heard not its footsteps soft and light,
Yet there it was in the morning bright;
Now it hath vanished away from sight.
Not a trace remains,
In fields or lanes.

Where is the frost?

They are gone and lost—
The forms of beauty last night it made.
With pictures rare were windows arrayed;
"Be silent," it said; the brook obeyed.
Yet silence and pictures all did fade.
At the smile of the sun
All was undone.

Where is the rain?

Pattering it came,
Dancing along with a merry sound.
A grassy bed in the fields it found;
Each drop came on the roof with a bound.
Where is the rain? It hath left the ground.
What good hath it done,
Gone away so soon?
Ever, ever
Our best endeavor
Seemeth to fall like the melted snow.
We work out our thought wisely and slow;
The seed we sow, but it will not grow.
Our hopes, our resolves—where do they go?
What do h remain?
Memory and pain.

Nothing is lost—

No snow nor frost
That come to enrich the earth again.
We thank them when the ripening grain
Is waving over the hill and plain,
And the pleasant rain springs from earth again.
All endeth in good—
Water and food.

Never despair;

Disappointment bear,
Though hope seemeth vain, be patient still;
Thy good intent God doth fulfill.
Thy hand is weak; His powerful will
Is finishing thy life-work still.
The good endeavor
Is lost—ah! never.

—Ch. Inquirer.

PAULINE THEOLOGY--NO. III.

Mr. Hastings constantly uses the word *perish*, under the impression that when persons are said to perish, or to have perished, their conscious existence was terminated. When a man is said to have perished, is the meaning that his conscious existence has terminated? When our Savior says, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that he who believes on him might not perish but have everlasting life," what is the exact antithesis? There is evidently a precise antithesis between *perish* and *life*. Is the amount of it, that one means *existence* and the other *non-existence*? If so, when Paul implies that those who had fallen asleep in Christ, or died, had *not perished*, as he does 1 Cor. xv: 18, he implies that their existence had not terminated. If the meaning of the word, *perish*, is what Mr. Hastings assumes, then those who perish cease to exist, in a conscious state. He, and Materialists generally, claim that all the dead have ceased to exist in a conscious state. Then all the dead have perished. This, Paul declares, by implication, is not true, in the following words: "Then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ (if the dead rise not) "are perished." As the dead rise, those who are fallen asleep in Christ are not perished; and if to perish, is to cease to have conscious existence, those who have fallen asleep in Christ, or died, have not ceased to have *conscious existence*. Thus Mr. Hastings' assumed definition refutes his theory of the unconscious state of the dead. But if the word *perish*, when applied to human beings, involves the idea of the termination of their conscious existence, as human beings, or if the termination of conscious existence is to perish, and the conscious existence of all the dead is terminated, then all the dead, both good and bad, have perished. Or, if to die is to perish, and dying, or perishing is to cease to have conscious existence, then

all the dead have perished. But Paul clearly implies that the dead in Christ have not perished. Christ has risen; the dead will all rise; the gospel is true; the promises are reliable, and the dead in Christ are not lost or perished. The Lord will keep them and bring them when he comes.

But, is the reward of the righteous simply existence, and the punishment of the wicked simply non-existence? Or is the reward of the righteous simply eternal existence, and the punishment of the wicked simply eternal non-existence? Does the word *perish*, simply express non-existence and the word *life* simply express existence? Certainly these important words mean more than this. The word, *life*, in such expressions as, "gave his only begotten Son that he who believes on him should not perish but have everlasting life," means more than everlasting existence. In the same way, the word *perish*, standing in antithesis with it, means more than mere non-existence. The word *life*, in expressions of this sort, embraces all that is promised to the righteous in the future and eternal state. On the other hand, the word *perish*, in expressions of this sort, embraces all that is threatened against the wicked in the future and eternal state. These words, in such expressions, is used metonymically, or a part is mentioned for the whole. The "second death," which the wicked shall suffer, is precisely the same as that they shall perish. When the threat is made, that they shall be banished from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power, though the words are very different, the amount is the same as when it is said they shall perish. Banishment from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power, includes all that is meant by perishing, the second death, cast into outer darkness, cast into the lake of fire, destroyed, tormented, or punished.—Some times we find words expressing punishment, sometimes the result, but the same thing is meant, or rather, embraced, when the eternal state of the wicked is alluded to. The punishment of the finally incorrigible, or impenitent, is one thing, no matter how

many forms of expression may be found in reference to it. No matter whether it be alluded to literally, or figuratively; whether it be called misery, torment, or punishment; nor is it any matter how the punishment shall be inflicted, it is the same thing. If we read of being cast into the lake of fire in one place and being beaten with many stripes in another, we are not to conclude that two things are meant. It is the same punishment represented in two ways. The second death represents the same thing. Punishment is the literal word. Torment and misery, though literally results, are mentioned for the whole. In the same way, when it is said of the wicked, they shall perish, be destroyed, lost, cast into outer darkness, into the lake of fire, or banished from the presence of the Lord, we are not to think that they are so many distinct things to be done, but different representations of the same thing. We may not be able to tell precisely what the punishment will consist in, or how the Lord will inflict it; but of one thing we may rest assured, and that is, that when the Lord has threatened punishment in time past, as in the case of the angels who sinned, the Antediluvians, Sodomites, Egyptians and Jews, he fulfilled his word to the letter and vindicated the honor of his government. What then may we expect when the terrible, fearful and awful threatenings of the New Covenant shall be fulfilled, in reference to those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?

When we read of *everlasting fire*, it is no difference whether we take the fire to be literal, or figurative, whether the wicked will literally be punished in fire, or fire is only employed as imagery to represent the punishment; still, there stands the word *everlasting*, expressing its duration, which really expresses the duration of the punishment. When we read of the fire that shall never be quenched, no matter whether the fire is literal, or metaphorical, it stands for the punishment, declaring to a man who understands its import, that the punishment shall *never cease*. The angels who

sinned and were cast into *tartarus*, are bound in everlasting chains. The word "everlasting," here comes not from *aionion*, but *aidios*, and occurs in but one other place in the New Covenant, where it expresses the duration of the existence of the God-head, or the Divinity. See Jude, 6.— This expresses the duration of the punishment, the same as if applied directly to it. The same thing is called torment, misery and punishment. It is not the consequence that is everlasting, but the punishment itself. The chains, binding in punishment, are everlasting, or power, of which chain is a figure. The fire in which the wicked are to be punished, no matter whether literal, or metaphorical, shall never be quenched. They shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. They shall go away into everlasting punishment.

A man lost, is not a man not in existence. The prodigal son was lost, destroyed or perished, (*appollumi*) when away from his father's house, but as really in conscious existence as after he was received home. The sheep that was lost (*appolumi*) was as actually in existence as the ninety-nine not lost. The lost sheep of the house of Israel, were as really in existence while lost, as those from among them were after they were found. A man lost, as the rich man, who lifted up his eyes in *hades* in torment, is in existence as certainly as a man in heaven is in existence. The statement that a man is lost, destroyed or perished, whether referring to man in this or the future state, is no proof that the man is not in conscious existence, as we find references to persons and things destroyed, where we know they were as really in existence as things not destroyed. A man in everlasting punishment, is lost, destroyed, perished, tormented in misery and suffering, but in existence as much as the saved.

The Lord says, Matt. xxv: 46, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This is literal. The same thing is called "the second death." The same is implied where we read of their being "cast into the lake of fire"—"being cast into hell-fire;"

(the fire of *gehenna*) the same precisely is embraced in destroy, perish, lost and all the other expressions applied to the wicked in the eternal state. You are not to infer from any one of these expressions precisely what the punishment will consist of, but never forget that "the wicked shall not go unpunished"—that "these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment"—"into the fire that shall never be quenched"—"tormented day and night forever and ever"—that the Lord says, "With lies you have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad, and strengthened the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." See Ez. xiii: 22. The punishment of the wicked is not to be evaded, nor set aside in the public mind, by an attempt on the one hand to show that they will be stricken out of conscious existence, nor on the other hand, by promising them life—that they shall all be holy and happy. The Lord will punish the wicked precisely enough, and at the right time, and we need give ourselves no special trouble about it. He will also reward the righteous. In one word, he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained.

B. F

DIALOGUE ABOUT THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Between a Christian, or one who believes that all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works: and a Spiritualist, or one who believes that, in addition to the Gospel, and previous to believing it, the heart must be regenerated by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and that revelations are made to the sinner by the Spirit.

Spiritualist. Good morning brother Christian.

Christian. I am pleased to meet you, and trust you are in good health, and would

be glad to converse on the subject of religion.

S. Yes I would. Religion is my chief concern. I understood you to say last night in your discourse, that he who waited for the Holy Spirit to come into his heart, and reveal to him that he is a sinner before God, is deluded. Am I correct in this?

C. That is what I said substantially. I would have it understood also that I would say it in all kindness, and yet in all confidence that it is true.

S. You think then there are no revelations made by the Holy Spirit now?

C. Are any needed beside those recorded in the Bible?

S. I have as much confidence in the written word as you have, I presume.

C. If a man should believe all that is to be believed in the Bible, and obey all that is there commanded, would the Lord bless him?

S. Well, yes, I suppose he would, but he cannot do that without faith, and it is the gift of God.

C. How does God give faith?

S. Paul says, (1 Cor. 12: 9,) He gives to another faith, by the same Spirit. There it is plain enough, that faith is given by the Spirit of God.

C. Paul is there speaking of miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and the faith of which he was speaking was possessed by *one*, and not by all the members at Corinth.

S. Well, I know very well how it was in my experience, and hundreds and thousands of others can testify to the same thing. I was going on in my sins heedless of heaven or hell, when one day it suddenly came into my mind that I was a great sinner in the sight of God, and unless I repented, I must forever perish. Now if it was not the Spirit of God that made that known to me, what was it?

C. Had you never read, nor heard the Bible read before that time? Does not the Bible teach that all men have sinned before God?

S. Yes, I had read and heard the Bible read, but I never had such feelings before,

and they were produced by the Holy Spirit.

C. Certainly, your conviction of sin was produced by the Holy Spirit, for that is one of the things he was to do when he came. How was the Spirit to convince the world of sin?

S. We can not tell how, as Jesus said to Nicodemus, the wind bloweth where it listeth, but thou canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit. There is scripture.

C. Jesus was not talking to Nicodemus about the wind, nor did he use the word *wind* but *pneuma*, spirit. He said, the Spirit breathes where he pleases, and thou hearest his voice, but canst not tell whence he cometh and whither he goeth, so is every one born, or begotten by the Spirit.

S. You may say what you will about the translation, I know that I was born again, and I cannot tell how it was, any more than I can tell where the wind comes from and goes to.

C. How do you know then that you were born again?

S. Because I felt my burden of sin removed, and that God had revealed His Son in me and shed abroad his love in my heart by the Holy Ghost.

C. Jesus said to Nicodemus, every one is born by hearing what the Spirit says, and James says, of His own will begat He us with the word of truth. Jas. i: 18. And Peter declares that we are born again— by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. I. Peter, 1: 23.

S. Well; I know that things were made known to me that I never read nor heard in the Bible.

C. Were those things confirmed by miracles, that were made known to you?

S. No, I cannot say that they were. But why do you ask that question?

C. Because the revelations recorded in the Gospel were confirmed by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to the will of God. Heb. ii: 4. and, because these revelations you speak of are not confirmed by

miracles, then they are not according to the will of God, and he who trusts to them is deceived.

S. You seem to forget that the Spirit was to convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. John, xvi: 8. Besides the carnal mind is enmity against God, Rom. viii: 7.

C. I have not forgotten that passage in John. Jesus said to his apostles, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." John xvi: 7. The Lord had said before, John 14: 17, of the Comforter, that, *the world could not receive him*. He would guide the apostles into ALL the truth. John xvi: 13.

S. Well, that is just as I thought. You deny the operation of the Spirit entirely and have nothing but the word of God. I feel the need of religion that has the Holy Spirit in it.

C. Any religion that is not revealed by the Spirit of God and confirmed by miracles, I will not receive as divine. No other religion than that taught in the Bible has these marks of divinity upon it. The apostles of Christ, inspired by the Spirit, spoke and wrote *all the truth* concerning man's salvation, and whatever effect their preaching produced was wrought by the Holy Spirit. The word of the Holy Spirit is still true, living and effectual to every man that believes it. The authority of the Lord is still with what his Spirit spoke by the apostles, and will be always.

S. Can not the Holy Spirit make revelations now as well as formerly, and are they not just as necessary?

C. There is no need of new revelations, because those we have are sufficient to thoroughly furnish the man of God to all good works. "The Spirit of God searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God— which also we speak." I. Cor. ii: 10, 13. We speak the things, says Paul, that are freely given to us of God. Would you have more than all the truth, more than all things given to us of God?

S. Here are some things I never noticed before. But there are a great many passages in the Bible that sustain my views that I cannot call to mind now, but I may at some other time.

C. It will afford me pleasure to talk with you at length on the Bible, but meantime be assured that he who waits for revelations from the Holy Spirit besides those already revealed and confirmed by miracles, waits for what he will never realize, but is deceived. From this may the Lord preserve all who love Him.

J. M. HENRY, Reporter.

UNIVERSALISM.

Salem Station, O., Feb. 21, 1863.

ELDER FRANKLIN—*Dear Sir*:—With your permission, and in accordance with the request expressed in my article, I would desire to say something concerning the questions I submitted to you, and your courteous replies thereto. Different minds, it appears, cannot see the same things in the same light, and an interchange of thoughts, sometimes may be of no harm, at least.—Truth, a bright jewel of the world, never suffers from investigation. In what I shall say, I will attempt as much brevity as a clear elucidation of the subject will admit.

In the first place, let me call your attention to the fact that you entirely overlooked my fourth question, namely, "Did the death of Christ restore the posterity of Adam to the position they would have occupied had Adam not fallen?"

Now this is a very important question, as much, if not more so, than any of the others, for in it are involved the issues whether or not God could provide for and meet the events which he foreknew would take place in His creation. Christ was prepared before the foundation of the world to atone

for Adam's transgression, as it is called.—Now, if the atonement was not equal to the offence, the mission of Christ has failed of its object, and God did not, or could not, complete what He had commenced. The remedy was insufficient for the disease.—Then, the only logical conclusion at which we can arrive, is this, if Christ died for the sins of the world, His death, to accomplish its object, must restore *every* individual to the position they would have maintained toward God had Adam not sinned. If but one is left unrestored, the mission of Christ is incomplete, "for as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive." There are no exceptions, as *all* die, even so shall *all* be made alive.

To my first question, you affirm, that is, admit that God is *perfect* in all his attributes. To *perfection* there can be nothing added. Then, God has all power and wisdom, and He possessing all these, there can none higher in heaven or earth, and consequently, God could create all things as He desired, there being none to dictate to Him, or rival or to thwart Him. Who will say that God did not do all this? Surely not I. In regard to "man's reasonings and deductions from His attributes and perfections" being "very imperfect," I would say, we reason from the light we have; and "how can man reason but from what he knows," from the perfect book of nature, which is an exhibition of the capacities of its Author, and His revelation, as He gave it to man? God cannot contradict Himself. To my second question, you also affirm,—namely, that "God created man the being He *designed him to be.*" This at once and finally settles the question that God has not, nor now is, disappointed in man, and that man has done nothing but what God had anticipated and provided for. Man has only employed the faculties given to him by God, and has but followed the teachings of a nature given him by God—not one of his own creation. God could not, in justice, expect man to act contrary to his own nature, nor would God require man to obey laws that were in entire opposition to this nature, and which God

knew the great majority of mankind would disregard, and then suspend upon the disobedience of these laws, their eternal misery. Certainly God is more wise and just than that. It makes no difference whatever in this question, that God created us *but men*. God could create as *perfect a man*, and adapt his surrounding circumstances to him, as He could create a perfect angel, or even a Christ. This is incontrovertible.—In regard to your assertion, then, man could not have been man unless left free to sin. I cannot see its validity. There is, strictly speaking, no *absolute* freedom of the will.—Man's will is governed by *motives*—he chooses a thing because a *superior* interest, or *greater* gratification is connected with it than with another. This, and this alone, controls his choice where two things are of equal interest to him. He cannot decide between them.

To my third question, you reply that Adam was a *perfect man*." Here we again agree; but I am sorry that we must so soon part company again; for I suppose you will not agree with me that Adam was not a more perfect man than either you or I, even in a moral point of view. To attest this, we have the fact, that Adam yielded to the very *first* temptation that beset him. Had Adam been a perfect being, in the sense that this term has been defined to the world, he would have maintained his integrity. This is proof that Adam had the *same nature* before he fell, that he had after it, and we after him. It is true that man is a subject of law, laws adapted to his capacities, but not of laws he cannot obey without going entirely contrary to his *nature*. God certainly knew that Adam would act as he did upon this occasion. Then why did He subject him to the temptation, and place the *future* destiny of mankind upon the result, when He had the power to prevent it? This is but charging injustice upon God. For one, I have a higher admiration of my God than to do this. I rest assured upon the wisdom of God, and from this reason that this act of our first parents was but a necessary link in the grand chain of God's harmoni-

ous creation, and that it was for the ultimate good of His children, its highest and best link upon earth. God's creation is a unit—it was made as He designed it to be. His almighty attributes brought it from chaos to perfection, and no created being has the power to change it. Now, can it be possible, that God has delegated to man the power to mar its fairest part, the ruin of himself eternally.

If man was *once* perfect as God *designed* him to be, as you affirm, can he be imperfect *now*? To do this, man must possess a power superior to that of God, a power that has thwarted God's plans in regard to man. This power man could not give himself; it must then come from God. And if God granted it to him, knowing in what manner he would employ it, who, I would ask, is responsible for the awful consequences?

You ask me, "Does Universalism reform any body, or make any body any better in this world?" I must emphatically answer it does. It does this by maintaining this character of a perfect and *immutable* God; discountenancing the idea that God has been thwarted in His creation, and that man is not as God designed him to be. It does this by appealing to all the better faculties of our nature, teaching us that we are yet the dear children of our heavenly Father, and yet the heirs of eternal happiness, and not degraded out-casts, our inheritance lost to us, because we do not live contrary to our natures. It does this by claiming that God is yet the kind Father of all, and not their enemy, condemning him for an act which he had no lot nor doing in. It does this by maintaining for God a character of love and mercy, and not one of anger and revenge.—It does this by drawing us to God by a representation of His lovely and holy character, and not the hard one of driving us to God by threats and excited fears. It proclaims the duty of us doing right towards our fellow men, from principle, as God has done right towards us, and not from the penalties of our human laws. It teaches us to raise our aspirations of praise to our high exalted, true, and glorious God, a Father

that is good to all, and not to a God of partiality, or one of failed designs. It reforms by teaching us that the penalties of transgression follow close upon the act and cannot be escaped, and not that they are deferred to a future judgement day, or can be escaped by repentance.

It reforms by maintaining that the reward of doing good is a greater incentive to right action, than the fear of future eternal punishment. (How few the latter restrains from crime.) But in conclusion, I would say, Universalism betters mankind by being in *unison* with the whole created plan of God, and with our natures, and by erasing all the better attributes of our being, by leaving us to occupy the position in which God has placed us, the co-workers with God in advancing the great creative plan, and not by representing us to be degraded outcast beings of a disappointed and angered God.

To your second question, in which the same terms are embraced, but applied to the future world, I answer, as we are improved in the present world, so we enter the future world, some greatly advanced, and others but little, with all intermediate grades of advancement, and we there progress towards perfection eternally.

What I have said here has been uttered in all kindness and fraternal love, and is meant as an inquiry after truth, that great principle that must ultimately prevail. Though covered up by the rubbish of ages, it will yet resurrect itself and stand forth in all its native grandeur, and obtain the homage of mankind.

Yours truly,

G. L. PURDY.

REPLY.

We have not now at hand our answer to the Dr.'s questions, and cannot recollect precisely what it was. We shall, therefore, proceed to answer the foregoing. The Dr. thinks we entirely overlooked his fourth question. We will try then, and not entirely overlook it now. It is as follows: "Did the death of Christ re-

store the posterity of Adam to the position they would have occupied had Adam not fallen?" Certainly not, for had Adam not fallen, he and his posterity would not have died; and the death of Christ does not prevent them from dying. But after the penalty of death has been inflicted, through Christ, the second Adam, they all shall be made alive, or raised from the dead. "As by Adam all die, even so by Christ all shall be made alive." Precisely what was lost to the descendants of Adam, without their consent, volition or action, by his transgression, was restored by Christ, or, as Paul says, by his righteousness, without their consent, volition or action. Paul makes the death of Adam precisely equal to the resurrection by Christ. What was lost by Adam shall be gained by Christ. All the descendants of Adam are under the consequences of the Adamic transgression, but not the guilt, and when restored from the penalty of the Adamic transgression, there is no condemnation. Through Christ all will be justified from the Adamic transgression, in a resurrection from the dead; all who will then be condemned, will be condemned for *their own* sins, and not for the Adamic sin. The salvation from the Adamic sin, or its penalty, will be universal. We have no fears that any of the posterity of Adam will ever be punished in the future world for Adam's sin. We are not preaching to men to save them from the Adamic sin, but to save them from *their own* sins. We are not trying to induce men to repent of the Adamic sin, but their own sins.—There is a long chapter beyond the Adamic sin, demanding our attention. We invite the Dr.'s attention to the following:

I. "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all who are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; those who have done good, to the resurrection of life; and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." John v:28-29. Their coming forth to life, or condemnation, does not

turn upon the Adamic sin. They shall all come forth or be raised from the dead, both good and bad, those who have done good to life, and those who have done evil to condemnation. The whole matter turns upon their own doing good or evil.

II. "He became the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him." Heb. v. 9. He saves all men from the penalty of the Adamic sin, by raising them from the dead, but he is the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him. Men may be saved from the penalty of the Adamic sin, or raised from the dead, and then be lost, or never obtain the eternal salvation from the penalty of their own sins.

III. "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Here, it will be perceived, a man may not escape, but lose the great salvation by his own neglect, and not by the Adamic sin. See Heb. ii: 2.

IV. "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 out of the things written therein." See Rev. xxii: 19. What is the reason here given for a man's part being taken away out of the book of life and out of the holy city? Certainly not the Adamic sin, but his own sin, in taking away from the book of this prophecy. Can a man be saved whose part is taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city and out of the things written therein?

V. "Then shall they say, Lord, when saw we thee ahungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison and did not minister to thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me. These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. xxv: 44-46. In this case, the reason given for

their going away into everlasting punishment, is not the Adamic sin, but *their own sin—you did it not to me.*

These Scriptures we give as an exponent of the New Covenant, on the ground of future punishment. It is not the Adamic sin, but *the sins of those who shall be punished.* The apostles never commended any man to repent of the Adamic sin, seek salvation from it, or threatened any punishment in the future world on account of it. Christians, and even infants, suffer the penalty of the Adamic sin, but Jesus, in the resurrection, saves all from from the Adamic sin, and none will be lost in the future world only those lost for *their own sins.*

Our very pleasant and affable friend, Dr. Purdy, has fallen into the deceptive meshes of philosophy, speculation and metaphysics, in which a man may wind round and round till he will actually think the opposite direction from home is the precise course homeward. It is the easiest thing in the world for the finest head ever put upon the neck of a man, to be set to swimming and running round almost as if partially under the influence of chloriform, by launching into the general lababyrinths of subtle reasonings from the attributes of the Deity. What does any man know of the attributes of the Deity apart from the revelation in the Bible? What can a man learn of the will of God, in reasoning from the attributes of the Deity, compared with what he may learn from the clearly expressed will of God as found spread upon the pages of inspiration? Where did any prophet, or inspired teacher, ever send any human being to reasoning on the attributes of the Deity to learn the will of God? Philosophers have been reasoning, speculating and making deductions from the attributes of God for ages, and what have they learned from it all? Absolutely nothing. No two of them agree. They have arrived at no settled conclusion. They have deduced no settled system from these attributes and never will if

they should reason a thousand years longer. The reason is, that there is nothing tangible, clear and intelligible in this method of attempting to obtain knowledge.

Another difficulty is, that when men undertake to deduce a system from the attributes of God, nature, or what some call "the light of nature," or "the book of nature," they never fail to get a system which contradicts the clearly revealed will of God in the Bible. When they arrive at this point, they have such an affection for their theory, or system, composed of their own deductions from the attributes of the Deity, that they will hold on to it at the expense of giving up the Bible. If we could see those who talk of learning the will of God from reasoning on the attributes of God, reading the Bible, appreciating it, loving it, obeying it, becoming Christians and keeping the commandments of God, as set forth in the Bible, we should have much more confidence in their mode of reasoning. We know not how it is in the case of our worthy friend, Dr. Purdy, but as a general thing, this plan of reasoning leads men to evade and avoid the clearest requirements in the oracles of God—even the initiatory steps to enter into covenant with God. This shows that their reasoning sets aside the Bible authority *with them*.

Again, if the attributes of the Deity teach Universalism, it is a wonder that no inspired prophet or apostle ever discovered it, or that no other person ever knew of even Restorationism till hundreds of years after the birth of Christ! If modern no-future-punishment Universalism is taught by the attributes of the Deity, it is a wonder that no man ever found it out before the time of Hosea Ballou! What a loss to the world, too, if this doctrine is true, that six thousand years should have passed away before it was discovered, especially if it is as useful as the Dr. thinks! The preaching of it can do no one any good so far as the world

to come is concerned, if true; for, in that world, all will be saved whether they ever heard the doctrine preached or not. The only benefits it professes to bestow are for this world, and yet centuries passed away and even thousands of years before it was found out! Indeed, even now, there is not one in a million of the human race that knows any thing about it or believes anything in it. If the purpose of God was to reveal Universalism to any considerable portion of our race in this world, he has, up to this time, made a failure! The Pagan idea of a future punishment, as Universalists style it, has prevailed almost universally. Can it be that the doctrine is written so clearly on the attributes of the Deity, and yet that the world has remained so long in almost universal ignorance of it?

Our worthy correspondent settles every question by reasoning. He gives us some fine reasoning, showing how Universalism is calculated to reform men! But this is to us, as if he would show us an ague pill, which he had been giving for years without curing anybody, and make a fine argument, showing its chemical properties and how it would certainly cure. We would prefer some facts and less philosophy. We should say, Dr., refer us to some cases, where your pills have actually cured ague. In the same way, in the other case, we say, Dr., refer us to the instance where Universalism has reformed men. True, we are acquainted with some clever gentlemen who are Universalists, civil, moral and correct in their business transactions, but no more so since they are Universalists than they were before. We are not aware of a town, community or individual reformed in the least by Universalism. Nor do we believe there is one particle of reformatory power in it. We believe, as the prophet says, Ezk; xiii; 22, that it strengthens the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way, to promise him life.

Before we dismiss the Dr.'s article we

must notice his more effective punishment. His present punishment, or punishment in this life, he thinks more effective in restraining men from sin than the threatened punishment in the world to come. He believes in no debt and credit in this matter, but that men are punished as they go along—that the account is squared as we go along. This punishment, he maintains is certain and there is no escape from it by repentance. All that is smooth, pretty and has about it an air of plausibility; but we have several things to inquire in reference to it, as follows:

I. What is his punishment, that is received as men pass along in this life? Is it the compunctions of conscience? Who denies that punishment, if it be such? Who denies that men who are not past feeling have compunctions of conscience? What other punishment has he, in this life, that all others have not as much as he? All the consequences of sin, that follow in this life, are believed in, and known to exist, by all others as much as by Universalists. All others have all there is in this to deter men from sin and the tremendous influence of the belief that those who die in their sins will be punished in the world to come.

II. Since the Dr. is a philosopher, and delights to reason, we beg his attention to a few considerations. He is, if we understand him, a warm advocate of temperance. Suppose, then, he finds the poor man addicted to habits of intoxication, and he undertakes to reform him, by preaching his doctrine to him. In his effort, he addresses him as follows:

"My dear friend, do you not perceive that by your dissipation, you are ruining your estate? That you will prostrate your reputation? That you will disgrace your family? That your eyes are becoming blood-shot? That your face is becoming bloated? That your constitution is becoming shattered? That you are suffering for your sins as you go along?" The man replies to him, "Dr. is this *the* punishment for dissipation?

"The Dr. replies, "Yes sir, this is the punishment you *must* suffer, and from it there is no escape. And then, there is no lay credit. The account is kept square and you get your punishment as you go along." The man inquires, "And, Dr., is this hell, that we suffer as we go along?" "Yes," replies the Dr., "you get your punishment as you go along. I do not believe any long credit is to be settled up in the world to come. The punishment is all in this life. You are now suffering for your sins." Instead of reforming, the man would probably reply, "Well, Dr., if this is the punishment I am to suffer for my sins—if this is the hell I am to suffer for all my sins against God, it is so mild that I should have passed through it without knowing that I was in hell at all, had you not enlightened me. And now, Dr., to be candid with you, I would rather remain in it forever, than to die and risk the prospect of your universal happiness."

III. We do not like the Dr.'s teaching, because it does away with repentance, or, at least, the ground of it. Except you repent you shall perish, says the Lord.

IV. We do not like the Dr.'s teaching because it contradicts the Scriptures. The apostle says, "The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." II. Peter ii: 9. Again, the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word, are *kept in store, reserved* unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." II. Peter iii: 7.

B. F.

The full assurance of faith consists in a feeling application to Christ, or taking Christ to myself: being persuaded, that, by God's free gift, Jesus Christ is mine; that I shall surely have life and salvation by him, a life of holiness and a life of happiness; and that whatever Christ did and suffered for the redemption of any one of the human race, he did the same for me; as for any soul in all the creation of God.—*Ryland.*

THE GOSPEL—AN INDUCTION.

In considering the conditions on which faith rests it may be stated, without fear of contradiction, that in the absence of facts and testimony, it is never known. The whole Bible recognizes the truth of this assertion, and it corresponds with the reason and experience of all men.

There was nothing in the system of nature that indicated to Noah, that a flood in one hundred and twenty years would come upon the world of the ungodly. All things apparently stood up to his day in creation, as at the beginning. No changes in the earth nor in the sky—no barometer spiritual or physical pointed out to Noah, the flood of water. All signs were against him. If he had taken counsel from the age, or his own senses, or head or heart, the decision would have been against it. How did he know it? Whence came his faith in one of the most stupendous judgments that ever fell upon the earth? Was it by the direct influence of the Spirit in the Christian sense of that word? It was by revelation. It originated in words. It rested upon the oracle of God to him. This is expressly declared by Paul—"By *faith* Noah, *being warned* of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Heb. xi: 7. Gen. vi: 5-22.

In plain language God declared to Noah, that he would destroy the earth with a flood because of its wickedness, and Noah believed what he said, and did what he commanded; and by his faith and obedience he and his family were saved. But it may be said, that this was a special revelation to him, and is unique and peculiar. True, but he might have treated it with neglect and scorn, as Balaam afterwards did, when the Spirit made revelations to him. Noah believed the word spoken, and acted accordingly.—His family also believed and acted in con-

cert with him and were saved. All the prophets had special revelations made to them, and believed the words which they received and wrote, and the oracles they have left were "written aforetime for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the *Scriptures* might have hope." Rom. xv: 5.

If they, the early Christians had hope, they first must have had faith in the *Scriptures*, for no one has hope of the fulfillment of a promise who does not believe the promise.

To make the objection valid, as in the case of Noah, every man who believes, ought to have a special revelation made to him! This would convert all the Lord's people into prophets, and would reduce us to the condition of the Spiritualists, who, rejecting the written word, depend upon oracular communications from they know not who.

Indeed we all remember well, when it was the common opinion of nearly all the sects, that faith was revealed directly from the Spirit to the sinner, and this opinion is not even now obsolete. Nothing has brought so much dishonor upon the word of God as this, and kept so many thousands out of the church and heaven. It has led men to look into their own hearts for faith, rather than to Christ, the object of faith. To expect new and strange impulses and special inspirations from God, instead of examining the *Scriptures* to know whether Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. Break but this spell—this wicked device of the adversary, and thousands would obey the truth, and purify their souls, and come under the Christian institution.

There is one class of persons, we find it extremely difficult to persuade to unite with the people of God. They are those who have believed the gospel from their childhood. They never knew the day when they did not believe; but they have been taught that this faith received in the simplicity of childhood and unmixed with doubt is not the faith of Christ. They never had any strong and pungent convictions of sin.—They never at any one time seriously set

themselves to seek the Lord. They may have sought religion, and this has been the cause of their delay and difficulty. They had always known the Lord. They believed the Scriptures. They drank into the faith of the gospel from the breasts of their mothers. But they were turned away from the Lord to seek religion! There is no such thing known in the Bible, as "seeking religion." Religion is not to be sought—but to be done. Jas. i: 27. "The Jews' religion," was found at Mt. Sinai, when God gave the fiery law; and the Christian religion was found at Mt. Zion, and given to the apostles for the benefit of the world, and these religions—or divine institutions have never been lost. God expressly commands the Jews "Not to seek after their own heart." Num. xv: 38. David says, "Salvation is far from the wicked." Why? "for they seek not thy statutes." Ps. cxix: 155. He commanded all Israel to "keep and seek the commandments of the Lord, that you may possess this good land." I. Chron. xxviii: 8. And to Solomon he said, "If thou seek him (the Lord) he will be found of thee," 9th v. Of Josiah it is said, "while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David his father." II. Chron. xxxiv: 3. Ezra "prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord and to do it." Ezra vii: 10.

We are commanded and exhorted to seek the Lord—to seek his law—his word—his commandments—his favor—his kingdom—his righteousness—to seek for the old paths, to seek his face, his name, to seek wisdom, seek judgment; to seek ye out of the book of the Law of the Lord—seek good, not evil; seek Jesus, seek for glory, honor and immortality. Seek those things which are above—seek a country, a city out of sight, but no where, in the popular sense of the term "to seek religion." Those who find, what they are thus commanded to seek will "do religion."

We do not speak thus, because we feel indifferent to the care and anxiety—the grief and anguish of those who are anxious about their souls. We would not offend one of these little ones who believe in Jesus

We have no sympathy with those who would ridicule, when they ought to teach; and scoff when they ought to weep; or jar the prejudices, when they ought to allay them. Much less would we taunt the "sects" with profane words about "Holy Ghost, religion!" We utterly abhor and condemn all such rudeness; and will not fail to reprove publicly, as they deserve, any one, who has so little of the spirit of Christ as to indulge in such boorish and base-born utterances. Infinite mischief has been done to the cause of Christ by such vulgar and unfeeling minds. Constantly has it been thrown in my face, when I have tried to convert sinners from the evil of their ways. The base coinage of the gutter, has passed from hand to hand, polluting every thing it has touched. It is seldom I have heard any one make use of the term, and never, but from the ignorant and besotted. *Let it die the death.*

Paul, at Athens, when there were thirty thousand gods, in teaching them the way of truth, used no slang words—no bitter taunts—no irony: "I perceive, Athenians, that you are too much addicted to the worship of Demons." Nothing could have been more faithful, or more courteous. If the Savior would caution men "how they hear," surely he is equally concerned "how we speak." "Preach the word," is Paul's exhortation to Timothy. "In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works. In doctrine, uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you." Titus, ii: 7, 8.

I thank God, that I have lived to see a better race than what has passed away; and that a purer speech is heard among those who plead for a return to the Gospel of Christ. They have caught the spirit of Him, who was "meek and condescending" in his bearing and teaching, in his addresses to sinners. But much is yet to be learned.

I judge that in proportion to our knowledge of the word, and our ability to preach and to teach it; and our sincere devotion

to it—just so far as we have the truth and feel its power in our own hearts; and as it is incorporated with all our thinking moods; just with the hold it has upon our heads, our hearts, our consciences and our lives, and the spirit which dictated—so will be our success in winning souls to Christ. We should, with *all our heart*, believe it and be willing to die for it, and for those who have like precious faith. Our confidence in “the living God” should be unshaken. We should preach the word, as God’s power to save men. We should pray with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit for success in our calling, and then, will Christ be glorified by us, and sinners be converted to God.

JAMES CHALLEN.

DAVENPORT.

THE ANALOGY BETWEEN THE ANCIENT AND MODERN SECTS.

NO. II.

Bro. FRANKLIN—*Dear Sir:*—No people can be a sect while they build upon original principles—upon the first and highest authority, such as the Koran, the Law of Moses, the Gospel of Christ, or the New Testament. But when Mohometans, Jews or Christians build on opinions and make peculiarities the basis of their distinctions, then are they sectarian—then they stand opposed to the original Constitution. So long as the Jews adhered strictly to the Law of Moses, they were not a sect. In the days of Moses, the tribes of Reuben and Gad, settled on the east side of the Jordan, but they were not sects, they adhered to the Law of Moses—in the days of the Judges, the tribe of Benjamin was nearly extinct, and in the days of Solomon the twelve tribes were divided into two and ten tribes, but they were not sects; they adhered to the law professedly. It is

believed that sects arose among the Jews in the days of the Ptolemies, after the conquests of Alexander the Great, after the Grecian philosophy was introduced into Judea—one hundred and forty-four years before Christ. Pharisees, Saducees, Essenes, Scribes, Lawyers, Samaritans, Herrodians, Gallileans and Zealots sprung up among the Jews, then were born traditions, and they and the law were the basis of ancient sects, as the Bible and creeds or modern traditions are the basis of modern sects. Something, therefore, besides the Bible is necessary to constitute a sect. All parties ancient and modern, who have any other rule of faith and practice, than the Bible, are sects and not the Jewish or the Christian congregation. We have done these sects great injustice by dignifying them with the name churches. The congregation of Jesus Christ, is one and *invisible*. The Bible does not allow of sects any more than it does of murder or drunkenness, for the Scripture style *sect* and heresy mean the same thing. Rent and schism merge into heresy. Heresy means the right to choose our own religion or our own way to heaven, instead of God’s way or plan. Paul deprecated schism and divisions in the body or congregation of Jesus Christ. I Cor. i: 10-12-25. Gallatians v: 19 to 22. Such shall not inherit the kingdom of Christ or of God. Mark them that cause parties among you, contrary to the teaching of Christ, and avoid them. Romans xvi: 16, 17. They corrupt men and dishonor God. Sects have done more injury to men, than any thing else, except sin, and have dishonored God more. What our Lord said of the ancient sects is true of the modern sects. They are often tenfold more the children of the devil, than they were before they were made sects. Sectarianism is flagrant infidelity and is therefore to be avoided as contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ and his apostles. Party makers like Hymeneus and Philetus, overthrow the faith of some, and have hindered millions from believing Christianity to be true. Many glory in being called

leaders, doctors, still more in being led by these leaders. But there must be sects that the approved may be manifest. I. Cor. xi: 18, 19. Schisms, divisions, sects or heresies are all used in nearly the same *bad sense*. *Hairesis*, the Greek noun, is from *haireo* to choose our religion, instead of letting God choose it for us. Our choosing his religion, we choose for ourselves. We make parties of his religion and then boast of our liberality or charity at the expense of dividing his religion. Calvinism and Arminianism divide the body of Christ. One takes out its entrails, and stuffs the body with chaff; and all sects have a part of the truth, and have divided the body of Christ, as the papists say they have the body of John the Immerser scattered all over the world. His head is in one place, his body in another place his feet in another and the finger with which he pointed out the Lamb of God is in another place and so on. It is best to bring the different parts together and cement them; then there will be strength, beauty, life, power and harmony in the body. But dissected into small fragments, there is nothing but weakness and confusion. This is emphatically the *heretical age*, or the age of choosing our different religions. What God said of his ancient people is true of this age. My people have committed two evils: They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters and hewn out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water. Clinging to the commandments of men instead of to the institutions of God, makes sects, which is rebellion against God, which is worse than witchcraft and idolatry. I. Sam. 15. Sectarist, factionist and hereticist, designate the same person. Inspiration says they must be rejected and are self-condemned. Titus iii: 10. No inspired writer ever denominated the disciples of Christ, partisans, or sectarists in any sense. Paul was maliciously charged with being of the sect of the Nazarenes. But said Paul, this I confess to thee, that after the way they call a sect [*haireisis*] so worship I the God of my

fathers, *hoping for immortality through his Son*. Peter speaks as forcibly against sects as Paul. There shall be false teachers, (these are what the people call very good men) among you, who privily shall bring in damnable [*haireisis*] sects—denying the Lord that bought them, and shall bring on themselves swift destruction. Can these be innocent and good men, when inspiration denounces them *damnable*? Surely not. Heretics are men that make factions and after the first and second admonitions must be rejected. It is said there were sects in the days of the apostles. So there were; and there were crimes of every species, too, in the days of the apostles, but this did not make crimes lawful because they existed in the apostles' day. Is Christ divided *then or now*? Was it ever right to cut up the body of Christ into parties or sects?

Let no man glory in men, such as the Pope, Luther, Calvin, Arminius, Wesley or Swedenburg, that he that glories, let him glory in the Lord, in being a Christian. There is not now on this earth a people that pleads for and is governed by the *Scriptures alone*, save one, as known to me. Yet all protestant sects say the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. If this is so, why not carry it out? It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing. I challenge investigation on this point. Christianity is the religion of the New Testament. Heresy or sect is the religion of the doctrines and commandments of men. Many glory in being branches of the Church not considering that the branches of the true vine are not sects, but persons—sects are wild, poisonous berries of a strange and degenerate vine from Rome or Sodom. The Church of Rome is certainly the head of factions and sects, the mistress of parties, the fruitful mother from whom sprang the most if not all the sects of this sectarian age. The prevailing maxim of this age of charity is, *all sects, though as opposite to each other as the zenith and nadir, are right and in the strait and narrow path to immortality.*" It may be said of us in this

age as God said of the Jews—the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge. Before we can discern our right hand from our left some sectarian mantle is thrown over our eyes, through which few of us ever see. I do not regard the sects as dishonest in this matter. I believe they are sincerely sects. I believe Jews, Pagans, Mahomedans, Romanists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists would suffer and no doubt die for their sect; yea they boast of dying happy. But men have been as sincere in error, as in truth. But all this does not prove that sects are the congregations of Jesus Christ whose history we have in the first seven chapters of the Acts of the apostles. I believe there are sincere and devoted persons in all the sects. But what then? Yours truly,

J. CREATH.

TRUTH.

Truth is a reality or fact. A reality is that which is real, positive, certain, and not imaginary. A fact is an act, deed, or reality. Truth, therefore, conforms to that which is real, positive, certain, an act, deed; &c. Truth is made manifest to man through seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling. Each sense tries its particular class of objects. Truth, in her most remote source, stands dressed in the sublime phrase, "I Am." She stands in the highest order of intelligence, and is an attribute of perfection.

There are two central truths; one in nature, the other, in the Bible. Nature shows "His eternal power and divinity."—The Bible declares that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Visible nature—"the things that are made"—His works, exhibit "His eternal power and divinity." The evidence of this truth, like those of the Bible, have been perverted by the Philosophy of men. Some Philosophers have

disputed the existence of visible nature, from the fact, as they thought, that our ideas do not resemble their correspondent objects. Malbranch said, "That our senses are not given us to discover the essences of things, but to acquaint us with the means of preserving our own existence." It is apparent that this extreme would make God the author of falsehood—that He brought visible nature into existence, not in conformity to reality or fact, but as an imaginary entity. There is another extreme in the opposite direction, that makes visible nature prove too much. This is "Natural Religion." This extreme, however, has the assistance of the "bumps" on man's head; and we might say, the other has too. By false reasoning, heathen nations worshiped idols, and made it manifest, *in them*, that they knew there was a Supreme Being, by making corruptible gods of their own; such as men, fowls, four-footed beasts, reptiles; &c. Correct reasoning on nature will only keep man from idolatry, and lead him to the belief of "His eternal power and divinity."

There is something very assuming in the modern acceptance of "Natural Religion." It sets at defiance the wisdom of God, and the scheme of human redemption. Nature, however, truly manifests "His eternal power and divinity"—that His divinity, nature, or composition, is not that of matter, in the visible form and shape of man, fowls, four-footed beasts, and reptiles, but that of spirit invisible, and infinite in all conceivable attributes of perfection. The central truth in the Bible, we have said, is "That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Here truth stands in her prophetic and miraculous attitude, and defies the intelligence of men or angels to set aside the truth of her grand predicate. This is a moral truth, and is believed through the written testimony of *inspired* men. It is, also, a historical truth; and must be believed, if believed at all, by its own appropriate history—the Bible.

As visible nature is adapted to the proof of "His eternal power and divinity;" so is

the Bible adapted to the proof, "That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Nature establishes the authority, power, and divinity of the Father, while the Bible establishes the authority, power, and divinity of His Son. Therefore, as God is the central idea of nature; so is Jesus the central idea in the Bible. Men, however, in their vain attempts to live on angel's food, have found a variety of central ideas in the Bible. The central idea in Catholicism is, that Peter was Pope; therefore, Pope is *infallible*. So it is with all the "Harlots of Babylon," who have been made drunk with the wine of her false assumptions.—They all have a nucleus, surrounded by a *creed*, in which they live, move, and have their religious being. Their *creed* is a fortification against the reception of the truth; for when they would advance, the *creed* is present. We must return again, however, to the consideration of truth in general.

Truth is immutable, unchangeable, permanent, and eternal; "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth;" 2 Cor. xiii: 8. It is, then, beyond the power of man to do anything against truth. Man may develop falsehood, but truth defies all his efforts. Man may live and die, empires may rise and fall, and all the glory of man fade like the flower of grass, yet truth stands upon the eternal foundation of reality or fact—perched upon this foundation, truth bids defiance to all the principalities and powers of earth. It is an axiom in the very nature of things, that no two persons can differ respecting the same truth, and both be right. One may be right, or both may be wrong, but both never can be right and differ with each other. If this be true of two, what of more than two? This being true in respect to truth in general. What of the religious world? Are there as many true roads to heaven as there are "*denominations*" in the world?—As well might we say that God has given as many Sons to die as there are "*denominations*" in the world, as to say those differing and differing "*denominations*" are all right. Hence, in religion, there is but

one truth, one Lord, one immersion, one faith, one God and Father of all. The one truth establishes the authority of the one Lord—"That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Then, by his authority, we have but *one immersion*.

But again, truth, of course, is better than falsehood. Can falsehood save a soul, body, or spirit? Has falsehood ever been a benefit to one single human being? Never.—This is true both in nature and religion.—The farmer, who scratches the surface and leaves the rich loam beneath, has but a small harvest. In consequence of this, he is unable to cloth and educate his children; and the final effect of his error is ignorance and rags. And here we see what man can do "for the truth."

He can put his plow into the earth and give truth a chance. But, if he scratches above rich loam, he is doing "nothing against the truth." So it may be in the great day of eternity—we may fail to reach the rich loam—truth—in this life.

W. BAKER.

NOTHING IS LOST.

Where is the snow?

'Tis not long ago

It covered the earth with a veil of white.
We heard not its footsteps soft and light;
Yet there it was in the morning bright;
Now it hath vanished away from sight.

Not a trace remains,
In fields or lanes.

Where is the frost?

They are gone and lost—

The forms of beauty last night it made.
With pictures rare were windows arrayed;
"Be silent," it said; the brook obeyed.
Yet silence and pictures all did fade.

At the smile of the sun

All was undone.

Where is the rain?

Pattering it came,

Dancing along with a merry sound.
A grassy bed in the fields it found;
Each drop came on the roof with a bound.
Where is the rain? It hath left the ground.

What good hath it done,

Gone away so soon?

Ever, ever
 Our best endeavor
 Seemeth to fall like the melted snow.
 We work out our thought wisely and slow ;
 The seed we sow, but it will not grow.
 Our hopes, our resolves—where do they go ?
 What doth remain ?
 Memory and pain.

Nothing is lost—
 No snow nor frost
 That come to enrich the earth again.
 We thank them when the ripening grain
 Is waving over the hill and plain,
 And the pleasant rain springs from earth again.

All endeth in good—
 Water and food,
 Never despair ;
 Disappointment bear,
 Though hope seemeth vain, be patient still ;
 Thy good intent God doth fulfill.
 Thy hand is weak ; His powerful will
 Is finishing thy life-work still.
 The good endeavor
 Is lost—ah! never.

—Ch. Inquirer.

PREACHING HELL.

MR. EDITOR:—You are conducting a protracted meeting; your congregation embraces, as usual, a people who have often heard and as often rejected the gospel.—You wish to move them. You have a good sermon, say, on *faith*. You show what faith is, how it comes, that the faith-alone system is unsound and that faith is made perfect by obedience—all true—close up with an exhortation—give an invitation, but no one comes forward.

Next night—You wish to treat the subject of repentance. You will show what the word means; that it does not mean mere sorrow, but embraces reformation also; that repentance comes after faith; that repentance is both a national and individual duty; and that it is an essential prerequisite to baptism—all right and sufficiently orthodox. Now you exhort, sing and invite; but the audience is tearless—you hear no sob, while a provoking composedness is seen in every face.

Preaching again. To-night you will perhaps preach on moral and positive law.—You will show their difference and illustrate by the case of Adam and Eve, that all dispensations have had their positive institutions; that obedience to a positive law is a better test of loyalty than obedience to moral law; that baptism is the positive law of the New Testament and that salvation is promised to the baptized believer “five points”—all right—nobody hurt—dismiss and go home.

Once more. To-night we'll show the order in which the several conditions of salvation come—preaching the gospel, faith in Christ, repentance of sin, confession, baptism—these five—so plain that no honest heart can err therein—pardon, the Holy Spirit and Eternal life are all promised, but no stir in the audience. What's wanting? The doctrine was all true and well delivered, but no good result. A conscientious minister will prayerfully look around for the causes of the failure—suspects at last it is not for the lack of *knowledge* so much as an *unwillingness to repent*. The proper condition of heart is wanting. There is no sin sickness; feel no *need* of salvation. They neither see nor feel the exceeding sinfulness of sin; are not very anxious to be rid of sin as it causes no particular uneasiness of soul. What must the preacher do? He thinks of the text “The goodness of God leads to repentance”—he develops that goodness in creation, providence and especially in redemption; in nature and in grace; for body and for soul; for time and for eternity. He portrays the life of Christ, paints his sufferings and urges that this was all for our sins; exhorts, sings, invites—why do'nt they come? No contrition yet? Why no contrition?—Who can tell? Christ has truly been preached, but who has cared for that? Why not? Is not the death of Christ the best argument to show the heinousness of sin? The excellence of his love and the necessity of obeying the gospel?

This brings us to notice a very popular error both among preachers and churches—

That we are not to preach the terrors of hell and eternal damnation, not to move the sinner by fear; that the love of God is the all controlling motive for obedience; that fear should seldom, and then very gently be invoked as an element of converting power.—

This is a great and almost a fatal error and is an element of great weakness in every preacher who so feels and believes. Without a knowledge of the consequence of sin, of hell, and the terrors of eternal judgment, who can appreciate your sermon on the love of God? In what does that love consist if not in delivering the soul from the "Worm that never dies?" If we have not been saved from "So great a death," escaped no deep damnation, if there is no "unquenchable fire," no "hell," no "bottomless pit," no "lake of fire," no "everlasting fire," no "everlasting punishment," no "damnation of hell," no "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," what does salvation mean? and what does love mean? and how could we so highly appreciate the love of Christ when, in the case supposed, he has done nothing for us? Where there is no danger of hell there can be no salvation from it; and if no salvation from any "great death," how can the operation of any great love be found? Is the love of God exhibited in the death of Christ?—Think of the garden, the tree, his bursting veins, his spasmodic heart blood sorrow, prayer, death. A sad picture indeed.—What is the back ground of the picture?—Who could paint a white picture on a white canvass? or a black picture upon a black canvass? If you regard the sufferings of Christ as a scene of sadness and darkness, you must view him on the white canvass of his own innocence bleeding at the hands of sinful men. Should you regard them as a scene of luminous triumph and glory you must throw the picture upon the back ground of the horrid gloom of hell and eternal night from which he has thereby saved us. When salvation is written over damnation, when heaven is written over hell, life over death and love over wrath, each word is understood in contrast with its antipodal word.

Preach the love of God without preaching hell! Who can understand the death of Christ or see any love in it unless he first understand what hell is and that he is himself in danger of eternal damnation? What meaning in the word *salvation* except to him who knows the force of the word *damnation*? We are constantly told that the great controlling, converting power of the gospel is the preaching of the *love* of God. But the gospel is the good news, the good news of redemption—*redemption from hell*. Damnation is not the definition but the explanation of salvation. Perhaps no word of promise can be defined to the understanding of sinners without the aid of terms of penal significance. Who can define joy to the comprehension of one who never knew sorrow? Adam came to the knowledge of "good and evil" simultaneously. And why should not the preacher, in defining heaven, lay under contribution the entire vocabulary of hell? And why endeavor to impress the sinner with a sense of the love of God without exhibiting the damnation, of hell from which that love has saved him? Let the minister preach heaven *and* hell, God *and* the Devil, life *and* death, rewards *and* punishments, love *and* wrath, then will the sinner know the meaning of love and be thankful for itself exercise toward him.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." This fear must be created before there will be wisdom enough to obey the gospel. God intends fear to do its part—fear of sin, fear of punishment, fear of eternal judgment, fear of hell, fear of the deathless worm, fear of the unnavigable lake of fire, all of which make up the fear of God. *Now preaching the love of God cannot create the fear of God.* It is quite impossible to fear any being who has no power to punish. The King is no longer to be feared in the absence of executive authority; and had Almighty God no means of punishing the sinner he neither would nor could be feared any more than the man in the moon. The services of Noah in building the ark were very acceptable to God notwithstanding he was "moved

with fear" in the work. So is every Christian's service acceptable who works out his salvation "with fear and trembling." The sinner must be shaken with fear as well as wooed by love. As Grattan eloquently said, "One world ought to be shaken by the thunders of another." The rolling thunders of that igneous force at the heart of the earth warn us of God's power below. The floods of beamy day flowing from that mountain of light assure us of God's love on high. Should the sinner overcome the power of two worlds his victory is his ruin. He cannot afford to conquer God and his Gospel. But why should the preacher under the vicious influence of half formed convictions in himself, of the reality of hell, deprive the sinner of more than half the motives for repentance to be drawn from the fear of the Lord. Or, why should the preacher compromise even the respect of the sinner both for himself and his cause by drawing out his weakly recommendations to join the church unsupported by any full declaration of the terrors of the Lord? No sinner respects the preacher that does not probe the disease of his heart to the bottom. He knows his own sins, his own deserts, that he ought to be threatened, aroused and alarmed, and feels a kind of contempt for the quackery that can neither understand nor prescribe for the malady of his soul. Bible writers and inspired preachers took the course I here recommend as I shall fully demonstrate in my next. Let us do likewise, making the sinner, first of all, to feel himself a *lost* sinner, then he'll love Christ for finding him. Let him know all the terrors of that "great death," and this will measure the value of the "great salvation." Let him hear the avenger of blood in the rear then will he fly to the city of refuge. Not only life, but *life and death*, must be preached in all their equal extent and significance and the sinner will feel

"I must from God be driven

Or with my Savior dwell;

Must at his comman to heaven,

Or else to depart to hill."

THOMAS MUNNELL.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE.

OVID, IND., Jan. 17, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Dear Sir:—Mr. Peter Fesler of the Dunkard Church, has shown me a letter from the Rev. Isaac Lawshe, of the same Church, in which he requests Mr. Fesler to inform your friends here, that he wishes to have a discussion with you—in fact he rather urges the thing. His propositions you will find on the inside of this sheet.

All I know of this man Lawshe is, that he preached here some time ago, and I think he is, perhaps, the best man they have shown here; but I do not think him a man of great ability. He lives in Summerset on the Wabash, I believe.

They requested me to inform you of his request and to ask an answer from you soon. He proposes to hold the debate here in September next. Please write me on receipt of this.

Yours with due respect,

HIRAM PEDEN.

Proposition on Baptism.

Does the New Testament teach that one immersion only, in water, is Christian baptism?

Lawshe denies.

Proposition on Feet washing.

Does the New Testament teach the disciples to wash one another's feet, in their worship?

Lawshe affirms.

Proposition on the Lord's supper.

Does the New Testament teach the disciples to take the bread and wine of communion in the day time, and term it the Lord's supper?

Lawshe denies.

Proposition on the holy kiss.

Does the New Testament teach the dis-

ciples to salute one another with an holy kiss, as an act of worship?

Lawshe affirms.

REMARKS.

We have a few remarks on the foregoing, as follows :

I. We have no objections to debates, when properly conducted, and between proper persons, as we think we have given pretty full testimony. Still we can not debate with every man who may desire to debate. We have not the time. We would do nothing else. The best we can do is to select a representative man, once in a while, from some of the contending parties and enter into a pretty full investigation of the points at issue. In the case before us we know nothing of the man proposed, save the brief account above. We know not whether the Tonkers think him a man of ability, or whether they would consider his defeat a matter of any importance. If the Tonkers of Indiana will select a man, to whose hands they will commit their cause and bring him forward in some proper way, we will meet him, and discuss fair propositions, or propositions embracing the difference between us.

II. We object to the propositions as follows :

Prop. 1. "Does the New Testament teach that one immersion only, in water, is Christian baptism?"

We object to this proposition as *evasive*, showing an effort to avoid the real issue, and unfair, in trying to induce us to affirm a negative. There is no question between us about *one immersion*. We all agree that *one immersion is right*. The Tonkers themselves must have *one immersion* before they can have *three*. The debate is about the *two immersions*, which they add to the *one immersion*. Will they, therefore, affirm what they practice? Will they affirm as follows :

To constitute baptism according to the New Testament, the person to be baptized must kneel in the water, and after being

once immersed, face foremost, be immersed *twice more, face foremost?*

This is precisely what they practice.— Let them affirm it, or cease to practice it. We believe that their two extra immersions are clearly additions to the New Institution for which no man ever did or ever can offer a reason or Scripture, and a mere pretext for building a religious faction.

Prop. 2. "Does the New Testament teach the disciples to wash one another's feet, in their worship?" This is not fairly stating the issue; but rather an evasion. Tonkers practice feet washing as an ordinance of the Church and an act of worship in their public assemblies. The question, then, is as follows :

Did Jesus authorize, and the first Christians practice, feet washing as an ordinance in the Church and an act of worship in the public assemblies, as Tonkers do? We deny that Jesus authorized, or that the apostles ever practiced, any such ceremony in the public assemblies for worship.— There is no more authority for it than for doing penance or counting beads for worship.

Prop. 3. "Does the New Testament teach the disciples to take the bread and wine of communion in the day time, and term it the Lord's supper?"

We would not discuss this proposition in its present form. We suppose it to be entirely immaterial whether in the *day time* or *at night*, so that it is "on the first day of the week." We have no dispute about "calling it the Lord's supper." Paul says, "When you come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper." "At the same time, the disciples came together on the *first day* of the week to break bread." They did, then, come together to *break bread*, but *not to eat the Lord's supper*.— They came together to *commune*, but not to eat a supper, under a pretext of eating the Lord's supper. If our Tonker friends will affirm what they practice, it must be something like the following :

Did our Lord authorize, and the first

Christians practice, communing invariably after night, the supper of soup, accompanied with the ceremony of feet washing, as practiced by Tonkers?

We repudiate their ceremony of *soup*, as being no more a part of Christian worship than a pagan feast, and their confining the communion to any special hour of the Lord's day, or "the first day of the week." The Lord's time, and the time the first disciples met to break bread, was "on the first day of the week," and no man has any authority for limiting it to any special hour, or to throw around it any other limitations than those placed there by the great head of the Church.

Prop. 4. "Does the New Testament teach the disciples to salute one another with a holy kiss, as an act of worship?"

We should suppose that there was scarcely any community sufficiently unenlightened to require any discussion of such a proposition as this. There is certainly no man in this country who has read the New Testament once through, who does not know that the apostle enjoined upon the disciples the salutation with a holy kiss. But that this is an *act of worship*, we think is a *little new*. The holy salutation, the salutation of the holy ones, or saints, whether it be with the kiss, or with the shake of the hand, or without either; the cordial Christian greeting, from the heart, is all right, but the idea that the kissing among the Dunkards is *worship*, is certainly new, and assuredly merits no discussion.

The men kissing the men and the women kissing the women, as practiced by the Tonkers, is not the ancient custom. "Greet all the brethren with a holy kiss," includes all, both male and female. The first Christians took the manner of salutation as they found it. The manner of salutation then, when it was hearty and cordial, was with a kiss, in greeting both male and female.—This is coming into custom, now, in many parts of the world. But the Tonker custom is peculiar to themselves, having neither the sanction of ancient custom nor Scripture.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. I.

The *five* books, written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, called the **FOUR GOSPELS**, and **ACTS OF THE APOSTLES**, contain the most wonderful history in the world. We have, in these Scriptures, one continuous **HISTORY**, or narrative of events—**EVENTS** the most important ever recorded by the human hand—beautifully blended with dialogues and discourses upon the most important subjects which can engage the attention of the human race,

Believing it might be edifying to the brethren, as well as profitable to myself, to review the lives, travels, acts, and teaching of Jesus and his Apostles, so far as given in the Christian Scriptures, I have determined to commence a series of articles, in which I hope to interest some, who seem to regard the study of these sacred writings as dry and uninteresting. Indeed, I feel the need of a more thorough acquaintance with sacred history, myself; though, more than any other writings, I have from my youth studied those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude.

There is one thing about these writings, when published *without note or comment*, which renders them less entertaining to the common readers of our country and of the present day, and less influential upon the minds of ordinary scholars, than they would otherwise be. It is true, the sublime teaching, the grand precepts, and the glorious facts and promises, which these books contain, will captivate and interest the spiritual-minded Christian. But there are many good, sensible people, to whom the historical parts appear, for some reason, to be rather repulsive than attractive.

Many of the places, customs, and circumstances, merely alluded to in these writings, because they were familiar to those

early Christians for whom they were written, are mysteries to a large class of Bible readers now. This unsatisfactoriness in the historical portions of these books commentators and translators have tried to supply, by writing large commentaries, long and tedious prefaces, or separate volumes, so large and costly as to be useful only to a few. My present design is, to reach up, get hold of some of the fruit of these men's labors, and hand it to the PEOPLE.

And here allow me to ask: If it was proper for Matthew to suit his narrative to the Jews, by giving the genealogy of Christ, and for John to omit it, when writing for brethren at Ephesus, because it could not interest them, how can all the historical matters, contained in all the Christian Scriptures be made equally interesting to all classes of Christian readers?

It is hoped that a satisfactory answer to this important question will be found in the series of papers to follow this. The remainder of this article shall be devoted to the GENEALOGY OF CHRIST, which is the first thing introduced by the first writer of Jesus' biography.

Many Bible-readers are inclined to pass or skip over the first seventeen verses of Matthew, and the last sixteen verses of the third chapter of Luke, because they see no use in reading what they do not understand: but not so with skeptics. Thomas Paine observed a difficulty in reconciling these two genealogies, and made this discrepancy a ground of objection against the Bible. If there is, indeed, any contradiction or disagreement between the two accounts of Matthew and Luke, which can be satisfactorily accounted for, it would be well for the Christian to know the solution of the difficulty, that, when attacked by the doubter, upon this point, he may be able to maintain the integrity of the sacred record.

Some reader, whose mind may be better stored with ideas than words, may wish to know the meaning of the word genealogy. I will therefore attempt to give my idea of its import.

We, of the present day, can seldom trace

our line of descent farther back than to our grand-father, or great-grand-father: though some of the nobility of England and France, and some of the distinguished families of America can boast of a line of descent from some royal or distinguished person, extending back through several generations. But the Jews kept their family records in such a way, and with such care, that they could trace their line of ancestry up through many generations to Jacob, Isaac, or Abraham, and tell whether they were descended from Judah, Benjamin, Levi, or Joseph. For this purpose, certain persons, called SCRIBES or RECORDERS, were appointed to attend to the business of keeping the records of the different tribes and families of the Jews.

It was from these FAMILY RECORDS, or GENEALOGICAL TABLES, that Matthew and Luke took their accounts of the lineage or genealogy of Christ; and their reason for inserting them in their narratives was this: the Prophets had foretold that a descendant of David should sit upon his throne, whom the Jews understood to be the MESSIAH, spoken of by Daniel. Indeed, we might expect the Jews to be looking for some great person to come into the world, for Moses had said: "A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up, like unto me: him shall you hear." And God had said to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In fact, all the old prophets had been foretelling of a Savior, a Deliverer, a Shiloh, the Anointed One, and the "Branch out of the root of Jesse," who should be "for an ensign to the people," to whom "the Gentiles should seek," and "whose rest should be glorious." It was necessary, then, in order to satisfy the Jews that JESUS THE NAZARENE was the person they were looking for, to prove from the public records that he was a branch out of the roots of Jesse, that he was of the descendants, SEED, of Abraham, and that he was a "son of David," or, in our own way of expressing it, a descendant of David.

Now as Matthew and Luke merely copied the genealogy of Christ, as they found it in the public records of the Jews, kept by the

Scribes, no one ought to fault the sacred historians for any errors that might be in it. The fault lies with the Scribes, who, in keeping a register for *fifteen hundred years*, have no doubt made some mistakes. How easy to leave out some names! But Mr. Paine, being under the impression that Christians, considered every word of the Bible as having been dictated by the Holy Spirit—every word, every syllable, every letter, must be infallibly correct, he thought, or else it could not be worthy of confidence. Therefore, having discovered that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke did not exactly agree, that they were not precisely alike, he concluded, without further examination (poor ignorant man!) that these writers were unworthy of credit.

No doubt many Christian readers have been puzzled to know why Matthew should call Joseph the son of *Jacob*, while Luke makes him the son of *Heli*! It is doubtless a happy circumstance, that many would study the Bible all their lives, without noticing this difficulty, unless their attention were called to it. But as skeptics will bring such things to our notice sometimes, we ought to be prepared to give a correct and satisfactory solution.

By comparing the two genealogies, we notice (1), that Luke traces the line of descent up to Adam, while Matthew begins with Abraham, and descends through forty-two generations to Joseph; (2), that Luke agrees with 1 Chronicles, except in making Cainan come between Arphaxad and Salah; (3), that from Abraham to David, Matthew and Luke perfectly agree; (4), we then notice that while Matthew descends through *Solomon*, Luke's line passes through *Nathan*—both sons of David; so that they agree in making Christ a lineal descendant of David; (5), that the two genealogies come together again at Salathiel; (6), and that from Zerrubbabel, his son, they seem to diverge, till they come to Joseph.

From these facts we infer that Matthew and Luke copied from two different genealogical tables; and there are good reasons

to suppose that Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, while Luke gives that of Mary. This supposition will go far to reconcile this apparent difficulty, which Clarke informs us has "puzzled the learned." I confess I find it difficult to comprehend much that he and others have written upon it. But after all I have read, I think I may offer the following as the most satisfactory solution for the people.

(1.) We may consider Jacob the *real* father of Joseph, because Matthew says that "Jacob begat Joseph." (2.) We may regard Heli as Joseph's *legal* father, or *father-in-law*; though not in our sense of the word father-in-law.

According to the law of Moses, in Deuteronomy, xxv chapter, 5th verse, "If brothers are living together, and one of them die, having no child, her husband's brother shall marry her, and the first-born shall succeed in the name of his brother." This law was carried out, as we see from Nehemiah vii: 63, where the children of Habaiah lost the priesthood, because Barzillai had married the daughter of Barzillai the Gileadite, "*and was called after their name.*" This law was alluded to by the Sadducees, when they put their hard question to Jesus, about the woman who had married "seven brothers." (See Matthew xx: 27).

What I wish to make out is this: that a man, who married a woman under certain circumstances, was adopted into *her* father's family, and his children were registered as the lineal descendants or *her* father, instead of *his*. Thus it appears that, when Joseph went to Bethlehem to be registered with Mary his espoused wife, his name was placed in the list with her father, and Jesus became a legal son of Heli.

The reader can, by this time, see the propriety of Paul's cautioning Timothy against "giving heed to fables, and endless genealogies, which occasion disputes, rather than great edification." (See 1 Tim. i: 4, and Titus iii: 9.)

WILLIAM PINKERTON.

PREACHING HELL.

NO. III.

The key-note of these articles is this:—To bring sinners to God; to effect their sound conversion; to make them steadfast and earnest Christians, and to produce the feelings of gratitude and love to God. It is most essential that they understand, not only the love of God, the terms of salvation, and the promises of religion; but also they must fully believe the doctrine of future punishment—must see their own exposedness to hell, and be made to fear and tremble for their souls. A sense of their own sins, and their consequent danger, are indispensable antecedents to gratitude. No amount of preaching the love of God can save the soul that believes there is no danger to be saved from. It was hell that suggested the manger and the cross, and that poured the unction of a deep concern into the eloquence of heaven and earth, when the souls of men were in danger of eternal damnation.

An erroneous opinion prevails among many that this view of the case is not supported by the practice of writers and speakers of Bible times. If not, who can explain the singular composition of the 28th chapter of Deut.? This chapter is devoted to the inducements offered to Israel to "Do all the commandments of the Lord." Does Moses dwell only, or chiefly, on the blessings consequent upon obedience? The chapter is divided into 68 verses—the first 14 name the blessings of obedience; the last 54 enumerate the curses of disobedience. Dividing the chapter, in reference to the space each catalogue occupies, the curses embrace more than four times as much as the blessings. True, these are but temporal blessings and curses, but the principle is the same—*God sought to move them to obedience by fear as well as by love.* If both promises and threats are employed to effect mere temporal prosperity, why not

use both these powers when the soul is in jeopardy? and even the more so since men are so much slower to secure their spiritual than their temporal good? A very natural query would also be, why was four times as much space devoted to enumerating the curses as to the blessings? The true answer, perhaps, would be, that God knows how prone we are to believe a good account of ourselves, and how slow to regard the denunciations of the law against our sins. Ahab hated Micaiah because he could not prophecy good concerning him. Whatever may have been his reasons for it, his example is worthy of all acceptance, and furnishes a stirring rebuke to all superfine preachers whose taste, vitiated by a false and shallow philosophy of the human heart, invites them not to split the ears of their superfine hearers by such vulgarities as "How shall you escape the damnation of hell?"

A similar allotment of space is found in Luke 16th—*less than three verses* record the entire history of Lazarus—his poverty, his piety, his wounds, his death, his procession to heaven, and his resting place in Abraham's bosom. But *nine verses* were needed, in the Saviors estimation, to portray the history of Dives on earth and in hell. Now whatever reasons could be given for this when Christ was preaching on earth, would justify the same course pursued at this hour—men are as sinful now as then; as slow to believe the doctrine of future punishment; in as much need of being roused into religious activity by all the powers of fear as well as of hope. Human nature has made no change for the better, nor can any improvement be made in the manner of treating it.

The 25th of Matt. would furnish us another example of the same kind, where nearly one half of the entire chapter is devoted to accounts of the disappointment, discomfiture and eternal overthrow of the wicked. Not to multiply single instances, we might refer to the heavy and oft repeated denunciations of all the old Jewish prophets, both major and minor—how they

scolded and threatened the people with the swift and terrible judgments of the Almighty. It is also worthy of remark, considering the very many topics treated in the Bible, how large a portion of it is occupied with warnings against the wrath to come.

To all this it is sometimes responded that the apostles after the resurrection, though "knowing the terrors of the Lord" did not preach these terrors, but confined themselves to "persuading men" away from sin. The response, however, possesses little or no logical force, for if their knowing the terrors of the Lord increased the ardor of their persuasions, why should not the hearers also know those terrors that they might be persuaded? Paul, perhaps, persuaded them by revealing to them the fearfulness of "falling into the hands of the living God." If an apostle feared for men they ought to fear for themselves. If it is right for men to fear it is necessary for them to know what there is to be feared. Why deprive the sinner of any revealed motive to flee from the wrath to come?—The two angels that visited Lot in Sodom knew the "terrors of the Lord" against that city, and revealed them unto Lot that he might fly for his life. The brief sermon of John the Baptist, in Matt. 3d chapter, is directed to the punishment of the generation of vipers. His exhortation to repentance was well supported by the warning "axe at the root of every tree," the separating "fan," the "unquenchable fire," and the "wrath to come." Paul did not develop the gospel scheme before Felix, but alarmed him with his intemperance and sins generally, and threatened him with the judgment to come. He cast no love pearls before that swine, lest he should consider them mere simpering weakness supported by no penal sanctions to make them respected. Paul had advised both Timothy and Titus to let no man despise them as preachers, and determined that Felix should not despise him, as sinners often do when urged to flee but see nothing very terrible to flee from.

Temperance, righteousness, and finally judgment to come! Eternal judgment! The judgment of the great day! The judgment is God's last and most powerful argument. The Spirit "convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment," and almost the last thing in the New Testament is an account of the judgment.—Jesus as a skillful orator closes up the effort with this best argument that sinners may be glad of salvation and may fly to the city of refuge.

How shall we convince sinners that God loves them? By preaching Christ crucified, say all. But why was he crucified? To save sinners. To save them from what? This question obliges the minister to preach the doctrine of hell that love may seem to have place, for our deliverance from the "great death" is the love of God. You can not paint the luminous portrait of the love of Jesus except upon the black canvass of hell. The word *love* is written with invisible ink, unless you bring out its letters of light by a juxtaposition with hell. This being true there is as much love preached by exhibiting the penalty of sin as by preaching the joys of heaven. Is there any ill will in warning the traveler of a lion in the way, or of a precipice ahead? "He that believeth not shall be damned" is as full of love as "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Saved" and "damned" were alike dictated by the same tender love. Why, then, should ministers so rarely develop fully the doctrine of future punishment as to impress but feebly the public mind with the irremediable consequences of sin? Love is sometimes called God's *darling attribute*; but there are no *darlings* among his attributes, as all are infinite. Justice is as dear as love. To exalt any one of his attributes above the others would be fatal to the normal operation of the divine mind, just as some human intellects are unbalanced by an undue prominence of some of their phrenological organs.

The whole truth of this matter was intimated to the world by the publication of the law previous to the gospel. By the

law is the knowledge of sin, the conviction of sin and the punishment of sin. If this be not first understood there will be feeble convictions and a shallow conversion and apostacy in time of trial.

If, then, we would present the love of God to the best advantage, let us preach heaven and hell, life and death, time and eternity, rewards and punishments—both sides fully and in due proportion, and Christ will appear to have accomplished something for us. But beware of leaving out one of the colors which God braided into the seven fold beam lest our mutilated light should seem little better than a medley of disturbed rays, each one dislocated by the absence of an essential element of the original composition.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

NO. II.

BETWEEN A CHRISTIAN AND A SPIRITUALIST.

Spiritualist.—Brother Christian, in our former conversation there is a passage that I quoted, Rom. viii: 7, that you did not say any thing about. Paul says, “the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Again in 1 Cor. ii: 14, the Apostle says “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

Christian.—Very well. Both passages are true without doubt in my mind. In the first of them, it is said that the carnal mind is *not subject* to the law of God, *neither indeed can be*. In the other passage, it is declared that the *natural*, or *animal* man, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them. The

reason he cannot know nor see them, is because they are discerned by the Spirit.

S.—But the carnal mind, and the natural man, refer to unconverted men, or men who have not been born of the Spirit.

C.—But Paul says they *cannot* be subject to the law of God, and *cannot* discern the things of the Spirit.

S.—How then can a man be saved unless he is born of the Spirit?

C.—He *cannot* enter the kingdom of heaven, unless he is born of water and the Spirit—Flesh and blood, the carnal and animal man, *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. xv: 50. The carnal mind is not to be converted, but is to be crucified—to be slain.

S.—I do not see how that can possibly take place until the man is regenerated by the Holy Ghost, because men in a state of nature are dead in trespasses and in sins. How can a dead man hear the Gospel?

C.—The word of the Lord is living and effectual—“The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life,” said Jesus. The literally dead heard the voice of Jesus and lived. The Ephesians had been dead in trespasses and sins; but *after* they heard the word of truth, the Gospel of their salvation, they trusted in Christ, in whom also, *after* they believed—they were sealed with the promised Spirit. Eph. i: 13.

S.—Well, all that may be true, but the root of the matter you have not touched yet. How is it that all who hear do not believe, when *some* do? There must be some antecedent work of the Spirit to prepare their hearts to receive the Gospel, or it is preached in vain.

C.—You assume that it is an antecedent work of the Spirit that prepares men for believing the Gospel. How do you know that is true?

S.—How do I know it? How do I know I am cold, or thirsty, or have pain except by my feelings? That is the way I know it; and that is a good evidence as any man ought to ask.

C.—It is the carnal, or animal man that feels cold, thirst, hunger, pain, etc. Please

to remember that these are not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be*. Tests of that sort are deceptive applied to the things of the Spirit.

S.—That is just what I have been fearing all the time during these conversations, that you would deny all feeling in religion, and make it a mere formal, lifeless thing. I can hardly endure such language.

C.—I have not denied that good feeling results from obeying the Lord, nor have I said the Spirit does not operate on men.

S.—Christ said the Spirit should convince men of sin, righteousness and judgment, and should also show them things to come, and bring all things to their memory whatsoever he had said.

C.—The Lord makes a clear and broad distinction between the man who serves him, and the man who serves him not. All this distinction you seem not to notice, and allow he does for the *ungodly*, what he promised only to the *apostles*. The Spirit was to bring to the memory of the *apostles*, all that he had said to *them*, and should show *them* things to come. We are saved by the Gospel the apostles preached, if we keep it in memory. 1 Cor. xv: 2.

S.—That looks to me too much like men saving themselves, to suit me. If I am saved in heaven, I expect to be saved, not by works of righteousness that I have done, but by the mercy of the Lord.

C.—Do you think the Lord will save them who will not obey him?

S.—Of course I do not. I am not an Universalist.

C.—Then our obedience has something to do in the plan of redemption. All that we can do will not purchase, nor cause us to merit salvation; and yet the Lord will not save the disobedient. Peter exhorted the Jews on Pentecost to save themselves; and Paul directed Timothy how to act, that he might save himself and them that heard him. God, the Saviour, and the Holy Spirit, are all ready, and every thing prepared for man's salvation: so that, if any are not saved, the fault lies against humanity. Men who hear the Gospel, and will not receive

it, will be condemned, for they refuse to yield to God's power, and the Holy Spirit's influence. On the contrary, the man who hears the Gospel of Christ, believes it, and obeys it, the Lord will pardon, and give him the Holy Spirit; and if he walks in newness of life, will be saved in heaven forever.

J. M. HENRY, Reporter.

PROVIDENCE: AN ESSAY IN TWO CHAPTERS.

BY DAVID WALK.

CHAPTER I.

"Man's goings are of the Lord; how can a man, then, understand his own way?"—*Solomon the Wise.*

How few persons of mature age find themselves in the position and circumstances which, in the ardor of youth, they hoped for! And how few of us now enjoy the honor and felicity to which early hope seemed so confidently to point! Could our expectations have been realized, this would be anything else but the hum-drum, matter-of-fact world which we find it. We all would have been heroes and heroines, inhabiting splendid castles, or residences of palatial magnificence.

The reason why such a state of things does *not* exist, is found in the motto at the head of this chapter.

Persons dwelling in castles and palaces have not generally been those who have done most for God and the world. God confounded the language at Babel, and the people found it expedient to disperse, and quit playing the fool! So with reference to what we do, what we are, and what we enjoy. It was a wise confounding of position and circumstances that made some princes and some serfs. "Man's goings are of the Lord." Were this not so, there would be nothing but confusion and disaster attendant upon human actions: a hun-

dred fold more than is now the case. The world of mankind would present the same scenes of irregularity and ill-advised effort as would a large family of unruly children without a natural head or governor.

Men are but children of an older growth, and the main difference in most cases is—the playthings of the man *cost more* than those of the child! Very appropriate the words of an elegant poet :

“Behold the child, by nature’s kindly law,
Pleas’d with a rattle, tickled with a straw :
Some *livelier* plaything gives his youth delight,
A little louder, but as empty quite :
Scarfs, garters, gold, amuse his *riper* stage ;
And beads and prayer-books are the toys of age :
Pleas’d with this bauble still, as that before ;
Till tir’d he sleeps, and life’s poor play is o’er !”

It were simply impossible for us to conceive of the wretchedness and misery that would fill this world did not an eternal law of Jehovah find a perpetual execution of itself in the ever-present fact that “Man’s goings are of the Lord !”

The wisdom of God is strangely exemplified in His over-ruling providence! Had Moses been permitted to enter the land of promise, he would have been deified by delighted Israel as a god. But as it is, “no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day.”

Alexander the Great wept because there was not another world to conquer, and then God removed him. After the first Napoleon [the only really great man since Julius Cæsar] had made Europe tremble with the thunder-tread of his armies, he was conquered and captured by what men would call a mere accident.

This world has been called a stage, and mankind the players, who regularly and systematically make their entrances and exits before the foot-lights of simply mimic life.

So, indeed, it appears to men from a worldly point of view. They see only the gorgeous scenic exhibitions, are amazed at (to them) inexplicable dumb show, and they applaud. But only take them once *behind* the curtains, into the green-room; let them see the paint-pots and brushes, and

they will be able to account for what seemed to them—simple souls!—supernatural beauty! Let them see the common tinsel, which they—poor fools!—mistook for pure gold! Show them the woe-begone misery and deep despair which, on the boards, and in the presence of an admiring audience, metamorphosed themselves into smiles and gaiety, and their opinions would speedily be revolutionized!

Thus it is with reference to the affairs of this world. We but see the *outside* of things. It is like looking upon the face of a watch; we know there is delicate and ingenious machinery *somewhere*, though we do not see it. And frequently, in the evolutions of God’s providence, we see this obvious principle of Divine government illustrated.

The *great* (according to man’s method of estimation) or *prominent* features ONLY are observed and noted, while the *perfection* and *harmony* of the whole are dependent upon some little, secret springs, cogs and wheels not patent to the vision! Or at least, men refuse to recognize them. Failing to note these facts, the sublime and impressive moral and social lessons which God would teach us are utterly lost.

Madness rules the hour. Passion is called to the council-chamber of madness. God is forgotten. The stupendous fact that Jesus the Messiah is King has been entirely overlooked. Men seek their own remedies for supposed wrongs, and insantly reject Heaven’s panacea! Well, what of it? Do we look for the heart-aches of the world to be healed by fire and sword, pillage and slaughter? Never! O, hell-born delusion, never! “I have set MY King upon my holy hill of Zion. I have announced the decree. Ask, and I will give you the heathen for your inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for your possession.” We *have* asked. Jesus Christ has asked, and God is giving audience to the petitioners! This whole earth, with all its governments and laws, should long since have been subordinated to Christ. This has not been done, and what is the consequence? Disappointment, deep, dark, appalling.

To a man with his Bible in his hand, and the love of Christ in his heart, many otherwise perplexing questions are settled—many fatally erroneous views corrected. He learns why it is that all great, popular men and events are so generally over-rated. Much is promised, but little, comparatively, is ever performed. Some men have *seemed* to possess the power to revolutionize the whole world—but they didn't do it. Philanthropists have informed us that certain political and social measures would precede but a short time the Millennium. They, too, proved false prophets and miserable comforters! Why? Because a “*man's* goings are of the Lord,” and these men have sought to restore the equilibrium of this world without any reference whatever to the Divine fulcrum and lever. “I will overturn, overturn, overturn!”

No man can be a *real* benefactor without the countenance of God and GOOD men.—These are the unseen, unacknowledged springs and wheels that move true men to *real* position and greatness. We have just what we ask for—just what we *will* have! We sometimes murmur at weak and corrupt administrations: we do not “understand” their whys and wherefores. But these, in the present state of society, are necessary as moral and social correctives—upon the same principle that storms rock the ocean into purity, and tornadoes sweep away the noxious gases that breed disease and death. We overshoot the mark. We give the glory to man that rightfully belongs to God; and then God chastises us by frustrating our designs, and bringing us back to a sense of our dependence upon him.

We will learn after awhile that swearing by Cæsar is not exactly becoming allegiant to Christ, and that there is a little doubt hanging over the minds of some as to whether or not the “Star Spangled Banner” will be the Judgment Hymn, with Gabriel for chief chorister!

God's plan is, generally, to work through the *people*. But the people forget God in worshipping idols of their own creation; and then He either suffers them to eat the bit-

ter fruit of their own misdoing, or shows them that their strongest towers are but as straw in his omnipotent hand. God is the most terrible of iconoclasts!

There are now men who are engaged in playing the game of humanity on a grand scale, using the great substratum of the people as they would the titular dignitaries of the chess-board. Our hope is in this: *God is presiding*, and will direct all to proper issues. When any man gets in His way, He will simply put him out of it!—Look to your hero-worship, O, ye Pagans! Forgetting that the “ways” of your man-made gods are of *the* Lord, and that God Almighty is using them for the accomplishment of His own purposes, like the idolaters in the days of Paul, we become infatuated, throw up our hats, wave our banners and cry out, “Great is Diana of the”—*pet notion advocated by our man and our party!*

Cincinnati, March 17, 1863.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

INTRODUCTION.

Next to the cause of our present national troubles, nothing is more dangerous to our civil and religious liberties, in my humble judgment, than Romanism. Their numbers are much greater than any two or three of the most numerous parties in the country together. Their rank and file are as well trained for defensive and aggressive effort, as an army on the field of battle. Cincinnati has been the scene of some of their efforts to obtain volunteers for the service of Romanism lately. A course of lectures, during two weeks, was delivered in their church on Mill street, another at St. Xavier, on Sycamore, during one week, and last week St. Peter's, at the corner of Eighth and Plum, was occupied in both apartments, above and below, by two speakers at the same time. Our little city of Dayton was also visited in the first part of the

month of February by one of these recruiting officers of the Pope, in the person of a Mr. Hecker from the city of New York. The most commodious hall in the place was crowded by our citizens for a little more than one week, of evenings, to listen to him. Brother J. H. Lockwood, of Clermont Co., being engaged in the second week of a series of meetings with us, I could not go to hear the "Rev. Father Hecker." Bro. Lockwood and myself met Mr. Hecker, and "Rev. Father Kelly" who has charge of the English Catholic church in this place, on the afternoon of Friday, and had an interview of nearly two hours with them. Mr. Kelly and I said little, choosing rather to let the others talk.—Conversation was soon introduced by one of two ladies, who heard Mr. Hecker's lectures, asking him if she had understood him, the previous evening, to deny that the Bible is an unerring guide. "Yes, lady," said he. Addressing himself to brother L. and me, he said—"The Bible is not an unerring guide. Of this I have good proof. You Protestants say it is an infallible directory to teach men their duty to God, and to one another, and to point out their eternal destiny. Now, I believe that you are honest men, who thus read the Bible. But you do not arrive at the same conclusions. One becomes a Trinitarian, another an Unitarian, one says that the Bible teaches that all men will be saved, another that only an elect number will be saved, one believes it teaches that men are justified by faith alone, and another that we are justified by faith and works. And so you differ about everything, except perhaps the existence of God. How can I believe the Bible is an unerring guide to our knowledge and duty, when I see good and honest men thus led to such widely different conclusions? The truth is, if God had intended to give a revelation that should be an infallible guide, he could, and would, have made it so plain that honest men could see it alike. But good men and honest men do *not* see it alike, *therefore*, we know it is not an unerring guide to our eternal destiny."

The foregoing is but a small part of all he said on that topic, but embraces substantially what he said, most of it, indeed, I think is his language. How can the orthodox partizans of the day reply to these things? No reply has been attempted by them, that I have heard of, yet. In private, it was said he was not reliable, because he, when a young man who had been reared by a Methodist mother, became anxious about his salvation, went to several preachers of different religious denominations to learn of them what to do to be saved, and none of them could give him any satisfactory answer, he at last found what he sought for in the Roman Catholic Church. This would represent Romanism as better than Protestantism, and for this they affected to despise him. There is no logic in a sneer, nor argument in misrepresentation. How can Protestants meet Mr. Hecker's argument against the Bible as an unerring guide? If they say, "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," he may reply, "how is it, then, that some of you are Presbyterians, some Episcopalians, some Baptists, some Methodists, etc.—Your Bible teaches you to be of the same mind, and the same judgment, to speak the same things, and to be perfectly joined together, and further, that there be no divisions among you. Christ prayed to His Father that all who believe in him, by the word of his Apostles, should be one, as he and his Father are one! Now, the Catholic Church is a unity in all the world. According to your own admission of the infallibility of the Bible, by it I prove the Catholic Church the true Church, without considering its antiquity, which is many centuries greater than any of your denominations."

Should any one of these contend for the all-sufficiency of the Bible, how fatal to their argument the reply, "How about your creeds and confessions of faith, and books of discipline, in addition to the Bible?"

Believing the Bible true and Romanism false, after delivering an address on "the Bible an unerring guide," it seemed good

to some of my brethren to advise me to deliver a series of lectures on topics involving the characteristics of Romanism. To this I hesitatingly consented, as I also do in preparing them, in substance, for publication. The last six of the addresses were listened to by one whom I was told was a Catholic priest, four of them were heard by a Wesleyan minister, and one by a Baptist minister. I came to the conclusion, after the close of my efforts, that if Romanism is to be successfully met, that those only can do it who are unfettered by human philosophies, sometimes called Orthodoxy and Protestantism. I may not be able to present the readers of the Review my feeble efforts in consecutive numbers of the paper, because of other duties, yet, the Lord permitting me, I will try to do so.

J. M. HENRY.

MODERN REVIVALS.

NO. II.

We take it that we have no reader who does not know that we read of no "revivals of religion" in the Bible. The apostles and first preachers of Jesus, had they heard any one telling of a "revival of religion," would have had no idea what was meant. They had nothing called by that name, nor did they have the thing meant by it.—To hear some man tell, in a grave style, of "a gracious revival of religion," how many had "experienced a hope," "obtained peace," "got religion," or "felt a change," one would suppose that such expressions abounded in the Christian Scriptures. Also to hear a preacher gravely denouncing a man as a scoffer, a heretic, or infidel, alleging that he denies "experimental religion," "heart-felt religion," Holy Ghost reli-

gion," one would almost conclude that the man denounced was a demon in human form. Then again, to hear pious persons tell how their eyes were opened, that they saw a light, heard a voice, felt a change, obtained a hope, &c., &c., one would inquire whence Bible language, and Bible things had fled and whence all these strange expressions and things supplying their place? The time has come for an entire overhauling of these matters. Two systems entirely different are in operation in this country. They are as wide a part as the poles. They are antagonistic. They are antipodes. They are wholly irreconcilable. Between them there can be no compromise. The one or the other must be put down, or the war must continue.

One of these systems starts out with the idea, that man is totally depraved, that he cannot believe, repent, turn to God, think a good thought, or do a good deed till operated upon by a direct and supernatural power, opening his eyes, quickening him, giving him ability to believe and do the will of God. These maintain also that the Gospel is a mystery, the New Testament a sealed book, the way of salvation a secret, the truth a dead letter, till it is quickened, made alive and rendered the power of God to salvation by a direct and miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit. Thus this theory is so arranged that the Gospel can do nothing for the sinner till miraculous power is infused into it, and the sinner can do nothing toward believing and obeying the Gospel till miraculous power is infused into him. It, therefore, requires the sinner to stand still and wait, and the preacher also to stand still and wait for the Lord to send the miraculous power and quicken the sinner so that he can believe, and quicken the Gospel so as to make it effectual in saving sinners.

Had this system, and all the preaching consistent with it, been intended to excuse the sinner in his disobedience, it could not have been better contrived for that purpose. What better apology, or excuse can be made for the sinner in his sins, than to tell him

that he is totally depraved; can not believe, repent, turn to God, think a good thought or do a good thing—that the Bible is a sealed book, the Gospel a dead letter—all a mystery; that he must wait—stand still—till direct miraculous power shall enable him to believe and quicken the word of God and render it powerful to the salvation of his soul? There stands the sinner, desiring to be a Christian, but thinks he can not till the direct converting power comes. There stands the preacher telling him that he cannot come to the Lord or do anything acceptable to the Lord till the power comes. Yet the sinner will be lost, if the converting power does not come. Why is the sinner not converted? Not because he is not willing, for he desires to be a Christian. Not because the preacher is not willing, for he is praying for God to send down the converting power. Why then is not the sinner converted? Because the Lord will not send down the converting power! The sinner can do nothing, according to this theory. The Gospel can do nothing, and the preacher can do nothing except pray for power. None but God can do any thing. He does not convert the sinner! He, and no one else, can send down the converting power, but he will not do it! Who is to blame? The sinner is not, for he can do nothing. The Gospel is not, for it can do nothing. The preacher is not, for he is doing all he can do! None but God can do any thing, and he will not do it!

We deliberately state, this whole scheme is most mischievous, disastrous and demoralizing and we may just as well meet it square first as last, for meet it we must and its pernicious influence must be brought to a stand. Men must be made to hear one more voice, see one more sight, and their eyes must be opened in a different manner from any thing they have yet experienced. The gospel must be reinstated among men, its power for salvation maintained, defended and demonstrated. Man's ability, capability, responsibility and accountability must be maintained and defended. The Bible makes man free, responsible and accounta-

ble. It gives him ability to believe, repent, turn to God and obey him. It gives to the Gospel the power of God to salvation to every one who believes. It leaves man "without excuse," "no cloak for his sins." It says, "You will not come to me that you may have life." It represents God as inquiring, "What more could I have done that I have not done?" as saying, "All the day long I have stretched forth my hand to a gainsaying and disobedient people"—as saying, "I have called and you refused." It represents the Lord as saying, "He who comes to me, I will in no wise cast out." Does the Author of the Bible make all these representations, knowing that man can do nothing? Does he tantalize man, commanding him to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," knowing that he can not believe? Does he tantalize his creatures, by "commanding all men every where to repent," when he knows they can not repent? Does he mock and tantalize his creatures, by saying, "Come to me all you ends of the earth and be saved," when he knows they can not come? Will you represent the blessed and faithful Creator, as mocking and tantalizing his creatures, by saying to them, "All the day long have I stretched my hand to a gainsaying and a disobedient people," knowing that they could not come to him without the aid which he would not extend to them? If the mother stand over her helpless infant, crying, come, dear, when she knows it has no power to come, till it cries itself to death, who was to blame that it was not saved? Certainly not the infant, but the cruel mother, who could have saved it, but would not.

But our intention is to file our bill of complaints against modern revivalism in a more formal manner:

I. It is wholly without authority, in all the prophets, apostles and first Christians have ever said or done. This is sufficient, provided we can make it good, if nothing more could be said. Where did the prophets, the apostles or the first evangelists ever attempt to get up a revival of religion in the modern sense and style? Where

did they ever call sinners forward as seekers, mourners, or anxious persons, to pray and be prayed for? Where did they ever tell the sinner that he could do nothing? that he could not believe? could not repent? Where did they ever join with the sinner, in praying to the Lord to send down converting power? We have for more than twenty years tried to induce some man of respectable talents and position, to undertake a defense of what is practiced all over this country in these revival meetings, in public discussion, and we do not recollect the man who would undertake it, without limitations, prefixes, affixes or explanations, making it something entirely different from what they practice. Why not? For the good reason, that every man of sufficient intelligence to be worthy of notice, knows that the apostles had no such practice. He knows that the idea of calling people forward to the anxious seat, mourner's bench, exhorting them to pray for conversion, joining with them in praying for the same purpose; for the power to come down and convert them; give them the evidence directly from heaven of the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God, is not in the Bible. They know that a defence of this practice can not be made, that it will stand the test in open and fair investigation.— They know better than to undertake a discussion involving their practice in this particular.

II. The idea of praying over persons, screaming over them, exciting them and agonizing with them, till they shall know themselves to be Christians, or know their sins forgiven, while they do not take the steps required in order to induction into the kingdom of God, for absurdity stands unequalled in the whole history of the great mystic apostacy. In this modern process of theirs, where is pardon promised? Is it promised at the anxious seat at all? If so, when? When you pray once? When you pray twice? three times? four times? five times? six times? seven times? Where in this process do you come to the promise, "You shall be saved?" Even the preacher

does not promise, that he who comes to the altar, prays and is prayed for, shall be saved, or that he who comes once, three times or seven times shall be saved. *His* promise is only, that if you come, you may be pardoned, the first time you come, the third time, the seventh time, or the fourteenth time. He does not refer you to any promise of God, and does not make any promise himself.

III. When a man comes to this altar of prayer and excitement once, and receives no relief, what ground has he to come with any more faith next time? When he comes the second time and finds himself disappointed, as thousands do, can he come with any more faith the third time? When he has thus continued coming for one, two or three weeks, as many do, without receiving even the imagination that he is pardoned, is his faith strengthened to continue longer? or is not the the whole tendency to weaken his faith at every step, and to fill his mind with doubts whether there is any reality in the whole procedure? Where did the Lord ever have an appointment to which men came and were disappointed? When he appointed the sprinkling of blood upon the door-posts, to save the first born in Israel, was any one disappointed who complied with the appointment of God? Not one! When he appointed for Naaman to dip himself seven times in Jordan, and promised that he should be healed of his leprosy, was Naaman disappointed? When he appointed for Moses to smite the rock, and water should be given from the rock; and Moses complied with the appointment of God, the water came. In the same way, from the beginning of time, when God had an appointment, and men complied with it, they obtained the blessing promised. An instance of a failure in the entire history of the human race cannot be found. Not so this human and wholly unauthorized system of seeking pardon at an anxious seat, or mourner's bench; its entire history has been but little short of a history of failure and disappointment. The reason is, that the promise of God is not there. Had

the Lord said, "He who shall come to the anxious seat, pray and be prayed for, shall be saved," every one who would come would be pardoned. But he has made no such promise.

IV. We most deliberately alledge that the system now in question, is hardening many sincere persons and ruining them forever. The country abounds with persons thus ruined. They went to the altar of prayer, so called, sincerely, honestly, and penitently. They know they did so with the deepest solicitude, anxiety and concern for their happiness. They went there believing they would find pardon. They watched for a sign, a miraculous change, some sudden emotion, or some direct evidence of acceptance with God. They received nothing. No evidence directly from heaven came. They were disappointed! The preacher told them to come again. They came again. The preacher told them to pray on. They continued to do so. He told them to give up their whole heart. They did so. He told them that they were keeping back something; that they had not given up their whole heart. They know they had given up their whole heart—that they were sincere. He told them to exercise more faith—to pray for more faith. They knew that they believed with all their hearts. Still, they were disappointed! deceived!! Others whom they knew to be light and frivolous, told an experience; professed a work of grace; found peace. They became discouraged, were thrown into doubt, dispondency, and were utterly disheartened. They turned away in utter disgust, saying, "We have been deceived, cheated, and disappointed. We doubt whether there is any reality in the whole concern." They became hardened, sinful, and turned to the world and styled unbelievers. *Modern revivalists are responsible for all this.* B. F.

THE GOSPEL THE POWER OF GOD.

"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," etc.—Rom. i. 16.

Rome was the "Eternal City"—the Queen City—the glory and admiration of the great Roman Empire. Thronged by persons of rank and distinction—the poet, the orator, rhetorician, statesman, philosopher, and sculptor, the poor and needy, wise and unwise, were there. Paul had not found an opportunity as yet to visit the renowned city, although he had often purposed so to do. He had been hindered. He greatly desired to visit his brethren in that city, to the end that he might impart to them some spiritual gift, and that their faith might be established, and that they and he might be comforted together by their mutual faith. He had learned, through some reliable channel, the condition of the congregation, and had become acquainted with the sentiments and religious doctrines by which the congregation was troubled and perplexed. Chief of the cause of difficulty was the doctrines of the Judaizing teachers, who regarded the natural seed of Abraham as the only people of God, and that the Gentiles were not entitled to the same exalted privileges on a common footing with them. In this letter the great Apostle of nations, as a master of logic, as also well acquainted with the root, trunk, and every branch of Jewish theology, shows God's design and gracious purpose of offering salvation to both Jew and Gentile, in pursuance of the promise made to the father of the faithful, long before the law intervened; shows the righteousness of the law of Moses, and contrasts it with the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

But our object on this occasion is not to comment on the whole Epistle, but to con-

fine ourselves to a few points presented in the 16th verse of the 1st chapter. Suppose, in a given locality, some terrible disease were taking away the lives of many of the citizens. Fear and dread would seize the whole community. Each one would be hourly expecting an attack of the fearful epidemic. Lamentation and mourning would be heard in the dwellings of the inhabitants. The kind-hearted and philanthropic would be busily engaged in the relief of the sick and sorrowing, according to their best skill and judgment. Antidotes and opiates are freely offered and often received, but all in vain. The terrible scourge moves on, and lays low the old, the young, the middle aged. The father is smitten, the mother not spared. The sister mourns the loss of a brother, and the child weeps for parents who have fallen. How the people would rejoice to find a remedy! How they would rejoice could some specific be found!

Now suppose a physician arrives in the place, with a medicine which has proved a specific in the same disease, in another locality, a thousand times, and never failed in a single case. "I am not ashamed of this medicine," says he. The people crowd around him to hear what he has to say about it. Do you imagine, friends, that he commences to deliver a discourse, first, on the four, five, or six ingredients of which the medicine is compounded, by giving, first, the name of the person who discovered ingredient No. 1; then a biographical sketch of him—his birth, life, education, appearance, etc.; then makes an appointment to meet them, in a week from that time, to discourse to them in regard to the chemical properties of ingredient No. 1; then makes appointments, from time to time, and discourses in like manner on ingredients No. 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.? However, before he is entirely through, the malady has so thinned the neighborhood that he has but few hearers. Is this the way people act in case of physical maladies? Certainly not. The physician

would, with energy and great zeal, cry aloud and spare not, saying, "Here, friends, is a remedy—here is an antidote to the poisonous malaria. I am not ashamed of it; I recommend it with all my heart. It has proved itself all powerful in a thousand cases—never failed in a single instance when received. Come, friends, receive and be healed." No one would wish to hear learned lectures on the preliminaries in regard to its discoverers, its component parts, and the peculiarities of each part, medicinally, chemically, and otherwise. No, no; none of these things are interesting—none! "Give us the medicine," would be the spontaneous and simultaneous cry from the anxious, aching, sorrowful souls, who want to be healed because they are sick and they know it.

Just so with regard to the gospel of Christ. Paul offers a single reason why he is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ. But that one is all—it is everything. Nothing that can be urged can add anything to it. "For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." He presents the gospel of Christ as a cause, producing an effect, under certain conditions. The effect is *salvation*; the *cause*, the gospel of Christ. The *effect* of the medicine is a cure. But the condition—the indispensable condition is, to take the remedy—is to receive it. Otherwise it is of no power—can not effect a cure. It is the *power* of God; that is, it is God's power. This must be moral power—not physical power. If it were physical power, there would not be connected with it any *condition* whatever. When God determined to create light he said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Christ, when standing by the cave in which was deposited the body of the brother of Martha and Mary, did not say, "If thou believest, Lazarus, thou mayest come forth;" because "the dead know not anything." But the divine Redeemer said, "Lazarus, come forth," and he came forth. This was a miracle, and of the nature of creative *power*. But that

the gospel may be efficacious as God's power, it requires on the part of the one saved that he receive it. It, as a power, acts on the principle of motive in the following sense. You say to your neighbor, "Friend, I want you to go to town for me to-day, and do an errand." Your friend says, "Indeed I can not spare the time. I have several things to do for myself to-day; it is important that I do them. Sorry that I can't accommodate you; you will have the goodness to excuse me this time." "Stop, friend; it is only ten miles. If you will go, I will give you these ten dollars. Here take them and go." Your friend says, "I will go." What was the *power* that moved your friend? Was it your words? No; certainly not. Was it your *wish* that he should go that moved him? No; not that. It was the ten dollars that moved him. When?—When they were in my pocket? No; but he was moved by the ten dollars *when* he perceived and believed that the ten dollars became his property by complying with your request.

The gospel of Christ moves one by the motives accompanying it. Christ told the Apostles to preach the gospel to every creature—"he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Here, then, is salvation offered, and damnation threatened. Salvation is offered to the one who believes the gospel and is baptized; damnation is threatened him who will not believe. Here is life and death—we desire life and deprecate death. But if you don't believe you will be damned. No stronger motive power can be furnished than is here in the gospel. You desire eternal life above all things else; and in the exact ratio that you desire life, you deprecate death and banishment from God and happiness and heaven. Can any higher, any stronger, more powerful motives be offered to a rational man than these: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned? Can any of you think of any motive stronger than this? Yes; eternal life, offered by one

who is able to give it, is the highest, the greatest, the best offer that can be made. But says one, I can't believe. Can't believe what? Can't believe the gospel.—Why not? Because, say you, my belief don't depend upon my will. Well, what has that to do with the matter? Why you say if you had a will to believe you *could* believe. That would depend upon another contingency. You believe when the testimony is received by you as true. Your will has nothing to do with your believing, only as it disposes you to examine the evidence. Believing and not believing has regard to testimony and the want of testimony. The Apostles preached the gospel of Christ in plain and unadorned style; they used great plainness of speech. They stated facts and truths—indisputable facts, incontrovertible truths. They affirmed that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God; that he was put to death in a very public manner; that he was taken down from the cross and buried in the tomb of Joseph, a distinguished senator; that he rose from the dead on the third morning; that he was seen by many (infallible proofs) after his resurrection. They affirmed that he commanded them to offer the remission of sins to the penitent believer, through baptism, and that he commanded them to tarry at Jerusalem till they were endowed with power from on high; that they did tarry, and were miraculously endowed on the day of Pentecost. Now these were plain matters of fact, not metaphysics.—The Apostles were absolutely without a motive, if their statements were not true, and since the world began it was not known that any sane man acted voluntarily without a motive. And then, that so many Jews and Romans should believe what the Apostles preached to be true and act accordingly, shows plainly enough that their testimony was irresistible. For to receive the gospel of Christ was to forego all the pleasures of the world, and to commence to look for new pleasures by faith and not by sight; to look for a city whose builder and maker is God. There are miracles

somewhere. "If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

But let us look at another feature of the subject. The gospel of Christ is *the* power of God, etc. Not *a* power; not a *part* of the power, but emphatically *the* power. It *excludes* all other power, and includes *all* the power. When it fails to accomplish the end designed, there remains no other means. Therefore, when the gospel of Christ does not save one, he necessarily remains unsaved; and if it never saves him, then will he never be saved. He will certainly be damned. There is no other power. In vain he looks for salvation by the operation of any other power. God has not ordained any other power. Whoever rejects it does it at his own peril. In vain he reasons that God has all power, that his power is infinite, and therefore, because he can, he will save men by some other power. This is not only fallacious, but presumptuous reasoning—the reasoning of infidelity. Indeed may we not say that it is impossible—morally impossible for God to save one in any other way than by means of the gospel of Christ? He that believes not shall be damned. But the rejector of the gospel believes it not; yet says God can and therefore may save him some other way or by some other power; and yet that these words stand upon the divine record unchanged and unchangeable, "he that believes not shall be damned." Now can he ever be saved while he believes not? No; never! He is condemned, will remain condemned, and can't be saved as long as he refuses to obey the gospel. Because we are not to understand that the man who merely assents to the truth of the gospel shall be saved. He must continue to believe by obeying his faith. Christ came to his own and his own received him not; but to as many as received him, to them gave he power or privilege to become the sons of God, even to as many as believed on him." To receive Christ is to obey him. Hence, in the day of eternity, Christ will take vengeance on them who know not God, and who obey not

the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power."

How fearful a thing it is to reject the only *power* of God unto salvation, and yet to hope for deliverance in some other way. Vain hope! Fatal mistake! What infatuation! The Heavenly Father has proposed to save men freely through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. The way in which they are to accept this redemption is alone made known in the gospel of Christ. This rejected, disbelieved, underrated, and despised, leaves the sinner in a hopeless, unsaved, condemned state. He never can be saved in any other way. The winds will not convey to him the knowledge of the remission of sins. He can't "read his title clear to mansions in the skies" on the fleecy clouds of the heavens. No brook that "bubbles by" whispers in his ear the pleasing intelligence that he is saved from sin—that he is pardoned. No traveler from the spirit land announces his acquittal. He may imagine it; he may feel that it is so; that he is forgiven; but all this is but delusion and error. There is nothing reliable in anything save in the unmistakable word of the living God, "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." "You know how that, a good while ago, God made choice from among us that the Gentiles, by my *mouth*, should hear the word of the gospel and not believe." Then we may with confidence and boldness say to you all, that it is your privilege, duty and honor—your highest and greatest interest—to receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls, remembering that we must be doers of the word and not hearers only. God has dealt very kindly with us, in that he has conducted us safely through every lane of life by his unseen arm of power, which has been underneath us and around about us. That we still have an opportunity to receive the gospel of his grace and be saved, is wholly owing to his unbounded love towards us, and not for any good in

us. My prayer is, that we may all acknowledge, with unspeakable gratitude, the gospel of Christ to be the power of God unto salvation. May we be saved from sin in this life by it. May we, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, one and all be brought to the realms of life and light eternal beyond the river of Jordan. Amen and Amen.

N. J. MITCHELL.

Delivered, Sept. 11th, 1863, }
at Howard, Pa.

ROMANISM.—Lecture I.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AN UNERRING GUIDE.

“Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father’s house: For I have five brethren; that he may testify to them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent: And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.”—LUKE xvi. 27-31.

The public and private denial in our city, by Mr. Hecker, a Roman Catholic lecturer, of the sufficiency of the inspired word of God, to guide man to duty here, and his eternal destiny hereafter, has suggested my theme this morning. It is no pleasure to me to occupy an adverse position to Protestants or Catholics, unless the truth of God makes it necessary. Even then my pleasure consists in doing what I believe will be for their good, and the glory of God. I desire it also to be remembered that religious error is not confined to Romanists. The divided state of those calling themselves Protestants, their petty jealousies, and rivalries are certain and sad proofs that much remains for them to do before the unity, even of Romanism, shall be realized by them. I have endeavored to

school myself to hate error wherever I find it, and to love the errorist. When Romanists come forward on the platform to plead their cause, we should be glad to meet them, and examine the claims they set up to be heard. When they assert that the Bible is an erring guide, they make an attack on the most precious thing to me, this side of Him that sits on the throne of supreme authority in the universe. In defending the Bible, I intend to quote much and frequently from its pages. I fear to venture beyond its lessons, lest I become bewildered, when multitudes wiser and stronger men than me have been lost in the labyrinths of philosophy, or in the fogs of human tradition.

In the Scripture just read, the rich man is informed that his brethren have Moses and the prophets. Moses had been dead for ages, and the last of the prophets hundreds of years, when Jesus endorsed what Abraham said to him. Moses’ authority as a lawgiver was still in full force, and the lessons of the prophets still divinely sanctioned. We have Christ and the apostles, in addition to the Scriptures of the former dispensations.

The rich man intimated that the writings of Moses and the prophets were not sufficient to warn his brethren against coming into this place of torment. He prayed to a saint, and was directed to the word of God. The Lord had not done enough for him to keep him from the flames; but if one should go from the dead, his brethren would avoid that evil place! Nay, said Abraham, if they will not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

In addition to all they possessed, we have Jesus and the apostles, and one from the dead. Notwithstanding all these revelations and wonders, men are found so void of faith, as to stand up and declare the Bible is not enough—not an unerring guide. No greater wonder than the resurrection from the dead has ever occurred, and yet it is insufficient to convince some men.

The Holy Scriptures themselves abound with statements and allusions to their sufficiency, as a guide to our duty and eternal destiny. John xvii. 8. I have given unto them (the apostles) the words which thou gavest me; and they have received *them*, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. John xvii. 17 and 20. Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is the truth. * * * Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word. John xvi. 13. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into ALL THE TRUTH. 1st Cor. ii. 12, 13. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God, which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. 2d Thess. iii. 14. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. 2d Timothy iii. 16, 17. All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2d Peter i. 2-4. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue; whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. 1st John iv. 6. We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. Eph. iii. 2-11. If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to your ward; how that by revelation he made

known to me the mystery as I wrote before in few words; whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles shall be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel; whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should 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: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

From these passages enough may be learned to assure us of the sufficiency of the word of truth, to guide us infallibly to duty and divine acceptance. 1. The Savior promised that the Spirit would guide the apostles into all *the* truth. 2. That they spoke in language taught by the Spirit. 3. That according to God's divine power (the gospel) *all things* pertaining to life and godliness were given through the knowledge of him. 4. That the apostles wrote, that when we read, we may know and understand their knowledge of the things freely given to us of God. 5. That these things might be made known by the Church to the principalities and powers in the heavenly region. 6. That the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished to *all good works*. 7. That we might be able to discriminate between the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. 8. That these things are according to the purpose of God. Whoever denies the sufficiency of the word of God, as a rule of faith and duty, impliedly assumes that the Holy Spirit did

not guide the apostles into *all the truth*, and that though the Spirit may have revealed to them the things freely given to us of God, yet they did not communicate them, nor make a record of them. These are the men against whom the anathema of an ambassador of Christ has been pronounced. Gal. i. 6-12. I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another; but there be some that 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 unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye 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 seek to please men, I should not be the servant of Christ. But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

The man who, in the face of such a lesson as the above, can have the impudence to assert the insufficiency of the gospel of Christ, as revealed by the Holy Spirit, and confirmed by miracles, to guide men, is prepared to resist any testimony that would contradict his own wishes.

There is an almost universal admission that the Bible is sufficient to every thing that pertains to life and godliness. Even Romanists quote the Bible to prove their doctrines true. Each party in Christendom regards its own doctrines best, because they think them nearest like the Scriptures.

During the first 300 years of the Christian era, nothing else was regarded as necessary to direct men in the way of life and salvation. In that time every variety of mind, and condition of life, and religion, was encountered; and for the control of all who believed in the Savior, the inspired word was sufficient. Against this, it is

urged by Romanists and infidels, that "Honest and good men read the Bible and arrive at very different conclusions. One man reads and becomes a Trinitarian.— Another reads the Bible and he is an Unitarian. One becomes an Universalist, another a Calvinist, and a third an Arminian. One believes men are justified by faith alone, another understands the Bible to teach justification by faith and works.— Honest and good men read the Book and become Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, etc. Hence it is said the Bible can not be an infallible guide; for if God had so intended it, He could and would have given such a revelation that all these good and honest men would see it alike. They do not see it alike, therefore we know it is not an unerring guide." We have seen from the declarations of the Bible, and from general admissions, that it was intended to be an all-sufficient guide, and that for three hundred years it answered the purpose. If it does not infallibly guide men now, the fault is not in the Bible, but in the men who pervert the gospel of Christ.

The trial of the word of God alone has been renewed, after ages of papal darkness, and is a marvelous success.

Romanists tell us that a council of the Catholic Church, in the 4th century, established the canon of Scripture. The Nicene council was not a Roman Catholic one, neither did the council determine what documents were inspired. They rejected the spurious writings for which inspired authority was claimed. Those rejected writings are still extant, requiring little intelligence to determine their character.— Long before that council met the inspired writings of the New Testament were well and generally known to Christians. Some years since a collection of the whole of the New Covenant, excepting a few verses in the book of Revelations, was made in England, from the Christian writers of the first two centuries. The vigilant providence of God has wonderfully preserved that blessed volume from the ravages of time, as well as

from false friends. But I close with this quotation:

"Men's books with heaps of chaff are stored,
God's Book doth golden grains afford;
Leave off the chaff and spend thy pains,
In gathering up the golden grains."

J. M. HENRY.

THE WAY OF SALVATION.

NO. I.

YOUNG JONES, at an early period of his life, expressed a great desire to know the way of salvation and to walk in the fear of the Lord. He was, therefore, a regular attendant on public worship, always attentive to religious conversation and delighted in the company of the pious. His father was a very devoted Presbyterian, his mother an equally devoted Methodist. A grandmother lived in the family, who was a decided Baptist. Owing to the religious difference between his father, mother and grandmother, the subject of religion was rarely ever mentioned in the family. Young Jones was naturally of an inquiring disposition, and loved his father, mother and grandmother most ardently. It happened one day, that a Baptist preacher of considerable note and distinction preached in the town where the family resided, in the Baptist Church. The grandmother prevailed on the balance of the family to accompany her to meeting and hear *her* preacher. After preaching, it being the time for regular monthly communion, the arrangement was made for this part of the service. The preacher made the usual explanation, that those of "the same faith and order" were invited to commune, and that it was well understood that the Baptist Church did not admit of *open communion*. Young Jones, now a lad

twelve years old, saw his much loved grandmother seated among the communicants and partaking, but his father and mother, equally dear to him, sitting back, apparently not happy. This attracted his attention. He could see no reason for this discrimination among those whom he loved without discrimination. He could see no reason for this partiality where he could make no partiality.

When they returned home and were all seated in a pleasant circle round the hearth, the following conversation ensued:

Young Jones. Ma, why didn't you commune with grandma in her meeting to-day?

Mother. My dear, I should like to have done so, but your grandma's preacher excluded us. He only invited those of "the same faith and order." This excluded your pa and myself.

Y. J. Grandma, why did your preacher exclude pa and ma?

Grandmother. My child, you can not understand these deep matters.

Y. J. Grandma, your preacher thinks pa and ma ain't good like you, and I don't like him.

G. M. No, my dear; that is not the reason.

Y. J. Why, then, won't he let pa and ma commune with you? Ain't they good?

G. M. Yes, my dear, they are good; but they don't belong to the same Church.

Y. J. Ain't the communion for good people?

G. M. Certainly it is, my child, but your pa and ma are not of the same faith and order.

Y. J. Grandma, I do not know what you mean by "faith and order," but if pa and ma are *good*, why won't your preacher let them commune with you?

G. M. My dear, these matters are too deep for you. You can not understand them.

Y. J. No, grandma, I can not understand why pa and ma, if they are good, like you, can't commune with you. Grandma, if I become good and join ma's Church, you will let me commune with you, won't you?

G. M. My child, I tell you that you are

too young to understand these matters.— These are deep matters, and can only be understood and explained by great and learned men.

Y. J. Grandma, will pa and ma commune with you in heaven?

G. M. I do not suppose there will be any communion in heaven.

Y. J. Will there be more than one Church in heaven?

G. M. No, my dear, they will all be one there.

Y. J. Which one will that be grandma?

G. M. I do not suppose it will be any one Church, as we have them now, either your pa's, your ma's or my own. The Church will then consist of *all the good*.

Y. J. Grandma, I wish all the good were in one Church now. Then you, and pa, and ma would all be in one Church and all commune together; and if I could get good and join the Church, I could be with you all and commune with you. But now I do not know what to do. If I go with ma, I have to leave you and pa. If I go with pa, I must leave you and ma. If I go with you, I have to leave pa and ma. I can't leave any of you. What shall I do?

Mother. My son, do you not know that I had you dedicated to the Lord when you were an infant?

Y. J. I know, ma, you have told me so.

M. Certainly I have told you so, and told you truthfully, and you will, of course, go with me and join the Church, where I had you dedicated to the Lord in holy baptism.

Father. See here, my dear, I think you are going a little too far. Our son should be left free, without any bias from us, to join any Church he may desire.

M. Mr. Jones, you know that I vowed when our dear son was baptized, to instruct him in the way in which he should go, and I feel bound to discharge my duty to him.

Father. Am I not bound as much as yourself? I am entitled certainly to an equal privilege with yourself to instruct our son; and I think I am fair and reason-

able when I propose to leave him free from all bias to *decide for himself*.

M. Mr. Jones, you know the Scripture requires me to bring up my child in the nurture and instruction of the Lord, and you know the vow I made, when our dear son was dedicated to the Lord, to instruct him and bring him up in the fear of the Lord. I think you have a strange view of it, that a Christian mother must not use her influence to save her child, but leave him to grow up as he may list, without any influence from his mother!

F. My dear, you know that you and myself do not belong to the same Church, and I do not desire to persuade our child to go one way, while you persuade him to go another. Yet, if you persuade him to join your Church and I persuade him to join mine, we shall persuade him to go in *two opposite directions*. Now the fair thing, I think, is to leave him without any bias from either of us, and let him *decide for himself*.

M. Mr. Jones, you are a kind husband, a fair and reasonable man, and I do not see how to answer you; but I do not know how I am, on your plan to obey the injunction, to bring up my children in the nurture and admonitions of the Lord. I certainly cannot do this without imparting instructions or using any persuasions!

F. Mrs. Jones, to tell you the truth, I am much puzzled and perplexed. I am not about to blame you, for you have always been reasonable. But there is one thing I cannot understand! My preacher says, and I have heard your preacher say the same, that "it is a wise providence of God that we have so many Churches, so that we can all be suited." But I cannot see how "a wise providence of God" could so conflict in our family instructions!

M. Mr. Jones, I have thought of that many a time. I believe you are a sincere man and desire to do right, and I trust the Lord knows my heart, and that I desire to do right. Still, it is manifest that our being divided in religion and belonging to different Churches is now a serious obstruction

in our way in imparting religious instruction to our child. I feel now that it is about all I can endure that I cannot have you in the same Church with me; and now, to give up my son, to join any other Church, would be almost giving up my life. I can not endure the thought.

F. And, my dear, do you not think it would be equally hard for me to give up my son to join another Church?

M. I suppose it would. How can the difficulty be avoided?

F. I do not know, unless you would join the Presbyterian Church.

M. I can never do that. Why not you join the Methodist Church?

F. I do not believe the Methodist doctrine.

M. I do not believe the Presbyterian doctrine.

Son. Ma, why were there so many Churches. I wish there was but one, and that you and pa, and grandma, all belonged to that. Then when I would get good I could join with you all.

M. My dear, I suppose it was wisely so ordered that there should be so many Churches.

S. Ma, who ordered that there should be so many Churches?

M. My dear, the Lord so ordered it.

S. Ma, did the Lord order your Church to be made?

M. Yes, my dear.

S. How long ago?

M. A long time ago—one hundred and twenty years ago.

S. Ma, how did the Lord make your Church?

M. He did it by raising up that great and good man, Mr. Wesley, who was the founder of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

S. Ma, did the Lord raise up a great and good man to make pa's church?

M. You must ask your pa, my dear. I do not know who was the founder of his Church.

F. My child, that great and good man, John Calvin, was the founder of the Presbyterian Church.

S. Pa, how long ago did he make your Church?

F. About two hundred years, my son.

M. Mr. Jones, I do not see how you can style Calvin a "great and good man," when he instigated the burning of that poor man, Servetes, to death!

F. My dear, you should inform yourself, before you make statements to prejudice my child against my Church. Your statement is not true, and I feel hurt that you should make such a statement.

M. Mr. Jones, I hope you do not deny that statement! I certainly read what I have stated from Dyer's Life of Calvin, containing a quotation from Calvin's own language, in which he admits that he instigated the burning of Servetes. Not only so, but Calvin issued a pamphlet vindicating his action. I feel mortified that you should question my statement.

F. We had better drop the subject. I see that we shall only wound each other's feelings.

S. Grandma, which is the right Church, pa's or ma's?

G. M. My dear, I think neither of them is right. The regular Baptist Church is the true Church.

S. Grandma, how long ago was your Church made?

G. M. I do not know, my child, but a long time—more than two hundred years.

S. Your Church was made before ma's and pa's, was it?

G. M. It was.

S. Grandma, was there no Baptist, Presbyterian or Methodist Church before that?

G. M. No, my child.

S. Were there no Baptists, Presbyterians or Methodists before that?

G. M. My child, you are too young to understand these things. When you get older, I will explain them to you.

S. Why didn't the Lord make only one Church, so that we all could go to meeting together and all belong to one Church?

M. I do not know what to do with that child. He annoys me constantly with his questions.

B. F.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. II.

More than eight thousand miles east of where I am now writing, where the sun rises *eight hours* before it does here, there is a small district of country, now called **PAL-ESTINE**, but known in ancient times as the **LAND OF CANAAN**. In the southern part, called the "Land of Judah," is the ancient city of Jerusalem. A few miles east of this city flows the Jordan river southward into the Dead Sea. About six miles south of Jerusalem is Bethlehem; and Nazareth is some seventy-five miles north, in Lower Galilee. The western coast of this ancient land of the Jews is washed by the waters of the Mediterranean Sea: so called, because, according to the ancients, it was in the *midst of the Earth*.

This great sea is bounded on the North by Europe, on the East by Asia, on the South by Africa, and is connected at the West with the Atlantic Ocean, by the Strait of Gibraltar. Regarding Palestine as lying at the east end of this Sea, the reader can form some idea of its locality, and its central position in the Old World.

Instituting a comparison between the **HOLY LAND** and the rest of the world, is like comparing a small garden with a large number of extensive grain-fields. It does not contain half so many square miles as the State of Ohio. Yet, small and insignificant as this country appears to us, here transpired the greatest and most memorable events in the world's history—here originated, eighteen hundred and thirty years ago, a **RELIGION**, which, against all kinds of opposition, has continued to spread and extend itself over the world to the present time.

This renowned **SPOT OF EARTH** is especially interesting to the Christian, because

here Jesus the Christ was born, lived, preached, suffered, and rose to heaven: here the Apostles began to proclaim the good news of salvation.

Nearly fifteen hundred years before America was discovered by Columbus, while Great Britain, France, and Germany were inhabited by barbarians; and when the Roman Empire was at his height of glory, events transpired in this land of Prophets and Apostles, which drew the attention and excited the admiration of a wondering world. Does the reader need to be informed that the record of these events is contained in the historical writings of the four evangelists?

But as these events are not all recorded in any one of the narratives, written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and as some are recorded by one, which are not mentioned by any of the others, if we would take a connected view of the whole history, we must ascertain the proper order of the events, and contemplate them in this order.

It may not be improper to remark here, that in this difference in the accounts given by these four witnesses, we see the best reason to regard them as worthy of credit. For it is evident that they were, all of them, in possession of a much greater number of facts than they reported, and that each recorded only those which he thought most suitable to his particular design.

We readily discover that Luke begins his history farther back than any of the other evangelists. To satisfy the philosophic minds of the Greeks, who must know the origin of every thing, he "traces every thing accurately from the first," and gives a particular account of the circumstances attending the birth of Jesus, and that of his fore-runner, John the Baptist.

Believing that the language of the sacred writers, when properly rendered, would be better than mine, I shall quote principally from them, taking the liberty to simplify and modernize the style in some places, without attempting to perform the part of a reviser, or translator, whose duty it is

to make changes with reference to the original. I will consult three versions, the Common Version, the Revised Gospels, and Campbell's Testament. The changes which I will make, shall be designed to render the language more conformable to the common style of the people.

THE BIRTHS OF JOHN THE BAPTIST AND JESUS THE MESSIAH ANNOUNCED BY THE ANGEL, GABRIEL.

In the "wilderness of Judea," twenty-two miles south of Jerusalem, is **HEBRON**. While Herod the Great was king of Judea, there was living at Hebron a good old Jewish priest, named Zachariah, with his wife, Elisabeth. Of these persons Luke says: "They were both upright before God, walking blamelessly in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord." Surely such persons were worthy to be the parents of one who was to "prepare the way of the Lord." But, though "they were both now far advanced in years," "they had no child, for Elizabeth was barren!"

But what does the historian tell us? That while he was burning incense in the Temple of the Lord, which was at Jerusalem, and while "the multitude of the people were praying outside," "an angel of the Lord appeared to him, standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And Zachariah was troubled at the sight of him, and fear came over him. But the angel said to him: 'Fear not, Zachariah; for thy prayer was heard, and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt name him **JOHN**. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great before the Lord; he shall not drink wine, nor any intoxicating liquor; and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. And many of the sons of Israel he shall turn to the Lord their God. Also, 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 to the wisdom of the just; to make ready

a people prepared for the Lord.' And Zachariah said to the angel: 'By what shall I know this? For I am an old man, and my wife is far advanced in years.' The angel answering, said to him: 'I am Gabriel, who stand in the presence of God and I was sent to speak to thee, and to tell thee this good news. And see, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, till the day when these things shall have been performed, because thou didst not believe my words, which shall be accomplished in due time.'

And the people were waiting for Zachariah, and wondered at his remaining so long in the Temple. And when he came out, he could not speak to them; and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the Temple; for he made signs to them, and remained speechless. And it happened, when the days of officiating were ended, that he went home.

And after those days, his wife Elisabeth conceived and she hid herself five months, saying: 'Thus has the Lord dealt with me, in the days in which he looked upon me, to take away my reproach among men.'

Now in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin, betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the family of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. The angel, having come to her, said: 'Hail highly favored one! The Lord is with thee. Happy art thou among women.' And she was troubled at the saying, and was revolving in her mind what this kind of salutation could mean, when the angel said to her: 'Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favor with God. And see, thou shalt conceive and bear a son, whom thou shalt name **JESUS**. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father. And he shall reign over the family of Jacob forever: his reign shall have no end.'

Then Mary said to the angel. 'How shall this be, seeing I have no intercourse with man?' The angel, answering, said to her:

"The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore the Holy One that is born shall be called the Son of God. And see, Elizabeth thy kinswoman has also conceived a son in her old age; and this is the sixth month with her who is called barren. For nothing is impossible with God.' And Mary said: 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to thy word.' And the angel departed from her."

Soon after this visitation of the heavenly messenger Mary left Nazareth, and traveling in haste to the hill-country of Judea, to Hebron, (a journey of nearly a hundred miles,) she entered Zachariah's house, and saluted Elizabeth. "And it happened that as soon as Elizabeth heard Mary's salutation, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she spoke out with a loud voice, and said: 'Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. But how have I deserved this honor, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For see, as soon as the sound of thy salutation reached my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And happy is she who believed that the things told her by the Lord shall be accomplished.'

And Mary said: "My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior. Because he looked upon the low condition of his hand-maid; for, look! hereafter all generations will call me happy. For the Mighty One has done great things for me; and holy is his name. And his mercy to those who fear him is from generation to generation. He shows the strength of his arm, and dispels the vain imaginations of the proud. He pulls down the princes from their thrones, and exalts those of low degree. The needy he loads with good things, but sends the rich away empty. He helps Israel, his servant (as he spoke to our fathers) ever inclined to be merciful to Abraham and his descendants."

WM. PINKERTON.

LYNCHBURG, O., March 16, 1863.

PROVIDENCE: AN ESSAY IN TWO CHAPTERS.

BY DAVID WALK.

CHAPTER II.

"Man's goings are of the Lord; how can a man, then, understand his own way?"—*Solomon the Wise.*

We expect too much of uninspired, fallible man. Old men have learned that kings are *not* hedged in by divinity, or anointed with the oil of wisdom and virtue above their fellows. Truth to tell, they have discovered that kings and rulers are made of flesh and blood and bone; and that the dust of a dead Alexander, Cæsar, or Napoleon *might* be traced to the stopping of a beer-barrel! The idea is not new, but it is well enough, occasionally, to resurrect old ideas, old facts, old principles. "History is philosophy teaching by example." We repeat: we expect too much of uninspired, fallible man. No greater or better men will arise than those already risen. The same imbecility, the same susceptibility to corrupting influences that have usually marked past leaders, will characterize those to come. In fact, we expect nothing better than we have had. The "coming man" will never come. He came nearly nineteen centuries ago; was murdered then, and has practically been rejected ever since! It is like the mythical millennium about which lunatics dream. If you really want the millennium, make one *in* you: then you will have it and enjoy it; *never otherwise!* We lean on an arm of flesh, and then wonder that it lets us fall.

Could we but see royalty in retirement, our ideas of *human* greatness would be measurably dispelled. It has been said that no man is a hero in the estimation of his valet. A man is a man, after all his pomp, and show, and glitter, and God alone is great. It required a long and intimate association to assure so great a man as Cassius

that Cæsar was not a god. And it was a positive relief to him to know that cold would pinch him, hunger gnaw at his stomach, and fever burh him, like other men. All this, and much more, he relates to Brutus as a matter of the profoundest importance! But at last, his eyes being unsealed, we can perfectly sympathize with his nervous exclamation,

"Ye gods, it doth amaze me,
A man of such a feeble temper should
So get the start of the majestic world!"

Cassius made a discovery! Ha! ha! ha! Let us all laugh at him! We have made no discoveries! Of course not! Cassius was an old Pagan! What did he know about the millennium, and cotton, and pork, and nineteenth-century virtue? "Man's goings are of the Lord." God designs that every man should "go" right. He has given every one the ability to be good, virtuous and charitable; and it is only through a wonderful perversion of gifts that we are not so. In the government of God, everything works by system—is methodical.—Certain principles of action will lead to certain inevitable results. You make a mismove, and persist in it, and the whole game is lost! This is according to God's irrevocable decree: "The soul that sinneth, IT shall die." Personal responsibility for personal actions is one of the great ideas of the Living Oracles. Stand faithfully at the post of duty to which God has assigned you. Make yourself one of the world's heroes or heroines by a conscientious discharge of all obligations. A clear comprehension of the teaching of Providence will reveal many of the mysteries of this world, and help us to understand how it is that "Man's goings are of the Lord;" as well as to satisfy us with reference to the painful question, "How can a man, then, understand his own way?"

A man's faith may be *satisfied* about that which his reason cannot possibly comprehend. And after expending all the might of his brain-power on this subject, the conclusion is irresistible, that he is being led in a way hitherto unknown to him. He is

traveling a *strange road*, in which he is directed by another! David says, "The steps of a GOOD MAN are *ordered* by the Lord"—directed or disposed—that is, so governed as to attain the righteous end at which he aims. We *cannot* understand our own way: it is mysterious, wonderful.

Solomon the Wise says, "A man's heart *deviseth* his way; but the Lord *directeth* his steps." A man considers and proposes to himself what he will do; designs an end, and contrives by what means he will attain it; but after all, if he is a *good* man, "the Lord *directeth* his steps."

God rules and disposes all his intentions and actions as it pleases His infinite wisdom; determining what the event shall be, and ordering his motions, perhaps to such an issue as never once came into his thoughts. We have all, in our own consciousness, come to this hour by a different route from that which we intended taking in the beginning.

The prophet Jeremiah says, "I KNOW that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." The prophet here acknowledges the superintendence and dominion of Divine Providence; that by it, and not by his own will or wisdom, the affairs both of nations and particular persons are directed and governed.

We cannot understand our own way, because if we could, the *effects* upon our lives and actions would be very *deleterious*. God could so have created us as to enable us to look *forward* to the end of life's journey, as well as *backward* to its commencement. But then we would have taken our lives and fortunes into our own hands, and ignored the very *existence* of God! Some of us come near doing this as it is!

We sometimes say that, with our experience, if we had life to go over again, we could and would do better. This is, indeed, plausible, but very fallacious. Experience helps us in specific cases, but not much in general ones. We would hope so to improve upon our experience as to involve ourselves in worse difficulties than ever—just upon the principle that if God were to

take man into His confidence, man would suggest improvement to the Deity!

We say we would do better. Do the present facts of men's lives establish the truth of the assertion? Do not men know that drunkenness will ruin them, and yet are all men sober? Do not men know that licentiousness is sin, but does this knowledge make all men virtuous? Do not men know that covetousness is idolatry, and yet are all men benevolent? No! These facts disprove the idea that, with the experience of Methuselah, we would act differently from what we do now. We must live up to the measure of *present* experience and *advantage* before we can promise better things. As it now is—not understanding our own way—for all the good we do God has the undivided glory.

This providential and gracious superintendence on the part of God is necessary for the advancement of His cause and the promotion of his glory. Man, left to himself, would do nothing but what ministered to his own will or inclinations. But not understanding his own way, and God mercifully governing his motions, his efforts—intended only for evil—often ultimate in the most glorious results to the race. How strange has been our earthly pilgrimage! How devious the paths of life! God has led us! Let Him continue to lead us, and soon the jewelled gates and glittering spires of the heavenly city will break upon our vision!

He may lead us through flood and fire, but it only proves that He is leading us; for if left to ourselves, we would never have gone through them! It only proves that we cannot understand our own way, and that God is directing our going.

God seems to lead different persons from the cross to the crown by different *routes of experience*; but to all of these Jesus the Messiah is the *one way*, the *one truth*, the *one life*! It is impossible that one man shall have the identical experience of another man. But it is possible, nay, it is a fact, that from the same seed of Gospel truth every plant in the garden of God has

sprung. One Lord, one faith, one immersion.

Some must sacrifice the *pleasures of home*, while others can enjoy all its comforts and blessings. How thankful should a man be who can do Christ's work without making an offering of such price! Some must sacrifice their *children*. Some must deny themselves *riches*, and live and die in poverty. Some are denied the sad pleasure of closing the eyes of their own dear ones in death. And many more are not permitted to die at home, but some dark cavern of the ocean becomes their grave, and cold, slimy sea-weed their only winding sheet! Others, again, must pass through literal fire to the land of rest! We remember, among many others, two young ladies who were burnt to death in the Pemberton Mills.—We blessed God, when we were able to comprehend how Christianity could triumph even over the fire-god! Finding they were inextricably fastened in the fallen ruins, and seeing the glaring sheets of wild and furious fire approaching nearer and nearer every moment, until the cloven tongues of the flames, like monstrous serpents, hissed like fiends and licked them in the face;—when they saw, and heard, and felt all this, we say, they naturally fell back upon their sure hope in Christ Jesus.

Hark! What is that we hear? High above the terrible confusion of that most dreadful scene, their clear voices—glowing with the eloquence of seraphs—were heard ringing out loud and clear in praise to God, "We hope to shout glory when this *world's* on fire, hallelujah!" They sang on till the last trembling cadence of song was hushed in the stillness of that sleep that knows no waking. They did not "understand" the moral sublimity and grandeur of what they were doing; but we venture to affirm that sweeter music never went up to God!

Cincinnati, March 24, 1863.

MODERN REVIVALS.

No. III.

In a previous article, we had commenced filing our objections to modern revivals and revivalism. We shall write the present article mainly on one more objection, which is contained in the following charge:

Modern revivals and revivalism are filling the land with unbelievers.

We are perfectly aware that this is a grave charge. We cannot be excused either, in making it, on the ground that it was hastily made, or made without due consideration. The charge is made in the most deliberate manner, after twenty seven years' reading, thinking and conversing on the religious operations of the world, and a continuous effort, during the same length of time, to turn men to the Lord and build up the Church of God. We most solemnly mean all we say in this, and invite all to hear us through, and then let him controvert our ground who can. The religion advocated in modern revivals is another religion, and not that inculcated by the apostles. The Gospel preached in modern revivals is another Gospel, and not the Gospel preached by the apostles. The effect produced among the people is a different thing entirely from that produced by the apostles. It is out and out another thing from the apostles' work. We say this much because it is our intention to make a bold and most determined attack upon it, as essentially and fundamentally wrong, and we are satisfied that nothing is necessary to show this only for the people to take one deliberate look at it.

The Lord says, "He who comes to me, I will by no means cast out." There is no Scripture more especially present in the mind of the whole people than the words, "They who seek, shall find." This is quoted with great emphasis by almost every

preacher. Right in the face of this, and where persons are induced, by quoting this very language, to come; to come and seek, persons are seen coming and seeking again and again, and, from their own account, finding nothing! They continue to come time after time, week after week, month after month, and even year after year, at intervals, in some instances, and find nothing. The man of the world looks on. He is not acquainted with the Bible. He hears the promise quoted, that they who seek, shall find. Yet he learns, from their own confessions, that many find nothing! What is he to conclude from all this? Is it not natural that he should say, "If God had promised, as is claimed, salvation would have been attained." How is the preacher to escape from the dilemma? The man of the world says to him, "Your Bible says, 'They who seek shall find.' You quoted this language to induce the sinner to come and seek. He has now come and done everything you told him to do, but has found no salvation! What is the meaning of this?" What can the preacher say? Shall he say, the seeker did not come in faith? that he did not give up the whole heart? that he has kept back something? To say that to those sincere souls, who come in streaming tears, in bitterness of agony, in deepest penitence and sorrow for sin, as is the case, no doubt, with a vast majority of those who thus come, is cruel. It is charging them with insincerity, hypocrisy, and being mere pretenders. This is the only excuse the preacher has for the failure.—The man of the world knows that this is only an evasion. He is satisfied that the persons, at least in a vast majority of cases, are sincere—that they are candid—in a word, that they are honest. He can have no reasonable doubt of this. How is he to account for the failure? He does not know that God never ordained any such system of seeking. He is not aware that God has any special appointment in which for sinners to seek pardon, where they have his promise. He does not know that there is not a promise of God, that he will pardon,

or in any way bless one soul who seeks in the popular manner of the modern revival. He thinks that there is precisely the place where he is promised pardon, and that the promise *has failed*. The whole tendency is to make him an unbeliever.

Candid and sensible men have looked upon these failures, reasoned upon them, and looked for evidence that God was in them; that there was anything Divine in them; in a word, that there was anything in them but mere *human magnetism*, and settled down in the conclusion that there is nothing Divine in them. They become impatient with the whole concern, begin first cautiously to express their doubts of its being from God. After a little they become more bold, and talk out more plainly. The preacher hears of it, and denounces them as scoffing infidels. They are infidels; but who made them infidels? Many of them have been reading no infidel books, talking with no infidels, and not trying to become infidels. They did not desire to be infidels. What made them infidels? We assert that a false system is responsible for it. A system of failures is the only one they have had before their minds, which they have supposed to be the system inculcated in the Bible. They have seen honest and sincere people go forward, heard them promised, that if they would seek they should find, and heard them say they had found nothing. They have thus seen them disappointed, deceived and deluded, and supposed them disappointed in believing and undertaking to follow the Scriptures. In this way, many men of fine sense have been driven away into unbelief.

The man of the world, well acquainted with those around him, witnesses a revival scene, and in a few days sees persons whom he knows to be giddy, light-minded and frivolous, telling experiences, what the Lord has done for them, that they have experienced a change, got a hope, and are new creatures. He witnesses the shouting, screaming, jumping, stamping, falling, and every other exercise common in these strange and irrational gatherings. He hears

the new converts talking, telling that they have got religion, and all the other strange things which they are accustomed to tell. The ridiculousness of the whole thing, the want of sense evinced by all that is said, the manifest silliness and shallowness of the entire scene, can but impress him with the idea that the Lord is not in it. There is no system about it, no order, no arrangement, no stability, no permanence. In the Presbyterian revival, the work is conducted quietly and without any special confusion. Among Baptists, also, there is comparatively but little confusion and disorder.— But among Cumberland Presbyterians, United Brethren, Albrights, and all sorts of Methodists, found in this country, noise and confusion abound. The man of the world goes to the Quaker meeting, and witnesses their sitting in silence, and hears them tell, when they do speak, of “the light within;” of singing inwardly, communing inwardly and praying inwardly. He then goes to the quiet, smooth and orderly Presbyterian revival, and witnesses all that transpires. Then he visits the Baptist revival, still retaining traces of order, and the whole scene. Then he makes an excursion round the entire circle of Cumberland Presbyterians, Shakers, United Brethren, Albrights and Methodists of all sorts, where all order is abandoned, all common sense set aside, and reason perfectly outraged; where noise, confusion and disorder reign. He asks himself is all this religion? Are all these varieties the same thing in different forms? Or, if some of this is the true religion, and not all, then which is the true? Remember, too, that he does not read his Bible, and takes it that all this is an exponent of the Bible. He holds the Bible responsible for it all, and decides against the Bible. He decides that this procedure is all human, and as he imagines it all to be a result of the Bible, he decides the Bible to be human also. Thousands of men stand precisely in this attitude.

There is but the one way to save the Bible and the faith of the true Israel of God, and that is to cut the Bible loose from all

this. We, therefore, vindicate the Bible from having any instrumentality in producing the silent meetings of Quakers, the dancing of Shakers, the quiet procedure of the Presbyterians at the anxious seat, the procedure of the Baptists at their altar of prayer, or the confused, disorderly and disgraceful scenes of any of the other parties before described. These procedures, disorders and confusions are all modern. They find no precept nor example in the Bible. God is the author of order, and not of confusion. The New Testament records not an instance of screaming, clapping the hands, stamping the feet, dancing, falling senseless, lying unconscious, or any of the other disorders alluded to. The apostolic appeals were made to the minds and hearts of the people, and when they were convinced, they yielded themselves to God deliberately. They heard the preaching, considered the argument, made up their minds, and decided to turn to the Lord. When they decided to turn to the Lord, and inquired of the preachers what they should do to be saved, the precise things to be done to become Christians, were set before them. They did what was commanded, and entered into the covenant at once.—They never kept any man seeking, grieving and mourning, but showed every man how to become a Christian at once. When a man did what they told him to do to become a Christian, he was not disappointed. There never was a failure in a single instance.—The failures in these modern systems are not chargeable to the Gospel at all. All who do what the Bible requires are certain of salvation. They have the unfailing promise of God. If we would save the Bible from sinking into utter disrepute, and the people from falling into utter unbelief, we must separate the Bible from all these experimenting, tampering and failing schemes. They are human, powerless, and only a disgrace to the Bible, where they are supposed to have any connection with it.

The only use made of the Bible, in revivals, is to refer to it for texts, and appeal to its heaven and hell to rouse up the fears

and desires of the people, and induce them to act, or to seek for salvation. But nothing is more carefully and studiously done, in these revivals, than to avoid the apostolic answer, when persons inquire what they shall do to be saved. Why this is so, is perfectly a wonder. Why any preacher should rouse the fears of the people, by setting forth their sins, danger of being lost and suffering eternal punishment, and refuse to give the Divine directions, showing them how to escape and be saved, is to us wholly unaccountable. Who can answer?
B. F.

GOD'S MODE OF DRAWING SINNERS.

"No man can come to me, except the Father, who has sent me, draw him." Jno. vi. 44.

There is scarcely a declaration in Holy Writ more wantonly abused and misrepresented than the above inimitably beautiful and literally truthful saying of our Savior. It has long been, and still is, the main prop, and resort of the mystic spiritualizer, whose favorite dogma is the direct and immediate operations of the Holy Spirit, and of the hereditary total depravity propagandist, who teaches that man is totally corrupt in all his parts, mentally, morally and spiritually, that he cannot think a good thought nor perform a good act, and that this total depravity descended upon him hereditarily without his consent, and to extricate himself from which, he might as well undertake to scale the battlements of heaven by a rope of sand! both of which theories have little more countenance from the Bible than Tom Paine's "Age of Reason."

It is a crying shame that any man, in this age of light and progress—now above the middle of the nineteenth century—making

any pretensions to honesty and a knowledge of the Scriptures, should stand up, and proclaim to the world these groundless and unsupported tenets, and do all in his power to wheedle the people into the belief that they are Bible truths. The expression, "direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit," or "total hereditary depravity," or anything tantamount to these expressions cannot be once found in the whole volume of God!

Man is a complex being; and the word of God, both in the Old Testament and in the New, recognizes him as possessed of moral, as well as intellectual and physical attributes. It is of his moral or spiritual nature that we wish to speak more particularly. It is an axiomatic truth, that *man is a creature of motives*. Hence, the gospel is pre-eminently and fittingly adapted to *man as he is*. If a rational sentient being cannot be incited to action without *motives*—which is emphatically the case—here you will find them without stint, as high as heaven, as deep as hell, as cogent as the eternal interests of mankind and as enduring as eternity itself! And hence, too, the command is, instead of preaching spiritual operations of any kind—either with or without the word—to "preach the word"—"preach my gospel." But what is the gospel? The Apostle Paul gives us a succinct definition of the gospel in the fifteenth chapter of his first Corinthian letter. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you *the gospel* which I preached to you, * * * how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he arose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Thus the death, burial and resurrection of Christ constitute the grand and fundamental *facts* of the gospel—the gospel in a nut-shell. Or, in other words, these facts constitute the *germ* from whence spring every pure and holy influence and principle, which go to make up the gospel *in extenso*.

In perfect consonance with the principles here enunciated, and with Paul's definition of the gospel, was the first gospel

sermon that was ever preached to a lost and ruined world. The Lord commanded the Apostles to "tarry at Jerusalem" until they were "endued with power from on high." Accordingly they returned to the city and continued the praise and worship of God, "till the day of Pentecost was fully come." Then, in fulfillment of the promise, that they should be endued with power from on high, they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, "and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance." When the multitude in Jerusalem heard of this matter, they came together, and were no little surprised to hear these illiterate Galileans declaring in some *seventeen different dialects*, "the wonderful works of God." Howbeit, some derided, saying, "These men are filled with new wine." Then Peter—the honored and illustrious Peter—arose and refuted this objection, in the following words: "These men are not drunken, as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." Then follows his sermon.

If the attentive reader will peruse carefully the second chapter of Acts, he will observe, that the discourse of Peter commences with the fourteenth verse, and continues without interruption, to the end of verse twenty-six, in which he closes up the argument as follows: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God has made that same Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ." Just at this point, a wonderful change takes place in the minds and hearts of his hearers. They appear to be in the most intense agony, and the cry is extorted, "Men and brethren, *what shall we do?*" Now, the question is, by what means was this change affected? Was it by the operation of the Holy Spirit, directly and immediately upon their hearts? Or, was it by the word of God, spoken by Peter, and "*heard*" by them? Let us have an answer to this, not from any human authority, but directly from the unerring volume of inspiration: "And having HEARD, they were pierced to the heart." Not, having been *operated on by the spirit*, but "having *heard* what Peter said. Their

faith came by "*hearing*, and hearing by the *word of God*." Rom. x. 17. They were "pierced to the heart" by the word of God, which they heard; "for with the heart man believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. x. 10. Hence, also, "it pleased God by the preaching of the *gospel*," not spiritual operations, "to save sinners. 1 Cor. i. 18-21. Paul says he is not "ashamed of the gospel;" and why? "Because it"—the *gospel* is the power [not a power] of God unto salvation." Rom. i. 16. I think however, that could the Apostle again visit our earth, and attend one of the popular revivals of the day, and witness some of the gross manifestations, called "immediate influences of the Holy Ghost," he would be *ashamed*.

The doctrine of Hereditary Total Depravity, besides being as false as night, is most deleterious to the best interests of mankind. The theory is, that man, being wholly corrupt, in all his parts, is incapable of thinking a good thought, speaking a good word, or performing a single act that would in the least enhance his condition with reference to the Divine Favor. Now we *know* by our every day's experience, that this is not true. Many times have I seen the tear of sympathy trickle down the sinner's cheek, simply on beholding some dreadful scene of suffering. And the idea that no unconverted man or woman ever uttered a good or kind word, is so repulsive to all the finer feelings of human nature, that I hardly know how to treat it without seeming to be too harsh and severe. It is a vile calumny upon the noblest work of God's creation. Everybody knows that it is false. Will any one presume to say, that no such thing as patriotism, benevolence, virtue, gratitude, love of parents, sympathy for the distressed, truthfulness, good neighborhood, etc., etc., ever existed in the mind and heart of the sinner? O, for shame! "Totally corrupt!" The devil cannot be more than totally depraved. Sinner, do you think you are as vile as the "totally depraved" divines would represent you? I

would avoid you as I would the ravenous beasts of the forest! I would shrink from your touch as I would from the most venomous serpent that crawls upon the earth!

This doctrine ignores the free moral agency of man, which doctrine floats upon the very surface of Revelation. The gospel rests its appeal to man, and its claims upon his attention and respect, upon the hypothesis that he possesses the ability to accept or reject the terms of pardon, as laid down by the Divine Author of the Christian system. Hence, we find the Scriptures addressing man in exact accordance with this wise arrangement?

"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; * wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread, and your labor for that which affords no satisfaction? *Hearken* dilligently unto me, and eat that which is wholesome, and let your soul delight itself in plenty. *Incline your ear*, and come unto me, *hear*, and your soul shall live. * * Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; *turn ye, turn ye*, from your evil ways, for why will you die." "Who-soever *will*, let him take of the water of life freely." "O, Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto you; how often would I have gathered you together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and you *would not*?" "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 *understand with their hearts*, and *be converted*, and I should heal them." "You *will not* come unto me that you might have life. "*Save yourselves* from this untoward generation." "Repent and be baptized, 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." "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth and be ye saved."

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned." "Repent and be converted when times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." "O, generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of reformation." "Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." "Make for thyself a new heart."

We might go on, and swell the number of such like extracts to an hundred, but for our present purpose, these are sufficient. The foregoing Scriptures are composed of two classes. The first class is merely *exhortatory*, and recognize in the sinner the ability to reject the overtures of mercy if he chooses, while the second class is *imperative*, and takes the form of *commands*, and recognizes, with equal clearness, man's power to obey said commands. The merest tyro in grammar knows that the imperative mood always implies the power or ability on the part of the individual commanded, to obey.

According to the theory under consideration, man is *totally depraved*—or "morally dead," as it is sometimes expressed. But cannot the advocates of this dogma see, that if it be true that man is totally corrupt, or spiritually dead, as they argue, there is not a solitary ray of hope for a single child of Adam? For if it be true (and true it is) that *supernatural* power is necessary to raise a person naturally dead, it would follow, on the same principle, as a logical sequence, that *super-spiritual* power would be requisite to bring to life an individual spiritually dead. But there is no such power; therefore, man's condition is deplorable indeed.

Our opponents are bound to concede the fact—for they have demonstrations of it daily before their eyes—that the unregenerate can reform themselves, and cease committing the blackest crimes on the long and dark catalogue of sin. The sinner can

"cease to do evil, and learn to do well;" the drunkard can throw aside his bottle; the liar can cease lying, and speak the truth; the murderer can stay his hands from bloody deeds; the gambler can stay at home with his wife and children in lieu of prowling through the gambling hells of our cities; and he who has wronged his neighbor can make the *amende honorable*.* Now, if men can abandon the worst sins that sinful men are capable of perpetrating, can they not refrain from the minor ones? Most assuredly they can!

The theory of "hereditary total depravity" puts an excuse for sin, in the mouth of the wicked of all classes and grades, which no man, holding to this dogma, can successfully rebut or set aside. "It (Hereditary Total Depravity) virtually nullifies all that book (the Bible) teaches, and destroys all responsibility. This doctrine puts into the sinner's lips an excuse for his sinfulness; instead of leaving him, as the Bible says, '*without excuse*,' it furnishes him with an unanswerable excuse for all his sins. If this doctrine be true, every sinner in the land can stop the mouths of all the preachers on earth. He has nothing to do to accomplish this but to say, 'I am by nature *totally corrupt*. This corruption has descended upon me without my consent, and without any possibility on my part of avoiding it. I have no power to turn to God, or to do any thing acceptable in his sight. I did not make myself sinful, and could not avoid being sinful. I can do nothing but await my destiny. If I am

* I regret to say, that before I submitted to the mild reign of King Jesus, and acknowledged him as my rightful Sovereign, I indulged freely in the intoxicating bowl, was one of the most wicked of profane swearers, and not unfrequently did I visit the gambling saloons, together with other worldly pleasures, which, at that time, I regarded as indispensable to real happiness. And here I record the fact, that on hearing three Gospel sermons, by Rev. I. M. Harrington—a Baptist minister of considerable note in Kentucky—I did, calmly and deliberately, of my own free will and accord, without any "immediate influence of the Holy Spirit," turn away from these sins and wicked practices; and if I know my own heart, I was actuated by no other motive than a sincere love for God, and a simple desire to obey my King. I will only say, further, that, as yet, I have never had occasion to regret my course!

punished for sins, they are sins I could not avoid. If the Lord had sent his irresistible power, I might have been converted, and made as good as any one else. The reason that I am not good is, the Lord has not made me such. The cause of my sinfulness is not in me, for I cannot be otherwise, but in God, who can make me good, and will not do it.' What could Mr. Hume say to such a man? What could any man say to one who would thus reply? What reason could be offered in the last judgment for punishing such for sins they could not avoid? I maintain that no reason can be offered why such should be punished. The Bible reason for punishment is taken away; the Bible doctrine of rewarding men according to their works is at an end." *Hume and Franklin's Debate*, pp. 23, 24.

This doctrine represents the holy, just and merciful God, as punishing men in hell forever for sins which they could not avoid; than which, nothing could be more preposterous and repugnant to the feelings of the enlightened Christian. It nullifies and renders nugatory the last command the Lord gave the Apostles, to "preach the Gospel to every creature."

Touching the long list of "proof-texts," which the sticklers for this theory have culled, and garbled, and detached from their contextual connection in the Living Oracles, and arranged in regular juxtaposition, as an Indian would string beads, it would be folly for me to attempt an answer to them all, in a single paper, like this. A general remark or two, therefore, concern- of Scripture advanced in favor of hereditary total depravity, that could not legitimately be shown to refute the very doctrine for which it was brought forward to prove.

Now, it is an admitted principle in all sound logic, *that the proof of a given proposition must contain the terms of the proposition, or their equivalents.* Take, e. g., Psalm lviii. 3, on which they rely so implicitly: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." Now, here is a very plain case. Here is one of their

ing all of them, must answer for the present occasion. And first, I do not remember, in all my life, to have seen or heard a passage strongest proof-texts, containing just eighteen words; but is the word hereditary "among them?" No. Well, is there a solitary word in the whole eighteen, or will the whole number combined amount to an equivalent for *hereditary*? Certainly no. We will, therefore, just subtract this term from the theory, when we will have left a slightly different proposition, viz.: "Total Depravity," without the idea of its being hereditary. We inquire, now, is the word "total" in this verse? Is there a word in the verse that is tantamount thereto? Assuredly not. Then we will subtract the second term from the proposition, and what have we remaining? The simple doctrine of "depravity," which, though it may not be "a most wholesome doctrine," nor "very full of comfort;" yet it is one that is plainly taught in the Scriptures, and in the passage in hand. This Scripture, together with its concomitants, clearly indicate *depravity*, but not *hereditary depravity*, nor *total depravity*, nor yet, *hereditary total depravity*! There is a world-wide difference between the doctrine of depravity, and either of these three propositions.

In this passage the Psalmist, in his bold, hyperbolic style of language, (which style was prevalent amongst the Orientals), is simply describing man's proneness to sin, and showing that *at a very early period*, he wanders away from his God. But the veriest simpleton knows that David did not mean literally and unfiguratively to express the sentiment, that the *infant* goes astray, speaking lies *the moment it is born*. This would be untrue, in fact, for we know it to be a mental, as well as a physical impossibility. Indeed the language itself forbids such an interpretation. Before the child can "go astray," it has to be old enough to *speak*, and *speak falsely*, at that!

The doctrine of human depravity can not be denied by any one who believes in the Bible. The Reformation has always strenuously advocated it, and deplored the cor-

ruption of the human heart, and they have done us much according to their strength and means to ameliorate the miserable condition of man as their opponents. In the fall, man lost the image of his Creator in a great degree. Yet he is magnificent in his ruins, and still reflects, "as in a glass darkly," the image of God.

I presume the advocates of the dogma we are opposing will not contend that the primal pair, anterior to the fall, were totally depraved; and yet, I seriously doubt whether you can find, in the history of our sinful race, a case of more consummate weakness than the case of their transgression, in that they yielded without the least perceivable show of resistance, to the first temptation ever presented to them!

But what of the passage of Scripture at the head of this essay? We set out with the design merely to offer a few remarks on this Scripture, setting forth its true signification, and showing its perfect harmony with the great principle of free moral agency, so patent upon the very face of Divine Revelation; also to strip it of its sectarian glosses, and demonstrate that it utterly fails to establish the doctrines, in support of which it has long been wrested and perverted. But owing to the nature of the subject, I have been led into a rather prolix discussion of other matters, closely allied, however, to the subject indicated by our caption. Let us, then, before we close this article, endeavor to ascertain, in as brief a manner as possible, its true intent and meaning.

And I doubt not that the great mass of professors who depend upon their spiritual guides for Bible knowledge, are totally ignorant of the fact, the immediate context of this self-same passage contains a lucid exposition of it, and an apt, germinal explanation of the way and manner in which God draws sinners to Christ.

Now, that the Father in some way *draws* the sinner is not denied; this is settled by the passage under consideration. There is no dispute as to the *fact* that God draws the sinner, but the all-important question

to be decided here is, *how* is he drawn?— Does some one say by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit? I pronounce that a *non sequitur*. It doesn't follow from the premises. "No man can come unto me except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him." Now, here is a plain declaration that no man comes to Christ unless he is drawn; and more, he is to be drawn by the Father, not by an "operation of the Spirit." It is impossible for men to disagree about so plain a declaration as this. The man must be moved upon or drawn by the Father. But does the text say *how* the Father is to "draw" him? What right has any man to add the words, "By a direct operation of the Holy Spirit," to this statement of the Redeemer? Is any thing of that sort to be found in the statement? Is there any thing of the kind in the chapter in which the statement occurs? There is not. It is strange, passing strange, that a text of Scripture should be adduced to prove a doctrine, that is so inadequate to the purpose, that all that would be essential in it as a proof-text has to be added to it!

But let us look a little more narrowly into this matter. Here is the forty-fourth verse, together with its context, as it stands in the sixth chapter of John: "No man can come unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, *and they shall all be taught of God*. Therefore every man that hath *heard and learned* of the Father, cometh to me." According to the plain teaching of this paragraph, who is it that comes to Christ?—"Every man that hath heard and learned of the Father." The prophets said that they should be taught of God, and by reason of this teaching that they are induced to "come." How does God teach man? Evidently by his written revelation, either read or heard. (a great many will not read for themselves, hence the necessity of *preaching*). The man reads what God has said in the Bible, or hears it from the lips of the preacher, and is convinced that *Jesus is the Christ*; and being thus "taught of

God," he comes, or is *drawn* to Christ. What have we, then, as the purport of this paragraph, taken altogether? It is evidently this, that while a man is ignorant of God's teachings, he can not come to Christ. The Father must "*draw*" him, by enlightening his mind. He must, as the Savior says, be "taught of God" before he can come to him. The prophets said he should be taught of God; and "therefore," says the Lord, "only those who have heard and learned of the Father can come unto me." Can any thing be plainer? The construction that the "called and sent" divines would put upon this passage deprives it of all its beauty and force, and converts the great scheme of human redemption into a perfect enigma—an inexplicable mystery. But our view renders the whole plan consistent with the teaching of this verse, and with itself throughout; and such Scriptures as the following are easy of comprehension:

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature"—"It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe"—"Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"—"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest for your souls"—"Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me"—"I am the Alpha and the Omega—the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely"—"Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near"—"Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation"—"To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts"—"The Spirit and the bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him come, and take of the water of life freely."

I might continue these quotations almost *ad infinitum*, but these are enough to show the fallacy of the views we have been re-

viewing, and also to give the reader a pretty fair clue to GOD'S MODE OF DRAWING SINNERS.

C. I. KIMBAL.

"YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE."

NO. II.

In addition to our article of March the 10th, under the above heading, we would invite the attention of the readers of the Review to a further examination of some of the arguments offered in support of apostacy.

1. It is asked, if the final reception of all true Christians into the felicities of heaven is infallibly certain, why do the Scriptures sometimes speak of it as contingent or conditional, as in Rev. ii. 10, and Matt. x. 22, where Christ said, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved"? If the Bible gives us positive assurance that all who are truly born of God will as certainly dwell with him in glory—that no real believer ever lost his inheritance or ever will—why are we repeatedly warned in God's word as though there were danger? These are questions worthy of notice. They have their explanation and answer in the fact that God sometimes speaks of things that may appear to us uncertain, being in the future, but to him are as definitely certain as though they had already transpired. And if the final salvation of the soul is a certainty with God, although it may appear contingent or even doubtful to us, it will as certainly be brought about as that soul exists.

For instance: Peter says, "Brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." Now, even admitting that they might fall away, and that they were

elected when converted, there was no uncertainty about their "calling and election" with God. They might have had doubts concerning it; but, as God knows all things, there was no possibility for uncertainty with him.

A more clear illustration, perhaps, will be found in the case of Paul's shipwreck. It was revealed to Paul, by an angel from heaven, that there should be a destruction of the ship, but not of life, yet he both warned the crew and mentioned the condition of their safety. He said to his fellow-voyagers, "There shall be no loss of life among you, but of the ship." Yet when "the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship," he told the centurion, "Except these abide in the ship, ye can not be saved."—Thus it appears that the safety of the crew was infallibly certain, for God, by an angel, had declared it, and yet it rested on conditions, and they were warned.

So it is with the Christian in the voyage of life—assailed by the storms of temptation, and surrounded by the elements of destruction, yet he has the assurance of his heavenly protector that he will neither leave him nor allow him to sink.

Thus God, who sees the end from the beginning, understands and takes into account all the means necessary to bring about the particular result or end. Now if conditions and warnings, in this case, were consistent with the certainty of their safety, are they not, according to the same principle, consistent with the Christian's safety?

These warnings and admonitions are a part of the powerful means instituted by high heaven to preserve the Christian from apostacy, and complete in him the work already begun.

If it were not for these warnings, the means of his preservation would be incomplete, and he *would* fall away. But having them, the means of his support are perfect, and he is secure from apostacy. Consequently all the warnings in the Bible, given to genuine Christians, do not prove that any such ever were lost, or ever will

be, but are intended to keep them in the "narrow way," and fortify them against all danger. It must also be remembered that a proposition, stated in the form of a supposition, does not necessarily imply that the fact therein mentioned is also contingent or doubtful. Paul says, "If the dead rise not, then is Christ not risen." But we are not to suppose, because he says, "if the dead rise not," that the resurrection of the dead is in any way doubtful. Neither are we to suppose, when Christ says, "if a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered," that there is any doubt about the real Christian abiding in Christ, but that he intended to teach us our dependance on him, and to encourage us to a more firm reliance on himself. If these principles be borne in mind, there will be no difficulty in reconciling the doctrine of the final salvation of all saints with Paul's declaration concerning himself in 1 Cor. ix. 27, or his teachings in the sixth chapter of Hebrew, or any other of this class of Scripture.

A. PHILO.

REMARKS.

We invite the special attention of our readers to the foregoing, from a young gentleman of great moral worth, a fair education, and fine talents. We shall recognize him as a *brother*, though he stands connected with a body of people that are tolerably severe on us. Our worthy correspondent has his mind a little mixed up with the metaphysics and subtleties of John Calvin. It may serve to exercise the mind, to experiment in these matters to a limited extent. It may not be entirely useless to try how deep water one can wade through. Still it is not entirely safe, unless one can swim well. We will risk it, however, to take a short excursion with our worthy young friend.

I. Suppose it is a matter settled and immutably fixed, in the mind of God, that all ever born of God shall ultimately be saved, what good can it do any human being to preach it? Will it make any man pray any more, be any more devoted and pious,

to know that the certitude of his entering ultimately into glory was immutably decreed before the world was made? Are we answered, that no man does or can know that? Then of what possible use is the teaching? If I can simply know that it is true, that all born of God shall ultimately be saved, but can not know certainly that I am born of God, and consequently that I will be saved, what good can the doctrine do me? Are we told that we must look to our faith and see if we have full confidence in God; look to our hearts, and see if we love God with our whole heart; that we must look to our characters, and see if we do the will of God; and if we have all these fruits, we have reason to hope we are of the number who can never fall? This places the man in a more doubtful position than the Armenian. It places him where he can not know, in this life, that his salvation is certain. The Armenian does know, on his hypothesis, that if he does the commandments of God, he will be saved. The Calvinist admits that, though none except those born again can keep the commandments, all who keep the commandments will be saved. Where then has the Calvinist any advantage? Surely none in the world. He can not know in this world that he is one of the elect, and consequently can not know certainly that he will be saved. He can furnish no evidence that he is one of the elect, unless he loves God and keeps his commandments; and, with him, even this is not a certain evidence. He may be deceived about it.

II. Our correspondent admits, that there are in the Scriptures apparent conditions, though he thinks the certainty of the salvation of all born of God is fixed in the mind of God. These apparent conditions, he thinks, or contingencies, may be means employed by the Lord to keep the saints from falling and finally saving them; or, if we understand him, God knows that, through these apparent means or contingencies, he will keep the saints from falling, and finally save them. Then, we humbly ask, if they are *apparently* conditions

or contingencies, how did he find out that they are *not* conditions or contingencies, but only *apparently* such? Did the Lord give them the *appearance* of conditions or contingencies, to make us think they were such, knowing that they were not, merely as a means to save us? If he did, why does our correspondent let the secret out, and let the world know, that, in the mind of God, they are not contingencies or conditions at all, but only means which the Lord employs to accomplish a work already decreed? We think it exceedingly unkind in him to blab out the secret, and let all men know that they are not conditions or contingencies at all, but only *apparently* such, and that, in the mind of God, the salvation of all ever born of God is certain. When it is generally found out that these are only apparent, and not real conditions or contingencies, upon which saints can be saved, but that the matter of their eternal salvation is certain—that not one of them can be lost in any event—the question of complying with these *apparent* conditions will become a mere matter of moonshine. If their salvation is certain, they are all safe, conditions or no conditions. This any man can see.

III. Since our brother has undertaken to untie hard knots, we will give him a few:

1. "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance." Heb. vi. 4. Persons "once enlightened, and who have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come," were certainly Christians—saints—were they not? When they have fallen away so that it is impossible to renew them again to repentance, they are certainly lost; are they not?

2. "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there

remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." Heb. x. 26. Those "who have received the knowledge of the truth" are certainly Christians—saints. Those for whom there remains no more sacrifice for sins, certainly can not be saved. How is this, Bro. Philo?

3. "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked men doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Ezek. xviii. 23. Here we have a righteous man turning away from his righteousness, doing according to all the abominations that the wicked do, and dying in his wickedness. Will he be saved?

4. "For if after they have escaped the pollution of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered to them. But it is happened to them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." 2 Pet. ii. 20-22. The persons here described, having once escaped the pollutions of the world, were once Christians, had known the way of righteousness, but had gone away from it—turned away from the holy commandment delivered to them, and returned to their wallowing in the mire. Is not this a pretty clear case of falling from grace?

I V. Could a man be reasonably required to make his calling and election *sure*, if God had made it sure before the creation of the world?

V. If a man shall honestly believe the gospel with all his heart and obey it, will he not be saved, let him think as he may please of Calvinism?

VI. Are there any so reprobated that

they *can not* believe, repent, turn to God, and be saved? If there are, whose fault is it that they are not saved?

VII. If there are any who never had it in their power to come to the Lord and be saved, can they justly be punished for sins in which they found themselves involved as soon as they were capable of knowing good and evil, and from which they could not escape?

VIII. When the invitations of the gospel are presented, *can* any sinner who may hear the invitations, believe, repent, and turn to the Lord, and become a Christian? or must he wait for some direct, miraculous, and irresistible power to turn him before he can turn?

A little light on those matters, Bro. Philo, if you please. B. F.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

LECTURE II.

ALL CHRISTIANS ARE PRIESTS.

Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen. Rev. i: 5-6.

I have been requested to lecture this week, of evenings, on topics involving Romanism. I have yielded my own opinion of the propriety of doing so, to the judgment of others, and, relying on God and the word of His grace, shall try to defend the truth, as it is in Jesus, from some of the numerous assaults made upon it. The time has fully come when men can not hide from exposure of religious error by crying out, "no controversy." The man who asserts that the Bible teaches Methodism,

Presbyterianism, Lutheranism, Episcopalianism, Romanism, etc., charges upon my religion, which is all the Gospel teaches, what is not true. In denying that it teaches these various systems, I am not attacking them, but defending the truth against their false assumptions. I am unable to call to mind a single truth, in the whole Christian economy, that is not perverted by some one of the religious parties of the present age.

One of the most pernicious of these errors is the assumption, by the Roman Catholic Church, that there is in the Church a class of men, separate from the masses of the membership, who are priests. To them alone, as a class, belongs the power of formally absolving aliens, and those whom they call the laity, from sins. The motto I have read from Revelations, declares "the servants of God," "the churches" to whom the language was addressed at first, "kings and priests unto God." Between these and God there was necessity for a high priest. Whoever, among the royal priesthood, which all Christians comprise, would exalt himself above them, takes the position of a high priest. He who does that claims a prerogative that God has given only to His Son, Heb. iv : 14. We have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God. Heb. v : 5. Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Again, Heb. viii : 3, 4, For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices : wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he could not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law (of Moses). From these statements of the Apostle it is clear that we have a high priest—that God made him one, and that he must of necessity have something to offer for sins. By the offering of himself, he has perfected forever them that are sanctified. Those who assume to be priests, according to Romanism, have nothing to offer that any Chris-

tian has not. They glorify themselves, or are glorified, by men to be made priests, a thing which Jesus Christ did not. What pride! what arrogance, for poor, little, weak and sinful men to be guilty of!

The text declares Christians, certainly all those there addressed, priests. The man that denies that, certainly must think the Bible unreliable. The Bible, teaching that all Christians are priests, we are concerned to learn from it three things: 1. How do persons become priests. 2. What are their duties, and 3. What is their destiny.

I. In determining how persons become priests, your attention is invited to what Peter, who is confessed by Romanists to be good authority, teaches, I. Peter ii : 9, Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people. In the 5th verse of the same chapter, they as lively stones, were said to be built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood. This language contains an unequivocal declaration of the fact that they were priests. The epistles of Peter were Catholic, not confined to a select few in the Church.—

(1.) They were kept by the power of God through *faith* unto salvation. *Believing* in Christ, they rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory : receiving the end of their *faith*, even the salvation of their souls.

(2.) They had been *born again*, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. I. Peter i : 23. (3.) They had been begotten to a lively *hope* by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. I. Peter i : 3.

(4.) They had been *baptized*, through which they were saved by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. I. Peter iii : 21. (5.) They had purified their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit. I. Peter i : 22.

(6.) They had been elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. I. Peter i : 2.

All these things had occurred in their history, and then they were addressed as royal priests, a holy priesthood, a peculiar

people, and a holy nation. From this general epistle we gather up the following items as necessary to constitute one a priest. He has been elected to obedience by the Spirit, he has been born (or begotten) by the word of truth, he has a lively hope produced by the resurrection of Christ, he has been baptized, believes unto salvation, and has purified his soul in obeying the truth. These things each Christian has done, and in doing them is become a priest unto God.

II. The duties of Christian priests. (1.) To present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service. Rom. xii: 1. (2.) To offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, and show forth his praises who has called them out of darkness into his marvelous light. I. Peter ii: 5-9. (3.) These offerings are declared by Paul, Heb. xiii: 15, 16, to be the fruit of the lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good and communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. To enumerate all the duties of priests would be to repeat all that Christians are commanded to do in the New Testament. There is not a duty commanded one of them as a priest, that is not enjoined upon every Christian priest. A Catholic priest has no divine warrant for doing a thing that is prohibited to any Christian. Whoever sins against a disciple of Christ, sins against a priest of God. Each of them, no matter how humble and lowly his worldly condition, has as much authority from Christ to pardon sins as the Pope of Rome. Christians are commanded to forgive one another, even as God for Christ's sake has forgiven them. Sins committed against God are to be confessed to God, and his forgiveness implored. Offences committed against our fellow-men are to be confessed to them, and their pardon sought, in addition to asking God for pardon.

III. The destiny of the Christian priest, is to be learned from those exceeding great and precious promises in the Bible, that look beyond this life, and this world. The

human heart yearns at times for a friend to whom it may confide its secret feelings and emotions. Such friend, tender and compassionate, we can find only in our high priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. To him we can go when no eye but his can see us, and where no ear but his can hear us. There is no man can go to God, except by him. A Roman priest has no privilege there, that the lowliest disciple of Jesus has not. I would not exchange the opportunity I enjoy, of going directly to the Savior with my sorrows, wants, and cares, for all the honor, wealth, and glory of the Pope of Rome. Christians obtain forgiveness of sins for the sake of the high priest. I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I. John ii: 12. Is there so much virtue in a Roman priest, that God will pardon a transgressor for his sake? No sooner than he will for the sake of any faithful disciple. It is no wonder that Catholics think the Bible an erring guide, when it fails to warrant their domineering assumptions over the people.

The conclusion of this subject, in my own mind, is, that each Christian, male or female, young or old, is a priest unto God, and having one high priest over the house of God, whose house Christians are, they should all offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God continually through Jesus Christ; confess to him their sins, and of God, for his sake, seek pardon. A crown, a throne, a kingdom, and eternal glory await all them that overcome as Jesus overcame. The throne of God and the Lamb is the final home of all true priests of God. All those who assume to be priests, par excellent, on earth, claim prerogatives that belong to Messiah alone, and are opposed to him, and the interests of his people. From all such may the Lord preserve his people.

J. M. HENRY.

PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

SHOP CREEK, Montgomery Co., Ill., }
March 8, 1863. }

BRO. FRANKLIN:—Peter says, 1 Pet., iii: 19, "By which also (the Spirit) he went and preached unto the spirits in prison," etc. Will you please explain to me how Jesus preached to the spirits in prison. Answer the above in the Christian Review.

WILLIAM L. ALLEN.

REPLY.

We have had substantially the same question as propounded above, presented for an answer, we think, at least as often as once a year for the past twenty years, and probably as many times given an answer to it, doing so, in many instances, in public. Many other brethren have given answers to the same thing. Still, there are many brethren, recently enlisted, who have not met with any of these answers, and for whom it becomes necessary to explain the matter again. One of the most talented, popular, and influential preachers among us, some years ago, stumbled upon this passage, stranded and fell. He soon founded an intermediate system of grace, or a system of grace between death and the resurrection of the dead, as he expressed it, to give those who did not obey the Gospel in this life, *another chance* to receive Christ, repent and turn to God. He, however, did not stop long at this point, but soon became enlisted in spirit-rapping, and, at last accounts, was pretty low down in the gloomy, dark and doubting regions of unbelief. Many other men, both among the German and French doctors, who, whether they design it or not, are continually undermining the Gospel, and destroying its power on the world, are adopting some similar speculations, and publishing them for the gratification of the

morbid, vitiated and corrupted appetite of these times.

Romanists have tried to draw support from this passage for the nefarious pretense of their priesthood, of delivering souls from purgatory—a false pretense and wonderful deception, by which they have taken from the pockets of the people more of their hard earnings than would found the richest kingdom in the world. This, however, is but one instance; out of many, where wicked and designing men have seized a rather obscure and incidental expression, and perverted it, not only to the most wicked and base purposes, but to their own destruction. Indeed, there is one thing clearly noticeable, and that is, that corrupt men are better read in, and more familiar with, the obscure, more mystical and difficult portions of Scripture to understand, than the clear, literal and practical parts. They love to deal in the obscure, the mystical and dark portions. In this work, there is an opportunity to get out of the purview of the people; beyond their knowledge; into the fog, mist and smoke. They then have a double advantage. 1. They can get credit for explaining a mystery, and thus astonish the world with the profundity of their knowledge. 2. They can explain the mystery to mean just what they please, and the masses of the people cannot determine whether they are right or wrong. This suits them precisely. They have a wicked scheme to advocate. To accomplish this object, they resort to obscure Scriptures, dark expressions, and obsolete metaphors, and interpret these to mean the very thing they aim to advocate, and thus claim Divine authority.

We press all these with the question, why not go to the literal; to the last commission; to the preaching of the apostles under that commission; show the people precisely what the apostles preached; the effect the preaching had on the people; the inquiries they made; what the apostles commanded them to do; what it was to be done for; how it was to be done; ascertain precisely what the people did, the result that followed, and all about it? We repeat it,

why not come here, and make this the main rallying ground? What reason can men have for not coming here, if they desire to know and teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Here we find the apostles with a holy commission immediately from Jesus, endued with supernatural power, to guide them infallibly into all truth, and surrounded by the most stupendous displays of miraculous power, confirming their Divine and holy mission, as well as all they said. Here we find a history of what they did, the founding of the kingdom of God, the introduction of the first converts into the kingdom, and everything as at the beginning. The only reason we can see why any man should avoid this all important portion of the Oracles of God, is because he does not desire to come to the light. The matters here are clear, tangible and intelligible. All can readily see the slightest departure from the truth. If a man attempts to deal with the things detailed here, he will at once be detected.

But all this is not answering the question at the head of these remarks. The question reads as follows: How did Jesus preach to the spirits in prison? The following is the reading of the passage: "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." 1 Pet. iii: 18-20. The following items we lay down as true:

1. This preaching was done "in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing."
2. Christ did not do this preaching *in person*, but *by the Spirit*. He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which (Spirit) he went and preached to the spirits in prison.
3. No preaching was ever done by the Spirit without employing a human agent, through whom to preach. There must,

then, have been a human agent in this case.

4. Was there any human agent, in the days of Noah, preaching by the Spirit?—Beyond all contradiction there was. That human agent was Noah. He was a preacher of righteousness, preached by the Spirit, the only preacher of righteousness in his time, and, therefore, the one employed.—Christ, then, went and preached by the Spirit, through Noah, a preacher of righteousness, to the ante-diluvians, who were the spirits in prison alluded to by Peter. Hence the Lord said, Gen. vi: 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he is flesh; yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." The Spirit of God which was in Noah, did strive with them, through Noah's preaching, one hundred and twenty years, at the end of which time God destroyed them by the flood.

5. Their disobedience was in the days of Noah, as is clearly stated, and most certainly their disobedience was when the preaching was done, and consisted in resisting the preaching, and refusing to repent, when solemnly warned.

6. It is a most unlikely thing that the Lord would attempt to reveal to man a dispensation of grace in the intermediate state, in a single obscure expression like this.—The thing is wholly incredible. It would be infinitely better to say, *we do not know what the passage means*, than to make it mean an entire system not mentioned anywhere else in the Bible.

7. It is assumed that this preaching was done between the death of the Savior and his resurrection, by those who claim that it was done in the intermediate state. This is not true, for our Lord went to paradise, when he died, as he said to the thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."—The wicked dead are not in *paradise*, but in *tartarus*, between death and the resurrection. Here, too, is where the angels who kept not their first estate, and who were cast down to hell (*tartarus*), are reserved in everlasting chains to the judgment of the great day. There is not, then, one scrap of

authority for thinking that there will be any dispensation of grace, preaching, or "another chance," to turn to God and be saved, beyond this life. The decree of God is, in reference to all who have passed over the boundary line of time, "He who is filthy, *let him be filthy still*; he who is unjust, *let him be unjust still*." There is *no chance* for reformation in this. Now is the time for reformation, and all who fail to turn to the Lord now—in time, will find it an everlasting failure. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." Let us neither trifle, nor be trifled with, in reference to these stupendous and wonderful matters, but listen to the sure and holy teaching of the apostles and prophets.

B. F.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. III.

BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

It ought to be kept before the mind, while reading the account of the birth of John the Baptist, that this event happened at **HEBRON**, a town situated about twenty-two miles south of Jerusalem, in the hill-country of Judea. The mind can thus take a firmer hold on the facts, and remember them better. That geography should be studied in connection with history, is now admitted by the learned.

It should also be borne in mind, that Zachariah and his wife were "blameless" servants of God, and could not be suspected of practising deception, when they related the extraordinary circumstances of the birth of their son. Indeed, those cir-

cumstances were of so public a nature, that their credibility did not depend upon the testimony of Zachariah and Elizabeth alone. The whole Jewish congregation at Jerusalem knew that Zachariah came out of the Temple dumb. The inhabitants of Judea knew that Elizabeth had lived to be an old woman, without having any children. Could they, therefore, do otherwise than regard the birth of John as miraculous?

Again, some thoughtful reader, who has perused the speeches of Zachariah, Elizabeth and Mary, may imagine that such lengthy remarks could hardly have been correctly reported, in those times when there were no *stenographers*. It ought, however, to satisfy every one who believes that "the Scriptures were written by the inspiration of God," and that the Evangelists wrote "as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," to know, that by this Holy Spirit all things could be brought to their remembrance.

But if we consider the extraordinary character of the events, in relation to which those speeches were made, we cannot doubt that the language used on such occasions would make a very strong impression on the minds of those present,—so strong as to enable them to *report every word with the greatest exactness*.

Indeed, the candid reader of Luke's narrative can hardly avoid being deeply impressed with its simplicity and truthfulness. It must seem to him, that **THESE THINGS ARE SO**. "The writer appears to be artlessly telling what he knows to be true, and therefore makes no effort to convince the reader of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of anything he relates.

But these remarks must not be extended, so as to become tedious. We are dependent upon Luke alone for a particular account of the circumstances attending the birth of the great Immerser and Preacher of reformation.

"When the time for Elisabeth's delivery was come, she gave birth to a son; and her neighbors and kindred heard that the Lord

had shown great kindness to her; and they rejoiced with her.

And it happened that, on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zachariah, naming him after his father. And his mother objected, and said: 'No, but he shall be called JOHN.' They said to her: 'None of thy kindred is called by that name!' Then they made signs to his father, [to know] how he would have him called. He asked for a writing-tablet and wrote, saying: 'HIS NAME IS JOHN.' Then his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue was loosed; and he spoke, and praised God. And fear came on all in the neighborhood. And these things were told throughout the hill-country of Judea. And all who heard, pondered in their hearts, saying: 'What will this child be!' And the hand of the Lord was with him."

These things being known to the inhabitants throughout Judea, and the people looking and watching to see what such a child would become, is it any wonder that, when he afterwards proclaimed reformation, the people flocked to him in crowds, and submitted to his immersion? Is it any wonder that they regarded him as a prophet, when they called to mind Zachariah's extraordinary prophecy concerning him?

And Zachariah, his father, being filled with the Holy Spirit, prophesied, saying: 'Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, because he has visited and redeemed his people; and has raised up a horn of salvation for us, in the family of his servant David, (as he spoke in old times by the mouth of his holy prophets,) salvation from our enemies, and from the hands of all who hate us; to show mercy to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant;—the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, to grant us that, being rescued from the hands of our enemies, we should, without fear, serve him in holiness and uprightness all our days. And thou, child, shall be called the Prophet of the Most High; for thou shalt go before the Lord, to prepare his way, in order to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the remission of their

sins; through the tender compassion of our God, by which the day spring from on high has visited us, to give light to those sitting in darkness and in the shades of death, in order to guide our feet into the way of peace.'

"And the child grew, and became strong in spirit, and continued in the deserts, till the time when he made himself known to Israel."

BIRTH OF JESUS, THE CHRIST.

Six months after the nativity of John the Baptist, in the last year of the reign of Herod the Great, a birth took place at Bethlehem, a town only six miles south of Jerusalem, which was attended with circumstances still more extraordinary. Matthew informs us that Mary, to whom the Angel Gabriel had promised a son, while she was yet a virgin, had been engaged to a man named Joseph. He says that, "before they came together, she was discovered to be with child by the Holy Spirit," and that "Joseph, being a worthy man, and not willing to expose her publicly, desired to put her away privately. But while he was thinking about it, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, and said: "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take home Mary, thy wife; for what she has conceived is by the Holy Spirit. And she shall give birth to a son, whom thou shalt name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins."

Now all this was done, that what was spoken by the Lord through the Prophet might be verified:—"Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and shall give birth to a son, whom they shall call IMMANUEL;" which, being translated, means GOD WITH US.

"And Joseph, awaking from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him, and took home his wife; but he knew her not, till she had given birth to a son, whom he named JESUS."

Luke's narrative is more circumstantial. He informs us, that Cæsar had decreed that

there should be an enrollment of the inhabitants of the country; that Joseph went from Nazareth to Bethlehem, in order to be enrolled with Mary, his espoused wife; that while there, Mary's time to be delivered came, "and she gave birth to her first-born son," and that, "wrapping him in swathing-bands, she laid him in a manger; there being no room for them in the public house."

Such were the circumstances of the birth of HIM, who was to be the Savior of the world. But, though humble, it was peculiar and glorious. What an account is the following! When did the heavenly host ever attend the birth of an earthly king? See how witnesses were prepared, to bear testimony concerning the Heavenly King!

"And in the same country there were shepherds staying in the field, and watching their flock at night. And, see, an angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them; and they were very much frightened. But the angel said to them: Fear not, for, see, I bring you good tidings, which will be matter of great joy to all the people. For to you is born, this day in the City of David, a Savior, who is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign to you: you shall find a babe wrapped in swathing-bands, lying in a manger? And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying: 'Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will among men.'

"And it happened, when the angels had left them, and gone away into heaven, that the shepherds said one to another: 'Let us now go to Bethlehem, and see this which has happened, of which the Lord has informed us? And they went with haste, and found Mary and Joseph, with the babe lying in the manger. Having seen this, they made known abroad what had been told them concerning the child. And all who heard, wondered at the things told them by the shepherds. And Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart. And the shepherds returned, glori-

fying and praising God, for all that they had heard and seen, as it had been told to them."

The publicity of these strange things, would sufficiently account for the immense crowds of people who afterwards flocked to Jesus out of all the cities, even if he had never performed a miracle. But when we consider that he "spoke as no other man had spoken," and did what no other man had ever done, we cease to be surprised at the multitudes who followed him, and only wonder that all did not believe on him.

WM. PINKERTON.

LYNCHBURG, Ohio, March 28, '63.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

LECTURE III.

Is Christ or Peter the foundation of the Church of God.

And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it. Matt. xvi: 18. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus the Christ. 1 Cor. iii: 11.

The Church of Christ being likened to a building, God's building, must have a foundation. From the manifest difference between Christianity and Romanism, it would seem that the settlement of the question concerning the foundation is a vital one. Three views are entertained about this. If it can not be satisfactorily determined by examining the Bible, I think we may give up the search for any means of settlement. There are three sentiments entertained as to what the foundation of

the Church is. To a brief examination of these your attention is invited presently.

1. "The connection, however, shows that Peter is here plainly meant. *Thou art Peter*, says Christ; and *upon this rock*, that is, Peter, pointing to him; for thus it connects with the reason which follows for the name, in the same manner as the reason is given for that of Abraham in Gen. xvii : 5, and of Israel in Gen. xxxii : 28. The Apostles are also called, in other parts of the New Testament, the foundation on which the Church is built, as in Eph. ii : 20 and Rev. xxi : 14, as being the persons employed in erecting the Church by preaching. It is here promised that Peter should commence the building of it by his preaching, which was fulfilled by his first converting the Jews, Acts ii : 14-42, and also the Gentiles, Acts, 10th chapter. This passage, therefore, gives no countenance to the papal supremacy, but the contrary, for this prerogative was personal and incommunicable."—*Horne, vol. 1, page 343.*

We are not now inquiring directly *how* the Church was built, but about the foundation of it. Horne says Peter is the foundation, because he first preached the gospel to Jews and Gentiles. Preaching is neither the foundation, nor the edifice.—The foundation is called a rock or a stone, and the building lively stones. There is homogeneity in the foundation and materials of the Church. If the foundation is doctrine or preaching, then the building is doctrine or preaching. This monstrous assumption is made by some, even Dr. Horne above quoted. In 1 Cor. iii : 12, 13. Now if any man build on this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. From this passage it is assumed that gold, silver, and precious stones mean true doctrines, and that wood, hay, and stubble mean erroneous or false doctrines. Admitting this position to be true, then it would follow, according to some succeeding lan-

guage of the Apostle, that one sure way to salvation would be to preach; for he says, "the man shall be saved," verse 15. If he have preached error he will suffer loss, but will himself be saved, yet so as by fire.

On the contrary, if the man have preached the truth, and persons have been placed on the foundation by that, do not abide, the laborer will suffer loss. They are here compared to wood, hay, stubble, that fire will consume. Fire will not consume gold, silver, and precious stones. So those persons who remain faithful are compared to these incombustible things.

The second theory I quote from Archbishop Purcell, *Debate with Campbell, page 57.* "In the first place, we prove from scripture that Christ did establish an earthly head to his Church, and that that head was the Apostle Peter. If not, why did he say to Peter, '*Thou art Peter, (a rock,) and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?*' Again, he did give him pre-eminence over the other Apostles. If not, why did he say to him, Luke xxii : 32, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (in the plural, that is all the Apostles,) that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being converted confirm thy brethren."

We object to Peter being regarded as the foundation of the Church of Christ, because:

1. *Petros*, the Greek word for his name, means a stone. John 1 : 42. Thou shalt be called Cephias; which is by interpretation a stone. This word is in the masculine gender, and Peter, addressed by the Messiah, is in the second person.

2. Because *Petra*, the word Jesus used as that on which his Church is built, means a rock, and is feminine gender.

3. Because it is not pretended that *Petra* means Peter in another instance in the New Testament, though the word occurs in fifteen other places besides in the disputed place in Matt. xvi : 18.

4. Because "The construction of lan-

guage requires that the word *this* should refer to something antecedent, different from *thou* or *you*, being different in *person* and *case*." This passage furnishes the only place in the Christian scriptures in which *Petros* occurs. How baseless then the Romish assumption that Peter is the foundation of the Church of God! Especially when so many difficulties are seen, as above, clustering around the assumption.

To this it is replied that in the Syriac there is no gender belonging to the word used for stone. To this it may be sufficient to say that no copy of Matthew is extant in Syriac, unless it be a translation from the Greek of Matthew. The Greek is the standard, and not a translation into any tongue.

The third position, and that in which we feel the liveliest interest, is that Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, is the foundation of the Church.

In fifty-six occurrences of the word stone (Greek lithos) it is twelve times used to mean the Lord Jesus Christ, and not once for Peter. Jesus Christ and not Peter, a person and not a doctrine, a fact and not a truth, is the foundation of the Church. Four times Christ is called a rock besides in the controverted passage in Matt. xvi : 18 in the New Testament. 1 Pet. ii : 6. The language of the prophet Isaiah xxviii : 16, is quoted as follows, Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Peter does not repeat the word foundation, which Isaiah had used twice in the passage referred to, as follows: Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste. Does this elect, precious, corner-stone, a sure foundation, refer to Peter? Peter declares that he who believes in this corner-stone, this sure foundation, shall not be confounded. Does he teach that men are to believe in himself, or in the Lord Jesus Christ? No one can be at a loss to answer this question, unless he believes Peter to be the foundation.

This precious, chosen stone, he says is a living stone, to whom the brethren, to whom he wrote had come, and declares that living stone to be the Lord.

If Peter is the foundation, how could he have made such a mistake as to say the Lord is the precious corner-stone, and the sure foundation? He had not learned, at the time he wrote this epistle, that he was the vicar of Christ; and that the Church was built on himself, or else he possessed a modesty of which none claiming to be his successors were ever possessed. The Apostle Paul says, 1 Cor. iii : 11, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus the Christ." The plainness of this is such as to confuse any but an infidel to deny that Jesus is the foundation. Jesus in his divine person is the rock on which the Church may securely rest, without fear of the gates of hades preventing her ultimate beatification and glory in the everlasting kingdom of God. Her membership, from age to age, goes down to the dark chambers of death; but each, as he enters the dark valley, rejoices in the hope of a triumph over hades, and all that separates between the soul and the glory of the heaven of heavens. They that believe in Jesus are begotten to a hope of life, by his resurrection from the dead. They all die in expectation of that glorious day when rising they will shout, O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?

How different in that day will be the condition of the man who has been relying on Peter and his successors, the day itself, alone, may fearfully and awfully disclose. Peter, as an apostle of Christ, was inspired, and was the honored instrument of first proclaiming to Jews and Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. As an apostle he opened the kingdom of heaven. As a disciple of Jesus he was justly reproached by Paul for dissimulation. Is that a precious, elect corner-stone, a sure foundation on which to trust? Never. Let me trust in him, of whom Peter spoke and wrote, living and dying. His is the only name

given under heaven or among men whereby I must be saved. Trusting in Jesus, the soul need not fear though a host should encamp against it. Trusting in Peter, it may fly from one saint to another, invoking aid in the day of trouble, in vain. The other apostles were inspired equally with Peter, forming altogether a number of witnesses for Jesus, whose testimony has survived the ravages of ages, and will survive when the earth and heavens shall be no more.

May the Lord in his mercy preserve all who love him from error and delusion in these days of sorrow and calamity.

At the conclusion, a gentleman arose and wished to know, if St. Peter ever sinned after he was inspired? And if Christ did not say to him, feed my lambs, feed my sheep? To your first question, I answer yes, certainly; and will read to you the account of his reproof by the Apostle Paul, Gal. ii: 11-13. But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them that which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

From this, my friend, you will perceive that Paul could not have understood Peter to be a Roman Catholic Pope.

Touching your second question I may have something to say to-morrow evening about it, and will be glad for you to be present. I am also pleased that you present your difficulties here, and now.

He said he was seeking the truth, and would come the next evening, which he did.

J. M. HENRY.

CARD PLAYING, DANCING, Etc.

"Christianity has its cross as well as its crown." It often becomes our painful duty to raise our voices against practices which creep into the Church of Christ, and which fills our hearts with grief. But such is the frailty of man that he is prone to wander from the path of rectitude, often, ignorantly, and quite as often, recklessly. It is with shame and bitter regret I am constrained to confess that many of our brethren, all over the land, are often engaged in card playing, *simply for amusement*. Others engage in dancing, *also for amusement* I suppose; and when reprov'd for these vices, they often tell you that members of other churches engage in these innocent amusements, and no fuss is made about it. This I do not admit; for, while it is true that members of other churches do engage in these sinful practices, they as churches, at least in this community, no more sanction them, than do we. But suppose they did; would that make it right, seeing that we have a great chart of unerring wisdom and truth to guide our feet in the ways of righteousness and true holiness? Though the task be an unpleasant one, yet I conceive it to be the duty of every one who desires to see the Church of Jesus Christ rise to its true dignity, excellency and purity in the earth, to bring the whole weight of his influence to bear against those evils that insinuate themselves into our midst drawing the very life's blood from our body. For I verily believe that there are few, if any, devices of the Devil better calculated to destroy piety and blast our hopes in the usefulness of the youth of our congregations than those above mentioned. But what says He who laid down His life for us. "Ye are the salt of the earth" Mat. v. 13.

If there is to be no difference between

the Church and the world, no difference between the Christian and the man of the world, then it is all a mistake to say "ye are the salt of the earth," and that it is through your influence upon the surrounding mass of mankind that they are to be preserved from putrefaction, decay and ultimate ruin. With what propriety, then, can it be said that you are the salt of the earth, if there is to be no difference between the salt and the earth? "Ye are the light of the world." What are we to understand by this? Are we not by our walk, by our light, to guide men who are walking in a sinful and benighted world into the way that leads to life eternal?

Again, are we not commanded to glorify our Father in heaven? How are we to do this but by letting our light so shine, that others seeing our good works may be constrained also to glorify our Father which is in heaven. Now are you letting your light shine to the illumination of a benighted world? Are you glorifying your Father in heaven when you are whirling in the giddy dance, or spending your precious time at the card-table, the theater, the circus or other similar places of worldly and wicked amusements? Again, says the beloved disciple, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us that we should be called the sons of God!" 1 John iii. 1. Is it possible that any one claiming to be a son or daughter of the Most High God can be found engaging in all the light, trashy, and foolish vices of this sin-cursed earth? How dignified, how exalted is the position of that person who can, in truth, claim to be a son or daughter of the Lord Almighty! Remember, my brother, your honored, your exalted position. Remember the name that has been named upon you. Remember that when the names of kings, of emperors, of statesmen, and of conquerors shall have passed away and been forgotten, yours shall live co-eternal with Him who gave it. Then, should we not labor to keep ourselves unspotted from the world, and strive to become each day more and more like Christ, our leader and exemplar? The

apostle Peter says, "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation; a peculiar people." 1 Peter ii. 9. And Paul to Titus says when speaking of Jesus Christ, "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii. 14.

These Scriptures teach us that we are not our own; that we have been bought with a price, Christ having given his own precious blood for us that he might purify unto himself a peculiar people. Hear with what profound earnestness and deep solicitude the apostle speaks to the Church at Rome: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. xii. 1.

Can there be then, agreeably to this teaching, any congruity between the sentiments, tastes, and feelings of those who realize the great truth that they are the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, and those places and sources of worldly and carnal amusements; the devices of the Devil to allure thoughtless and erring man from the path of safety and of rectitude? The temple of the Holy Spirit, the joint-heir of the Lord Jesus, will not be found in those places which the Master shunned. Let us suppose there are two young men of equal talents and attainments, living in our village, who have been brought up by respectable and moral parents; who move in respectable circles of society, and are both genteel and moral young men. One is a man of the world; the other, a member of a Church. Do we expect the one who makes no pretensions to christianity to *lie, cheat, steal, swear, get drunk and wallow about the streets as a beast*, simply because he makes no profession of religion? Certainly not. He abhors such conduct, and would associate with no such a character. But he will participate in the genteel dance; will attend the theater, the circus, and will play cards (*secretly however*) *simply for amusement*; and who will be his

companion in all of these worldly amusements? Do I not speak the truth when I say it is too often the very young man who claims to be a Christian? The only difference that any living man can see between the two is, that the name of one is on the Church book and the other is not; the one, when he happens to be at Church, partakes of the emblematic loaf and cup, the other, does not. Are these the characteristics of a peculiar people, *zealous of good works*? Is this letting our light shine, that others seeing our good works may glorify our Father which is in heaven? Is this fighting the good fight of faith, that we may wear a crown of glory?

We hear it argued by the votaries of these vices that there is no harm in indulging in them, since they are mere amusements, mere pastimes. If nothing worse could be said against them, is it not a waste of time which is not our own? Has it not the appearance of evil? Are we not commanded, most positively, to abstain from every thing that tends to evil, or to the injury of any? 1st Thess. v. 22-24. And when we participate in these vices where is our example and influence, if not on the side of the world and wickedness?

Again: We are sometimes told that "dancing is reveling," and, therefore, forbidden by the Scriptures; but there can be no harm in sitting down and exchanging pieces of paper that simply have "pictures and spots painted on them." Oh, the devices of the Devil! Suppose a son is sent to one of our large cities to engage in business. With what anxiety does a father follow him in his imagination to his future home; with what deep solicitude does a mother brood over his future prospects.—Anon, a friend writes you that your son is fond of gay and fashionable society and amusements, attending the genteel dancing party and other places of amusement. If that father be a Christian, he would much prefer to hear that he was attending the house of worship and of prayer. But oh! with what horror would his soul be filled to hear that his dear boy was spending his

leisure evenings at the card table. He, at once, looks upon him as in the downward road to infamy, disgrace and ruin. If there is one sin more heinous and more to be detested than another, in which respectable people are known to indulge, that sin is card playing, whether for *amusement* or *emolument*. Does the drunkard plunge into drunkenness in one mighty leap, or the gambler into the sinks and hells of earth at one mighty stride? Did any man or woman ever rise from the card table, or leave the dance feeling that he or she was made better, or more endeared to the meek and lowly Savior. Can you, who are heads of families without the blush of shame and conscious guilt, after having taught your children by your example to love these fashionable vices, then urge them, as you should when they go forth into the world, to abstain from them, and shun them, as they would the deadly upas, the sting of the scorpion, or the bite of the adder; Oh! how horrid is the thought, that he who now plays around your knee in all his child like innocence and purity, may, in after years, look back covered with shame and disgrace, and trace his ruin to a father's example.—But if there are no words in God's holy book by which you can be convinced that these worldly practices are wrong, let me propose a test to your own heart and conscience, and beg you to try it the next time you are about to engage in cards or the dance. There is Bible authority for it; for, we are told, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." James i. 5. Again, the apostle says: "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." Col. iii. 17.

Now, before you engage in the dance or card playing, retire to some secret place and call to your recollection the scene in the garden of Gethsemane. See! yonder goes the Savior "about a stone's cast" from his disciples; all nature is hushed and still; the full moon looms up over the eastern

hills of Judea, and pours her silvery light upon that vine-clad garden; the stars look down upon the scene with awful serenity, while sephyr's sigh mournfully through the olive trees. Hear Him, as he prays: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." When you have contemplated this scene, then bow your spirit before the Father of lights, and pray, saying, O my Father, I am not my own, I have been bought with a price, even the precious blood of Jesus; and since thou hast commanded *all things to be done in the name of the Lord Jesus*, now in His name I pray thee, as I am about to spend an evening in the social dance, that I may so dance as to attract the attention of all present; that I may be the delight and admiration of the fashionable and gay; that I may, by my graceful and elegant example, cause all the young people in the neighborhood to study the art of dancing; that I may even excel in dignity, grace and elegance the accomplished Miss Herodias who received, by order of a monarch for her splendid performance, the bloody head of John the Baptist. All of these things I ask in the name and for the sake of Jesus who died, that I, through his death, might have life. And when you have so prayed, go mingle with the giddy and thoughtless throng if you can find it in your heart so to do.— But remember "for all these things God will surely bring you unto judgment." But do you still persist in your position that although dancing may be wrong, still there can be no harm in playing cards, *simply for amusement?* Well, suppose we admit that you are right, that there is no harm in it; will you persist in it against the expressed will of the Church? Hear what the apostle Paul says on this subject, 1st Cor. viii. 13 and x. 31, 32. Will you thus offend against the Church rather than give up your ill-founded opinion? But ask yourself what are its tendencies? whither does it lead? which of the two vices has caused the greatest amount of human degradation, wretchedness and suffering?

Dancing, as conducted in this country,

has some moral restraints thrown around it. There is the presence of females whose society and influence is a check to drunkenness, profanity, and other departures from decency that might otherwise be indulged in. But, as a general thing, no such restraint is upon the card players. If men were not conscious that card playing is in bad repute, not only with the Church, but with the moralist and the philanthropist, why do you see them, usually, select some secret place, close the doors, and speak in suppressed tones while the game is progressing; and, if perchance a tap upon the door is heard, all is startled and still; the cards are shuffled, not for another game, but out of sight. These are facts, and they prove, beyond doubt, that you, sir, even you, who engage in this vice, know the whole thing to be wrong. I presume but few young men of good standing and self-respect, though making no pretension to Christianity, would be willing for the community in which they live to know that they were in the habit of spending their time at the card table. Shall the Christian, then, do those things that would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of the man of the world? Go, my brother, upon the wings of imagination from hovel to hovel, from prison to prison, and see the wretchedness, poverty, and misery brought upon the inmates of those places, and say there is no harm in card playing. See that sorrow-stricken, dejected being who was once the gayest of the gay, the pride of fond parents and the delight and ornament of society—a being in whom all the affections of a kind and fond husband once centered, filling her heart with joy and bright prospects for the future. That haggard look, those helpless children, covered with rags and tatters, clinging to her side tell the cruel story.— But stop not here. Go, follow the victim himself to prison, perhaps to the gallows. See him bid a last adieu to that one to whom in by gone years he plighted his faith, and pledged himself her protector and support. See him as he takes a last embrace of those little ones whom God has given him, and if

his soul is not seared with crime and vice, see how his bosom heaves and his eyes weep tears of grief and shame. But pursue him further, and hear him, in the dark, doleful regions of eternal misery, crying "watchman, what of the night?" And when ages and cycles of ages shall have rolled away still the piteous cry will be heard in that region of despair, "watchman, what of the night?" Is not this the fate of many who, with hopes as bouyant and prospects as bright as yours, sought only *amusement* in card playing? Then will you take one step, my brother, in the path whose end may be to *you* what it has been to others, both temporal and eternal ruin? Say not you can command yourself when you enter the abodes of sin and temptation. When once, the first, the fatal step is taken in the downward road to disgrace and ruin, and the passion for cards is formed and fixed, few ever retrace their steps; for that passion becomes as strong and irresistible as the gnawing appetite of the inebriate for the intoxicating bowl.

But I would say, in conclusion, to the votaries of pleasure and worldly amusement, go, witness a Savior's sufferings and remember that it was all for you; that he might redeem you from sin and "purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." See him in the garden of Gethsemane, with the sins of a world lying in wickedness pressing him to the earth; and hear him pray, "Abba Father, if thou be willing remove this cup from me." See him betrayed by a professed friend and brought to Pilate's bar. See him bearing his heavy cross up the rugged steep of Calvary. Faint and weary he winds his onward way until, at last, exhausted, he reels and falls. A shriek of agony is heard from the females who, with aching hearts, follow at a distance. The cry reaches his benevolent heart, and turning, with overflowing compassion, says: "Daughters of Jerusalem weep not for me." But see, oh! see that crimson tide as it streams down from his lacerated hands. See that pale, that cold, that marble brow, and sunken

eyes. Those lips that ever spoke words of peace and consolation to the suffering and afflicted of earth are now pale and silent in death; that heart which ever beat with universal love is now cold and still. And while gazing on this scene, ask yourself, is there to be no difference between the world and the Church for which he died?

Dover, Mo.

S. T. MENG.

MESSIAH'S REIGN.

Messiah's reign began with his coronation in heaven, and will terminate by the resurrection of the dead. When he took his seat in heaven, the fiat went forth, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Phil. ii. 10, 11. When the knees shall bow, and the tongues of earth confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, then will be brought to pass that great event which we call the Millennium. We now purpose noticing what has, does, and will hinder or retard this great event.

The first enemies to Messiah's reign were Jews and Pagans. The Jews, veiled in tradition and the law by Moses, denied their promised Savior and crucified Him; and are yet, as a whole, in opposition to His government. But they, having once been first, will now be last. Their conversion will be through that of other nations first. Their opposition, however, like others, has been gradually giving away. Pagan Rome, with her heathen philosophy, was a strong opponent to the reign of Messiah. The "ten persecutions" were brought against Messiah's government by pagan Rome. But,

at length, after Messiah had about gained the ascendancy over pagan Rome, or, at least, when pagan Rome had slackened her hand against the saints, the "man of sin"—papal Rome—became developed, laid hold on the very citadel of Messiah's government—assumed to be his dictator—took upon themselves the assumed attribute of *infallibility*, and martyred thousands of Messiah's citizens as disloyal rebel heretics. At length Messiah, in the person of the bold and intrepid Luther, began the work of dislodging and destroying the papal authority.

Since the period of the Lutheran reformation, there has been an irrepressible conflict, until, at length, we find the "man of sin" about dethroned from his power in political affairs. During the whole period of Messiah's reign to the present time, civil government has kept due pace with that of Christianity. While we had pagan Rome in opposition to Messiah's reign, there was, of course, a pagan government. But, as soon as pagan Rome would give away enough to Messiah's reign to allow a reformation, papal Rome was developed, and then we find a papal government. Government has, also, kept pace with the protestant reformations, until, we may say, the mould of civil government is the religious notions of the people. False government is the offspring of false religion. True religion only, will develop true government. Until, then, a nation is truly religious according to the revelation of God to man, it cannot have a permanent government.

There is no legitimate authority of man, except in conformity to the statutes of heaven. For the special purposes, however, of keeping pace with the moral and intellectual advance of man, and the punishment of evil doers, false governments have been a means, under God, of keeping in check the gross nature of the animal man. So were the Romans the means, under God, by which he destroyed the Jewish nation; but this by no means proves that the Romans were holy and righteous before God. Neither does false government, because it

fills a purpose of God, stand acquitted of its errors. Civil government, and the gospel, are the two elements of Messiah's power to bring man to loyalty; the first is his physical, the latter, his moral or spiritual power. Civil government keeps the animal passions in check, while the moral image of the gospel is formed upon the intellect and affections.

But to return. Infidelity and atheism, both based upon the vain philosophy of man, have greatly retarded the earthly reign of Messiah. Their wicked hands, however, at this age, are greatly weakened. Last, but not least, and to the shame of the protestant family, written documents, extraneous and superfluous, called *creeds*, and not the scriptures themselves, have been the exponents of orthodoxy. By this means, while they all labor for the same end, their own union, by which alone they could hasten Messiah's object, is prevented; and, by this means, they are retarding the work of reforming the nations, and developing the millennial reign of Messiah. We sum up, then, the enemies to Messiah's reign, which have retarded the millennium as follows:

Jews, Pagans, Catholics, false government, Infidels, Atheists, and protestant creeds. These seven enemies have been arrayed against Messiah's government for centuries. But what now, at this time, retards the millennial reign of Messiah? or who are his enemies? The very same that have heretofore been his enemies; but in a minor degree. The hands of every enemy have been greatly weakened, until it is clearly seen, that the gospel is the power of God to the destruction of false government and religion. That which now retards Messiah's millennium, will retard it in the future, until it be removed. There is a great moral and political reformation yet to take place among the nations. The moral must necessarily precede that of true government. As the basis of the moral or religious reformation, the grand predicate of the gospel system is the theme—"That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." But some one is ready to say, "everybody believes"

this fact; therefore, all that is lacking to develop the millennium, is political reformations. We have heard this objection, by crude thinkers, urged as an objection against the validity of *the faith*. It lacks about two thirds of being true—only one-third of it true. This agrees with all the figures we have seen. Olney gives the following figures: Pagans 572,000,000, Mohammedans 153,000,000, Jews 3,000,000—728,000,000—who do not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He gives the number of those who do believe it, under the name of Christians, at 252,000,000. From these figures, it is clearly seen, that over one half of the human race are yet pagans. And what is Mohammedanism but the most base paganism? Putting the two together, we have, out of the 970,000,000 of the human race, 725,000,000, pagans.

Yet it has been upwards of eighteen hundred years since Messiah began his reign on earth. Then, let us not console ourselves with the happy thought, that the summer is over, and the harvest is passed; for it is not yet for a season. The one-third, in the calculation, who acknowledge Messiah as the Son of God, destroy their influence by discords among themselves. The "man of sin," that lawless one, who has long sat in the temple as "very God," is included in this class. By his insignificant audacity and vain assumption of *infallibility*, the ground work of the protestant reformation was laid. Then the reformers, by defining their faith and cause of separation, gave the basis of protestant creeds, until, finally, a *human creed* is thought to be the test of Christianity—that a vessel without a *creed* "is *piratical*," as though the word of God only made pirates. The first thing, then, to be done for the moral reformation of the world, is, for protestants to drop human creeds as bonds of union, and meet upon the Bible alone as the exponent of their faith. When protestants drop human creeds and throw their wealth and moral efforts together, the power of all enemies to Messiah's reign will briefly yield. Catholicism,

Paganism, Mohammedanism, Atheism, and Infidelity will melt before the gospel of Messiah. Protestants, therefore, would do well, instead of watching the "signs of the times" through prophetic spectacles, to study their duty and volition.

There is too much time devoted to the *modus operandi* of the gospel system as adapted to man, instead of a more active hand in doing Messiah's commands. To fear God and keep His commandments, is Solomon's definition of the "*whole duty of man*." The time, which will be consumed in this moral reformation, compared with the antecedent progress of moral reformation, is, to human conception, indefinite. That it is far in the undeveloped future, is reasonable, and as we think, certain. Political reformations are but civil commotions to keep pace with moral and intellectual improvement. Man, from his lack of future conception, confines civil government upon present exigencies; and, when moral and intellectual improvement outstrips the times, the form of government must be changed or modified to suit this improvement. Hence political reformations, or revolutions. There are, comparatively, as many changes to take place in the political, as in the religious world. The gospel cannot, at present, have free access to many nations on account of their civil institutions; and we might say, their religious institutions. This moral influence being excluded from their people, will have no ingress except through the physical change of their political character by a political reformation. False jealousy, or jealousy in favor of false religion and government, is stronger, in appearance, than jealousy for truth—truth is prudent, falsehood is abominable. We shall not dwell upon isolations, but general principles. In the formation of human governments, they are framed to suit the peculiar prejudices and views at the time of their formation; and are viewed, upon the whole, as settled in principle and form, while in fact, they embody in their form or principle the embryo of dissolution. It is highly necessary, also, that

governments, at the time, are formed to meet the peculiar circumstances of society. A pure democracy, in form and principle, formed among persons, who, at the time, were not intellectually, morally and religiously prepared for its introduction, would be the wrong government for the time; but so soon as the masses are prepared for the change, a monarchy or aristocracy ought to be changed to that of democracy. Upon the principle, the European Governments, heretofore, have been right, or what we mean, adapted to the intellectual condition of the subjects. Their great error has been in the exclusion of intellectual privileges to the subjects, and their qualification, thereby, for the noble structure of a Republican Government.

Upon this principle, also, the United States Government was, in principle and form, in advance of the moral and intellectual improvement of the masses. The frequent elections, thereby throwing the unqualified masses into commotion; and the frequent harangues of office-seekers, thereby corrupting the masses; and above all, the Press, being frequently called into the service of individuals and parties, thereby making a press-ridden people, has about confirmed, in the United States' Government, the annunciation of Dr. Clark—that a Democratic Government is not as durable as a Monarchical or an Aristocratic Government—"For the people, through their representatives, will become corrupted and subvert their own Government." In this, however, Dr. Clark built a future axiom on present ignorance. We have now arrived at the point where we may assert the one radical and fundamental principle of true government; it is a government based upon the intellectual and not the animal man.

Heretofore, governments have been based upon the natural or animal rights of man, and he turned loose to feed alone on the pasture of penal law, and his weight in society or the government measured by his taxable property. Fine physical dress has been the idea of most nations. But to

make man, intellectually, morally, and religiously what God made him for and adapted him to, should be the purpose of all human government. Such government enlightens the masses—benefits them, and leaves the subject qualified for the duties of this life, and a better prepared spirit to enter an unseen state. But we must not dwell. There are two modes by which political revolutions, or change of government may be effected or terminated—one is moral or intellectual, the other, animal, gross, uncivilized, and barbarous. But the plan of war, as yet, is adapted to the moral and intellectual capacity of the age. To depend, at this age, upon the moral obligations of man in general, would be hazardous to every civil institution. But, that war is, at this time, the only means by which we can change the body politic, by no means proves that, in the future, the same will be effected without the shedding of blood. A Campbell said, "War, however, is wholly barbarous. Nations at war, are at best but partly civilized." "When we become more rational, more civilized, and more Christian, we will find some other way of settling our national disputes, than with the sword, and with the confused noise of the warrior, and garments baptized in blood;" Purcell Debate, pp. 256. This annunciation, we think, is true. But let it be remembered, that this state of rationality, civilization and Christianity is yet in the future. There is, at this time, a dark picture in the political world; but this is no more than a reaction in political affairs to remove evils which moral and intellectual improvement requires.

The mind and purpose of man now is, and has been too much directed to the things of sense instead of those more noble, invisible, intellectual, and eternal things which constitute the purpose of man's existence, and the future felicity and happiness of the human race. All things within man's voluntary scope, appear to be yet directed to earth as the abiding home and destiny of man. Wealth is abundantly expended for temporal things—the vain

objects of human pursuit—while the Lord Jesus, the Christ, has but few energetic, self-sacrificing citizens, who are not only willing to give their wealth and influence to His cause, but, if need be, their lives for His government.

This condition of the public mind must be changed. Then, when every one shall believe the same truth, put their trust in the one Lord, being immersed into the one name, having common and reciprocal reliance upon the one God and Father of all—raised to their adapted height of intellectual, moral, and religious capacities, the grand army of earth, upon their "white horses," will be mounted behind their leader, with His vesture dipped in blood whose name is called, "The word of God."

W. BAKER.

HINTS ON THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

Every reader of the Old Testament has noticed the prominence given to Jewish rites. One book of the Bible, (Leviticus), and large parts of others, are filled with minute directions to the people under the Levitical priesthood. We are apt to lay stress upon these, overlooking the *established religion* before the Law to Israel was given.

Like the Jews as they surrounded Mount Sinai with its thunders and lightnings, its fire and cloud, its smoke and tempest, its blackness and darkness, with sound of trumpet exceeding loud, we may fear and tremble at these manifestations of God's power and majesty; but the worship of God by man was not commenced here. The splendid Mosaic ritual had existed fifteen hundred years when Christ came upon earth. Yet thirty-five hundred years of the world's history had rolled away before Judaism was established; and through all those thirty-five centuries, obedient men of God had paid to him the just and willing

tribute of adoration. The time which has transpired since Moses received the tables of stone is not quite equal to the long reach of years before that event.

In the concise record of the patriarchal age while we may not expect a full and continued account of the way in which men approached the Almighty; yet surely during that period we shall not look in vain for some evidences of a *system of religion* furnished by God for the government of man in his acts of devotion. Hence, here and there, we are not surprised to read in those early times of altars and victims, of priests and sacrifices.

On the first leaf of the Bible we find no record of these ordinances of divine service. *Sin* had not yet entered into the world. In purity and innocence man held converse with his maker, as "friend holds fellowship with friend." But while looking at the fair picture of man, when he, like the rest of creation, is "very good," we immediately read of a violated law, of an offended God.

The scene is changed. Man receives his sentence and suffers the penalty of sin; he is driven from his home in the beautiful garden. From that time forth, throughout the entire Scriptures, mention is made of *offerings for sin*.

SACRIFICES APPOINTED BY GOD.

We turn to the first account of offerings brought unto the Lord, in Gen. iv. Paul says, (Heb. xi. 4), "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain; by which he obtained witness that he was righteous." Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock; Cain brought of the fruit of the ground. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. Why this difference? Undoubtedly because *God had commanded* that an animal should be slain. He had probably promised to accept the worship of the man who did as he directed. How could Abel come by *faith*? We answer: God had commanded and promised and he *believing* him, obeyed in selecting victims from his flock. Had

there been no instructions, Abel could have had no faith; for we have faith only upon *testimony*. Had not God previously informed them upon the subject, Abel could not have expected acceptance any more than Cain. By any amount of reasoning they could not have certainly decided which would be most acceptable, the fruit of the ground or the firstlings' of the flock; or whether either would be pleasing to God. But God had given directions with which Abel complied by faith. Cain disregarded the expressed will of God, perhaps bringing his fruit as a thank-offering; but to it God had not respect.

We might notice other instances, but it is unnecessary in this place. In every case where men approached God acceptably, they came with *faith* in what he had told them. The forms of worship thus early established were continued, as we shall see before finishing this article, till Moses received the Law "by the disposition of angels." They were incorporated into that Law with only such changes as were necessary in proceeding from *family* to *national* worship.

The Sabbath set apart. Gen. ii. 2; Ex. xx. 11.

In binding the observance of the Sabbath upon the Jews, God gives as a reason for keeping the seventh day, that he had on that day rested from his work of creation. Did he give the law concerning the Sabbath *first* at Sinai? I think not. It is not likely he would permit the day he had sanctified from the beginning to be unnoticed for thirty-five hundred years, and then, for the first, call man's attention to it, because he had rested on that day. "The Sabbath was made for man." From the first, man observed it and enjoyed its benefits if he would. He had forgotten or neglected many of God's appointments at the time of the giving of the Law, and their observance was again enjoined. Probably during the bondage in Egypt the Sabbath had been disregarded. Yet before the people came to Sinai, on the occasion of sending manna, (Ex. xvi.), the seventh day was pointed

out as a day of rest. In Isaiah lviii. 13, the way in which the Jews should keep the Sabbath is mentioned. On it they were not to do their own ways nor speak their own words. So with the people before Moses' time; they would rest on the sanctified day seeking the Lord. Accordingly Cain brought an offering unto the Lord "in process of time," or as it reads in the margin, "at the end of days." At the end of the six days of labor?

Noah in the ark reckoned the time by *sevens*; by the *Sabbaths*. Gen. viii. 10-12. The sons of Jacob, when on the way to bury their father, stopped at a certain place mourning for a week. Chap. l. 10. Job's friends mourned with him seven days and seven nights. Job ii. 13.

Genesis, Job and the beginning of Exodus contain the history of this period. In them we find man, taught by God, both by precept and example, worked six days and observed the Sabbath.

A PLACE FOR WORSHIP.

Cain and Abel each brought an offering unto the Lord. Where? To the altar where the sacrifice was killed and burned. So Jethro, Priest of Midian, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God; and Aaron came and all the elders of Israel to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law *before God*. Ex. xviii: 12.

When Noah went forth from the ark, he builded an altar unto the Lord and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. Gen. viii, 20. The division of animals into clean and unclean in the Jewish Law (Lev. xi.) was practiced by Noah. The clean beasts and fowls were saved by *sevens*, thus securing some for sacrifice as well as leaving some for perpetuating the species; while of the other animals were only saved *two* of every kind.

Gen. xii: 7. Abraham came into the land of Canaan and there builded he an altar unto the Lord. Verse 8. He removed from thence and when he again pitched his tent *there* he builded an altar unto the Lord,

and called upon the name of the Lord. He journeyed into Egypt. When he returned to Canaan, he called upon the name of the Lord. Where? Chap. xiii: 4. At the place of the altar which he had made there at the first. Chap. xxii. At the remarkable trial of the faith of Abraham we find these ever recurring details of items connected with God's service:—the altar, the lamb, the word and the fire. Chap. xxvi: 25. At Beer-sheba Isaac builded an altar and called upon the name of the Lord.

When Jacob journeyed toward Padan-aram, God appeared to him in a dream. Chap. xxviii. Jacob vowed that the stone he had set up for a pillar at that place shall be *God's house*. As he returned to the land which God had promised him, he came to Shalem. Chap. xxxiii, 18. There he bought a parcel of a field and on it erected an altar. He is reminded by God of the vow he had formerly made. Chap. xxxv: 1. He with his household proceeded from Shalem to Bethel, the certain place where he had dreamed. There, fulfilling his vow, he built an altar for *God's house*.

ITEMS OF ANCIENT CEREMONIES AND CUSTOMS.

1. They brought of the *firstlings* of the flock and of the fat thereof. Chap. iv: 4. The best of the sheep or goats (in margin) were sacrificed. Other beasts and fowls were also offered. Chap. viii: 20.

2. The victims were killed and burned. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Heb. x: 22.

3. Vows were made and performed. Gen. xxviii: 20, and xxxv: 7.

4. Oil was used for anointing pillars. Chaps. xxviii: 18, and xxxv: 14.

5. Drink offerings were brought. Chap. xxxv: 14.

6. Tithes were given. Abram paid tithes to Melchizedek the priest. Chap. xiv: 20. Jacob vowed to give a tenth to God. Chap. xxviii: 22.

7. Covenants were made with an oath. Chaps. xxi: 27, 31, xxvi: 28, 31, xxxi: 46, 53.

8. In this connection we might notice the law concerning murder. Chap. ix: 5, 6. Similar directions for taking the life of the murderer are incorporated not only into the Levitical Law, but into the code of all nations.

9. Chap. i: 29. God originally gave the herbs of the field and the fruit of the trees for food for both man and beast. Chap. ix: 3. In addition, after the flood man is permitted to eat the flesh of animals, avoiding the use of the blood.

10. Ex. xxxiii. It would seem that the events recorded in this chapter occurred before the Jewish Tabernacle was built. The second tables of stone were not yet provided. These tables were to be deposited in the ark of the covenant; and that ark placed in the tabernacle. But before the tables are renewed and before the ark or tabernacle is built, we find mention of a tabernacle. We conclude that men had perhaps long worshipped God at an altar connected with such a tabernacle, which was *God's house*. When men come "before God," he manifested his presence by the Shekinah in the former tabernacle, as well as afterward at the mercy seat in that tabernacle which was built by Moses' direction.

PRIESTS DESIGNATED.

There were Hebrew priests before the covenant at Sinai. Ex. xix: 22. Jethro was priest of Midian. Chap. xi: 16. Pothepherah was priest of On. Gen. xli: 45. Melchizedek was priest of Salem. Chap. xiv: 18. So of others already noticed. Offering the sacrifices, they acted as priests though not specially so named.

The patriarchs lived to a great age. Their children to the third and fourth generation grew up around them. Chap. i: 23: Job. xlii: 16. The households were large. At one time Abram led forth to battle three hundred and eighteen trained servants born in his own house; and he smote four kings and retook their captives. Gen. xiv.

The primitive simplicity in the lives of the men of those times was exemplified in

their religion. Or we might say the religion was adapted to the circumstances of the worshipers. Each patriarch—the head of the family, gathered all the members around the *family altar*. As a family increased in numbers, the father became chief or prince of a tribe. The father or prince officiated for the household or tribe. Job. i: 5. Job, Noah, Jacob and the other patriarchs are brought to our notice as priests of their respective families. Jethro was *prince* as well as *priest* of Midian. Melchizedek was *king* of Salem. If a son with his family removed from his kindred, as Jacob from Isaac, the son became priest for his family.

But when the father died, who succeeded as priest for the whole family? We might say the office with its honor and responsibility would *naturally* devolve upon the *oldest son*. The oldest son of a king is recognized as his successor. In Great Britain the right of inheriting the estate belongs to the oldest son. This rule of priority is probably derived from the custom in the earliest ages. Among other rights belonging to the oldest son was that of the *priesthood*. This principle became well understood.

When God established a *national* religion, he *adopted* a tribe in the nation, (the Levites) *instead* of all the first born of the males of the children of Israel. Num. iii: 40, 41. The first-born sons of the whole nation exceeded the number of males in the tribe of Levi by two hundred and seventy-three. To complete the arrangement for the transfer of the priestly office, God directed that the odd number over and above the Levites should be redeemed by paying five shekels apiece. Heretofore, then, these oldest sons, heads of the tribes, were priests as we read, Ex. xix: 22.

By this law of the rights of primogeniture we account for the language of God to Cain: Gen. iv: 7, and in the margin. Cain was the oldest son. Abel was to be subject to him. The same words are used to express this pre-eminence, as are given, chap. iii: 16, to denote the relation of Adam to

Eve. Of Eve it is said "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Concerning Abel, God says to Cain, "Unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." Each son would be a priest in his own family, but for the whole family Cain would succeed Adam in priesthood and in the rights of the first-born. As his offering is rejected, Cain seems to be afraid that Abel will supersede him. He appears both angry and alarmed. He satisfies his anger and quiets his alarm on that subject, (or expects to,) by killing his brother.

So again Esau was older than his brother Jacob. Yet he sold his birthright, chap. xxv: 32. In chap. xxvii: 29, 37, Jacob obtained the blessing that belonged to the birthright. When, just before their death, the patriarchs blessed their children, they were inspired of God to speak prophetically and pronounce suitable blessings. In Heb. xii: 16, Esau is spoken of as a *profane* person. In despising his birthright, he might be foolish and reckless, but could hardly be called *profane*, unless the priest's sacred office was included in his birthrights.

We conclude man, if he would, could not now worship God as did the patriarchs, for we have not sufficiently definite information on the subject. Still enough is revealed to show a *system*. That system in all its parts reveals the handiwork of God. Men did not invent the religion of Genesis. It came from God, and was "very good" for those for whom it was designed. R. S. V.

THE
 AMERICAN CHRISTIAN
 QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. II.

CINCINNATI, 1863.

No. 2.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF JESUS AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. IV.

PRESENTATION OF JESUS TO THE LORD.

Though Jesus was to be the founder of a new institution, and though his laws were to supercede those of the Jews, yet it was necessary that the old Law be faithfully observed, till the new order of things be fully established. It was a law, given to Moses by the Lord himself, that "every male child, who is the first-born of his mother, shall be consecrated to the Lord." Accordingly, about forty days after the birth of Jesus, (which was the time required for the purification of the mother and child, according to the Law of Moses), we find Joseph and Mary bringing their Son to Jerusalem, in order to present him to the Lord.

At this time a pious, "devoted man," by the name of Simeon, "who was waiting for the consolation of Israel, came by the direction of the Spirit into the temple. And it had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit, that he should not die till he had seen the Lord's Anointed. And when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him what the Law required, he took him in his arms and blessed God, saying: 'Now, Lord, let thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for my eyes have seen the Savior, which thou hast provided in the sight of all the people; a light to enlighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.'

"And his father and mother wondered at what was spoken concerning him. And Simeon blessed them, and said to Mary his mother: 'See, this child is destined for the fall and rise of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against; (and a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also); that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.'"

There was also in the temple a very aged and pious widow, by the name of Anna, who, coming up at that time, "gave thanks to the Lord, and spoke of him" (that is, of Jesus,) "to all who were looking for the redemption in Jerusalem."

"And when they had performed all things according to the Law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city Nazareth. And the child grew, and became strong in spirit, being filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him."

THE ACTS OF THE MAGIANS—THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT—AND THE SLAUGHTER OF THE CHILDREN AT BETHLEHEM.

Luke gives no account of Jesus from the time of the presentation till he is twelve years old. But Matthew informs us of events which must have happened soon after their return to Nazareth. But as it is evident, from several considerations, that these events could not have happened at Nazareth, we are under the necessity of supposing that Joseph, soon after his return to

Nazareth, made arrangements, and removed to Bethlehem. Matthew does not say where the holy family resided, nor how old Jesus was, when the Magians came to pay homage to the new-born king. But from circumstances which he relates, we must conclude that they were at Bethlehem.—And as Jesus, according to history, was born in the last year of Herod the Great, who slew the infants, he could not be a year old, when the flight into Egypt and the slaughter of infants took place.

It appears that some Eastern philosophers, or "wise men," called Magians having seen a star or meteor, understood that a king was born, and came to Jerusalem to inquire about him. (Perhaps they had been informed by an angel, as the shepherds were). "Where," said they, "is the new-born king of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the East and have come to pay him homage." Upon hearing this, Herod and all the people of Jerusalem were alarmed. According to Horne, Herod had been so oppressive and cruel to his subjects, as to procure their hatred, "especially that of the Pharisees, who engaged in various plots against him: and so suspicious did these conspiracies render him, that he put the innocent to the torture, lest the guilty should escape. These circumstances sufficiently account for Herod and all Jerusalem with him being troubled at the arrival of the Magi, to inquire where the Messiah was born. The Jews, who anxiously expected the Messiah, 'the deliverer,' were moved with anxieties made up of hopes and fears, of uncertainty and expectation, blended with a dread of the sanguinary consequences of new tumults; and Herod, who was a foreigner and usurper, was apprehensive lest he should lose his crown by the birth of a rightful heir."

And having convened the chief-priests and scribes of the people, Herod inquired of them where the Christ should be born. "They replied: 'At Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the prophets: And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of

Judah; for out of thee shall come a ruler, who shall govern my people, Israel.'" Strange that the scribes and chief-priests should reject the Christ, after having borne such testimony as this concerning him!

Herod then privately inquired of the Magians when the star made its appearance, and sent them to Bethlehem, saying: "Go, make an exact inquiry concerning the child; and when you have found him, bring me word, that I, too, may go and pay homage to him." They went on their way, and the star "moved before them, till it came and stood over the place where the child was." They rejoiced at again seeing the star, "and having come into the house, they found the child with Mary his mother; and bowing down they paid homage to him. Then they opened their caskets and made presents of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. And being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they went home another way.

"When they were gone, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph, and said: 'Arise, take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and remain there till I bring thee word; for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him.'" Accordingly Joseph removed with his family into Egypt, and remained there till the death of Herod. Here Matthew says this happened "that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be verified: 'Out of Egypt have I called my son.'"—But if these words of Hosea refer to Christ, they are a *typical* prophecy; for the words, with their context, were evidently spoken with *direct reference* to the Jewish nation. The prophet Hosea says: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt."

It is evident that Herod was not sincere in telling the Magians to bring him word, "that he, too, might pay homage" to the new-born king, for the angel informed Joseph that he would seek for the child in order to destroy him. This was proved out, for Herod, "finding he had been deceived by the Magians, was very angry, and sent out and slew all the male children that

were in Bethlehem, and in all the neighborhood around, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had exactly learned from the Magians. Then," adds the historian, "what was spoken by the prophet Jeremiah was verified: 'A voice was heard in Ramah—weeping, and great mourning; Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they are not.'"

Joseph did not remain long in Egypt, for after the death of Herod, which occurred soon after the commission of the atrocious crime of murdering the infants of Bethlehem, "an angel appeared to Joseph in a dream, and said: 'Arise, take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for those who sought the young child's life are dead.' And he arose, took the young child and his mother, and was coming into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning in Judea, in the place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go there; and, being warned in a dream, he turned aside into the district of Galilee, and took up his residence in a city called Nazareth." Matthew considers this a fulfillment of the prophecy, "He shall be called a Nazarene;" though the only prediction in the Old Scriptures, to which we could suppose the historian to refer, (Judges xiii. 5), was made in reference to Sampson. Perhaps Sampson may be regarded as a type of Christ; for he was to be a deliverer of the Jews.

JESUS AMONG THE TEACHERS.

We have now followed the favored family from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, from there to Nazareth, from Nazareth to Bethlehem, from where they went to Egypt, and then returned to Nazareth. We have no further history of them till Jesus is about twelve years old, except that Luke tells us that "his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover."

"When he was twelve years old, they went up according to the custom of the feast. And when they had completed the days, as they were returning, the child

Jesus remained behind in Jerusalem; but his parents were not aware of it. But supposing that he was in the company, they went a day's journey, and then they sought him among their kindred and acquaintance. And not finding him, they returned to Jerusalem, seeking him. And it happened that after three days they found him in the temple sitting among the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions. And all who heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And "they (that is, the parents, I suppose,) were surprised when they saw him. And his mother said to him: 'Son, why hast thou thus acted with us? See, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.' And he said to them: 'Why did you seek me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?' But they did not understand the remark made to them. And he returned with them to Nazareth, and was subject to them. And his mother kept all these things in her heart. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."

Here ends the early history of two of the most extraordinary personages that ever appeared on earth. John the Baptist was indeed a peculiar person. And a providence and a power attended Jesus the Christ from infancy, which must have rendered him conspicuous among the children and youth of that country and that time. And to suppose that these accounts are fictions, is to suppose that the most illiterate could impose upon the most learned of those times, in regard to events of the most public and extraordinary character; it is to suppose that the most simple, unassuming, unpretending, and apparently truthful narrators in the world have agreed thus to practice the most astonishingly impious deception upon the best and wisest of the children of men; and that they have succeeded, by their earnestness, and self-sacrificing devotion to their work, in deluding millions of people for hundreds of years. Surely the unbeliever is on the unreasonable side of the question. WM. PINKERTON.

MIRACLES NOT CONTINUED.

CHAMPAIGN CITY P. O.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—Please say what you think of the 17th and 18th verses of the last chapter of Mark, in their connection with the two preceding verses.

STUDENT.

The reading of the passage in question is as follows: "These signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." This is a difficult passage, and men, of course, have had different opinions respecting it. Some have supposed that the words, "These signs shall follow them that believe," etc., relate to all who believe on Christ. This we do not believe. We do not believe it related even to all who believed on Christ in the time of the apostles, for the following reasons:

1. The promise contained in these words was, we claim, most faithfully fulfilled. Let him deny this who can.

2. *All* who believed, even in the time of the apostles, did not work miracles, or these signs did not follow them.

3. *All* who have believed, since the time of the apostles, have not worked miracles, or these signs have not followed them.

4. It is simply a matter of fact, that since the death of the apostles, and all on whom they laid hands, there have been no miracles. All claims to miracles since that time are the most idle pretenses and base impostures. Why did they cease, if the Lord intended their continuation? Why did they not accompany all believers, if the Lord intended they should? Why did the inspired apostle, in the same connection in which he declared that prophesies and

tongues should cease, declare that faith should abide?

We are of opinion that the commission, as Mark inserts it, is parenthetical, and that reading the passage without the parenthesis will show who the signs should follow. Let us now copy the whole passage, placing the commission in parenthesis, that the reader may see what we mean, at the same time adopting the Bible Union version:

"Afterward he appeared to the eleven themselves as they reclined at table, and upbraided their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them that had seen him after he was risen. (And he said to them: Go into all the world, and preach the good news to every creature.—He that believes and is immersed shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned.) And these signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

"The Lord, therefore, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven; and he sat down on the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed."

1. The *eleven*, whom he upbraided for their hardness of heart and unbelief, because they believed not them who had seen him after he was risen, were unquestionably *the apostles*.

2. Where is the antecedent to the word "them," in the phrase, "These signs shall follow *them* that believe?" It is not the word "he," in the phrase, "*he* that believes," etc., because "them" is plural, and "he" is singular. It is certainly back of the commission, which we have included in parenthesis; it is certainly the eleven, whom he upbraided for their hardness of heart and unbelief.

3. The position just taken is evidently correct, from what follows. Mark says,

“The Lord, therefore, after he had spoken to *them* (the apostles), was taken up into heaven; and he sat down on the right hand of God. And they (the apostles) went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with *them* (the apostles), and confirming the word by the signs that followed.”

The following, we doubt not, is the true state of the case:

1. The Lord upbraided the apostles for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not those who had seen the Lord after his resurrection.

2. The Lord promised that the signs described should follow the apostles.

3. Mark informs us that the promised signs did follow the apostles.

4. The object of the signs was to confirm the word. The apostles went forth, everywhere, the Lord working with them, and *confirming the word*, which the apostles preached, by the signs that followed.

The Lord never promised that *all believers*, at any period, should work miracles, nor that any believers, *in all ages*, should work miracles. The miracles were intended to follow the apostles, and the promise was that they should follow them, and they did follow them, to confirm the word. They came at the time and place intended, answered the purpose for which they were intended, and ceased. It required a miracle to bring the first human pair into existence; but it requires no miracle to perpetuate the human race. It required a miracle to produce the first oak tree; but it requires no miracle to perpetuate oak trees. It required miracles to bring the New Institution into existence, and prove it to be Divine; but it requires no miracle to perpetuate it. In one word, everything began by miracle, and is perpetuated without miracle. Nobody now wants miracles but skeptics. They seek signs, follow delusions and are carried about by modern humbuggery. There is but one sure foundation of life, light and knowledge. That is the Bible, confirmed by the most stupendous displays of Divine power, and attestations of its faithfulness ever addressed to the reason

of man. He who rejects it is lost. If one would rise from the dead, he would not believe. There is no power in this universe that will save him. B. F.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

LECTURE IV.

The Authority of the Apostles of Christ.

“All authority in heaven and in earth is in the Messiah himself.” Matt. xxviii: 18.

“The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.” Eph. i: 18-23.

With statements such as the above, with which the language of the apostles abounds, whatever authority they or any class of men may possess in the kingdom of Christ, it must be subordinate to the supreme lordship of Jesus. Their power was all derived from him. In accordance with this, therefore, it is said that they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Mark xvi: 20. The apostles repeatedly declared that salvation is in the name of Christ; and that what they said and did as apostles was by his authority, or in his name. Ye men of Israel, why mar-

vel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? * * * Ye killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses. And his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all. Acts iii: 12-16. The apostles declared repentance and remission of sins to be in the name of Christ. Acts ii: 38. In striking contrast with this assertion, that the power is in the name of Christ, is the declaration of Pope Boniface, "that there is no salvation but in the admission of the Divine call of the Popes of Rome."

The apostles were to receive power, after that the Holy Spirit should come upon them. Luke xxiv: 49; Acts i: 8. The possession of that power made them infallible when under its immediate influence. They spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. This was necessary to make them witnesses of all Jesus said and did, while he was with them. But the Monitor, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatever I have said unto you. John xiv: 26. Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Acts i: 8. These are the men who are witnesses for Jesus. They were with him before his death; they saw him after his resurrection, and handled his body, and finally saw him ascend to heaven. These things no one has witnessed since the apostolic age. An essential element is wanting in any man, from that day to this, as a witness for Christ. In this respect, the apostles stand alone, having neither successors, nor any necessity for them. Their authority was supreme over all others on earth. They were qualified to testify, as no man nor class of men have been qualified, from that age to this.

What pope, cardinal, archbishop, or Roman ecclesiastic is inspired as the apostles were? Not one of all of them. No living man on earth has seen Jesus, or heard him speak vocally, or been baptized in the Holy Spirit.

They were to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to all nations. This they could do as no equal number of men since could possibly do. Their inspiration enabled them to speak in any language in the world. This no man since has been able to do. The Gospel they preached in all the world, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, which the Lord confirmed by many wonderful works, is the same that is to be taught now.

They were to remit and retain sins.—Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained. John xx: 23.—Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. Matt. xvi: 19, and xviii: 18. This power to remit and retain sins was given to all the apostles, as seen in the above references. Having authority and power to speak, and perform miracles as they did, what a monstrous assumption of prerogative is it, for any man or class of men, in these days, to assume the same authority and power which were confined to the apostles of Christ alone! This assumption is not restricted to Catholics alone. I wish it was. A large and influential orthodox denomination still retain in their denominational standard the declaration that "there are in the Church certain officers, separate from the civil magistrate, to whom are entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven; who have power to open and to shut that kingdom, both by the word and censures, and to remit and retain sins." What claims do these "officers" set up for having apostolic authority in themselves? Do they speak with other tongues as the Spirit gives them utterance? and does the Lord confirm what they say and do, by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit? When were any of these men, Protest-

ant or Catholic, put in possession of the keys of the kingdom of heaven? The *keys* were given to Peter. The Pope, I have heard, carries a symbolic *key* attached to his girdle. I thank God that Peter opened the kingdom of heaven, as all admit he did to the Jews on Pentecost. Acts ii: 14-42, and to the Gentiles at Cesarea, in the house of Cornelius. Acts, 10th chapter, and that in spite of papistical and prelatial assumption, it is still open to all believing penitents. These keys are under the control of Him who opens and no man can shut, and who shuts and no man can open. Rev. iii: 7.

How the apostles remitted and retained sins, can be learned only by following them and seeing and hearing what they do.—When they told men what to do in order to pardon, those who obeyed were declared forgiven. Those who did not obey their directions were not pardoned. Those whose sins were by them declared forgiven, were loosed from their sins in heaven. Those whose sins they pronounced unforgiven, were unforgiven in heaven. From that time to the present, no new or different terms have been authorized by the Lord. The power and the authority of the apostles are still, under Christ, in full force, without alteration or abatement, for binding and loosing men from their sins. I need not to tell you that the way the apostles of Christ opened the kingdom of heaven is recorded in the book called Acts of the Apostles.

Jesus gave Peter charge to feed his lambs and to feed his sheep. John xxi: 15-17.—The same charge was repeated by Peter to the presbyters in 1 Pet. v: 1-3. The elders (or presbyters) which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder (or presbyter, not the pope), and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. Paul also addressed the elders of the church

at Ephesus in a similar manner, as this language will show: Acts xx: 28, Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers (bishops), to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. The authority of Peter and Paul is here brought to notice as apostles, and no superiority of Peter over Paul is intimated. The division which some Catholics have made of the flock into bishops and people, indicated, as they say, in the charge to Peter to feed the lambs and sheep, is entirely imaginary. Peter tells the elders to feed the flock. A flock comprises sheep and lambs. Paul says to the bishops, feed the flock. John, in his first epistle, addressed old men, young men, and those whom he calls little children.

The authority of the apostles was equal in all respects. Jesus had charged them to call no man master, for, said he, one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. Neither be ye called masters, for one is your Master, Christ. Matt. xxiii: 8-10. Here is a solemn prohibition to their calling any man father, after the style of the Pharisees, who occupied Moses' seat, and the Popes, who assume to sit in the chair of St. Peter, or to allowing men to call them master. None of them could be so called without disobeying this precept, nor could any one of them call any other one master without disobedience. They were brethren, first as Jews, secondly as disciples, and thirdly as apostles. They were all baptized in the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, and all spoke with tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance, and all wrought miracles; and all together, with Jesus Christ as the chief corner-stone, formed the foundation of the Church.

J. M. HENRY.

MORAL DEPRAVITY.

This subject has been the field of much theological contest, and is still in dispute. Great minds have widely differed concerning it; it, therefore, becomes the advocates of the truth to stand firm and support their banner. The following questions upon the subject very naturally suggest themselves:

First, what is moral depravity? Second, to what extent are we depraved?

These are fully answered, both by Scripture and experience. The first inquiry, Jeremiah answers in the following language: "The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Solomon also declares, "The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live." Job also responds in like terms, "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. What is man that he should be clean? or he that is born of woman that he should be righteous?"

From this Scripture (which is but a part of a large class) it appears that moral depravity is being destitute of holiness, and possessed of wickedness, that the mind without the grace of God, is inclined to evil, rather than good, and sin is its most interesting and gratifying pursuit. And this is not from mere accident, but from necessity. For "what is man that he should be clean?" This necessity is so inexorable that no one can deliver himself from "the miry clay." The more he strives so to do, he but proves the futility of his own efforts, and sinks the deeper.

The poison of sin has so diffused itself through the whole moral nature of man, and so affected the heart that no human agency is able to remove it. For "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one."

Moral depravity is also an hereditary

principle, descending from parents to children. This the Scriptures affirm and experience corroborates. The Psalmist says, "The wicked are estranged from the womb: They go astray speaking lies soon as they are born." Paul says, speaking of himself and brethren, in Eph. ii. 3, "We were by nature the Children of wrath, even as others." Did not Paul and his brethren inherit their nature from their parents? Mr. A. Campbell, in his essay on "man as he is," sets forth this view in the strongest terms. He says "We all inherit a frail constitution, physically, intellectually, but especially morally frail and imbecil. We have all inherited our fathers constitution and fortune; for Adam, we are told, after he fell, *'begat a son in his own image,'* and that son was just as bad as any other son ever born into the world; for he murdered his own dear brother, because he was better than himself." Christian System, page 28. Infants, of course, are not practical sinners, but are possessed of a corrupt nature, which, when developed, will lead them in the way common to sinful man, unless restrained by divine grace. If they are not thus defiled, they are morally pure, and consequently occupy the same relation to God that Adam did before the fall. So that his transgression effected none but himself; and every individual comes into the world occupying the same moral position that he did; and, therefore, is not effected by sin, until he commits sin himself, or becomes a transgressor. This might all appear as a very well-spun theory, did it not contradict the facts in the case, and stand in opposition to the teachings of both the Scriptures and experience. That we are affected physically and intellectually by the sins of our ancestors, no one, of any reflection, will deny. The only question is, do we inherit from our fathers *spiritual* imbecility?

Paul says "by one man's disobedience many were *made* sinners." He also incidentally states in substance in the 15th verse of the 5th chapter of Romans, that in consequence of Adam's offence all are *spiritually* "dead." Could the doctrine of *total*

depravity be more clearly set forth? Experience also shows that before moral obligation takes place, sinful disposition is manifested. Now, if a depraved heart is caused by actual transgression (as some maintain), and that depravity is shown before the individual has sinned or is accountable for transgression, what has been the cause of that depravity?

That this is the case, is evident; for pride, anger and envy, with other evil passions, are seen in children at a very early age, before it is possible for them to be moral agents.

I ask attention again to Campbell's treatise on "Man as he Is." He says, "let no man open his mouth against the transmission of a moral distemper, until he satisfactorily explain the fact, that the special characteristic vices of parents appear in their children as much as the color of their skin, their hair, or the contour of their faces. A disease in the moral constitution of man is as clearly transmissible as any physical taint, if there be any truth in history, biography, or human observation." It is also true that a sinful act cannot be performed without a sinful intention, and this intention must exist prior to the act. But if a child is morally pure it has no sinful intention, for this is depravity itself, therefore, according to this theory, it cannot sin, or, if it does, it performs an act without the qualification, or, in other words, without the power, which is absurd.

The extent of our depravity, the Scriptures fully determine. Christ says, "without me ye can do nothing." None but the renewed in heart can be said to have Christ in the sense of the text: therefore none but such can do any thing pleasing to God. And the reason is, because they are totally disqualified by sin, or, in other words, entirely depraved. Hence "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was *only evil continually*. This was not only said of *men* who had *advanced* much in sin, but it is declared "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his *youth*."

If we are not wholly depraved, what part is unpolled? What power or faculty does man possess that has not been debased by sin? Where burns a spark of holiness in the sinners heart? What fountain yet remains sweet?

By total depravity we understand an entire destitution of any principle however highly improved or cultivated sufficient to save the soul. Not an inability to perform an act good in itself, abstractly considered. Nor an inability to become more sinful and degraded. A cup may be wholly poisoned, yet susceptible of receiving more poison.— A man may be entirely out of his way and lost in the wilderness, but who will say he cannot go further from his path?

If the soul is not depraved at all, it needs no savior. If it is partly depraved, it needs part of a savior. Hence if the soul is not wholly depraved, Christ is not, "all and in all," a whole savior.

A. PHILO.

Ohio University.

REMARKS.

We are amused to see the delicacy with which our worthy correspondent touches the antiquated doctrine of *total hereditary depravity*! He starts under the mild and cautious heading, "Moral Depravity."— Why did he not head his article, *Total Hereditary Depravity*? That was a little too salt for him. He preferred approaching this venerable orthodox doctrine carefully and guardedly, and, therefore, starts out with the two following questions:

1. "What is moral depravity?"
2. "To what extent are we depraved?"

He also has two sources of proof, viz.: The Bible and Mr. Campbell. Touching his Bible evidence, we have simply to observe, that we fail to find the word "moral" in any of his quotations. We also fail to find the word "*depravity*." The word "total," is also lacking. The word "hereditary," is also wanting. True, our correspondent did not start out with the word "total," or the word "hereditary," but used both these terms before he closed. He therefore, becomes responsible for all these

terms; for though they are not in his questions, they are in his conclusions. We have for many years been under the influence of a law of logic, something like the following: The proof of a proposition, to be valid, must contain the principal terms of the proposition, or others *equivalent to them*. The principal terms of the proposition in view, are not in the proof quoted from the Bible. This is settled. Will he, then, select those which he considers equivalent to them? If he will, and make an application of the terms to the propositions, or, as he states them, the questions, we will give them due consideration. We will, at the same time, attend to his illustrations. At present we desire to attend to some other matters. We take our worthy correspondent to be a very candid and pious brother, but considerably tangled and perplexed with sectarian theology, or, in plain parlance, with Babylonish phraseology, which never was understood, or which is wholly unintelligible. As we wish him a better fortune, we will try and reduce the matter to a practicable and intelligible form. To this end we respectfully and kindly invite his attention to the following:

I. In an unconverted state, the human race are all under sin, concluded in unbelief, lost, and can not be saved without the mercy of God.

II. They cannot be saved except through Christ. His is the only name by which they can be saved. No man can come to the Father except by him.

III. The gospel, as provided by Christ, *as it is*, is adapted to man, *as he is*, and does not need a miracle to make it the power of God to salvation; but it was in Paul's time, and is, in our time, the power of God to salvation, to every one who believes, to the Jew and also to the Greek.

IV. Man, *as he is*, without a miracle to quicken him, or give him additional power, can hear the gospel, understand sufficiently to turn to God, receive it into a good and honest heart, believe it with all the heart, repent and turn to God. Therefore, God can be just and good, and condemn him for

his unbelief, impenitence or refusing to turn to God.

V. If the gospel is powerless and insufficient to save, till a miracle is performed, or some direct influence or life infused into it, to give it power to save, and if the Lord, who alone can do the miracle, infuse the influence or life, withholds the miracle, influence or life, and the sinner is not saved, the sinner is not to blame. If he is condemned, it is simply because God would not impart the power to the gospel to save him.

VI. If the sinner is so depraved that he cannot believe the gospel, or if on account of any other disability, over which he has no control, the sinner cannot believe, and a direct power, or influence, is necessary to enable him to believe, and the Lord, who alone can give that power or influence, withholds it, the sinner is no more responsible in being lost, than a brick lost out of the wagon on the way to the building to be laid up in the wall.

VII. We do not desire to trouble our worthy young brother about depravity, moral depravity, total depravity, or even total hereditary depravity, if he does not work it up into an apology for sinners to continue in their unbelief, impenitence and persistent disobedience to the law of God. But if he forms it into an excuse for unbelief, impenitence and disobedience to God, we feel called upon to demur. We do not desire him to argue that the reason the sinner does not believe, is that he *cannot*; that the reason he does not repent, is that he *cannot*; that the reason he does not obey the gospel, is that he *cannot*; that none but God can give him power to believe, repent and obey, and he *will not*; that none but God can quicken the gospel, infuse life into it and make the power of God unto salvation, and he *will not do it*, and, therefore, the only reason why sinners are not righteous, is that God alone can give them the power to believe, repent and turn to God, and he *will not do it*.

VIII. Man is dependent entirely on the Lord, as he could not have been saved at

all, had not Christ come, died for him and extended mercy to him. He is now entirely and absolutely dependent on the Lord, as he cannot come to God and be saved, except in the way the Lord has appointed. In one word, he cannot save himself *in his sins*, nor *from his sins*, by his own efforts, without Christ and his appointments; but he *can* believe on Christ, repent of his sins, come to him in his appointments, where Christ has promised to wash away his sins in his own blood. In view of his ability thus to believe, repent and come to Christ, who will pardon sin and impart the Holy Spirit, Peter said, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." Jesus says, "You will not come to me," and not that you cannot come to me. Hence, he said to the Jews, "Therefore you have no cloak for your sins," and man is left *without excuse*. This is the doctrine to move the world, and not that man *can do nothing*.

B. F.

PREACHING HELL.—No. 4.

PENTECOST.

MR. EDITOR.—The sermon on the day of Pentecost has long and very justly been regarded as a model for all preachers, in all time. As it does not, upon its surface, deal in threats of death and hell for sin, it is thought, by some, not to be a supporter of the views enunciated in my previous article. To this I invite attention in the present number. It is patent to every man, of more than one idea, that many poor imitations of this noblest of all skeletons of the gospel, have been perpetrated before the people, and this even by good men who desired to preach the truth in all its length and breadth—who even did

reach its length and breadth, but not its *depth*. Nothing is easier than to be satisfied with weak conceptions of what is really a mighty theme; then, shallow sermons, shallow convictions of sin, and shallow conversions of those baptized, are the inevitable results. While many a man of God, especially during the last thirty years, has studied the depths of our model sermon, and preached its stirring truth to the people, some have confined themselves too much to the 38th verse. As the old Methodist minister, preaching from the text, "The world, the flesh and the Devil," said he would first speak of the "world," touch lightly on the "flesh," and then *hasten on to the "Devil."* So these few unfortunates generally first speak of the gift of tongues, touch lightly on Joel's prophecy, and then hasten on to the 38th verse. Careful attention is now requested to a few facts to be stated, showing the depth and compass of this, God's first great effort to bring men to the foot of the cross.

1. Peter did not hasten to the 38th verse. He seems to have come rather leisurely to the "terms of salvation." He waited till his sermon had generated conviction, and a tumultuous desire to know the "terms."—See how deliberately he approaches the subject of obedience—first repels the charge of drunkenness; then quotes Joel in extenso; refers to the life and miracles of Jesus; God's counsels concerning him, his death, his burial, his resurrection; the descent of the Holy Spirit, and all necessary scripture proofs and reasonings in confirmation of the gospel facts, and finally, having reassured the House of Israel, that all these things were true, seems to have paused to see the result. And what a result! 3,000 broken hearts! 3,000 bosoms heave toward heaven! How wise was Peter's course. He knew their hearts must first be pierced; that he must first kindle a fire to consume their love of sin, and then how easy is obedience, how plain is duty and how bold is such a heart to face a frowning world. Had the preacher begun on obedience, or dwelt chiefly on the love of God,

the joys of pardon and the bliss of heaven, the question in the 38th verse would not have been propounded, nor would the answer have found place as it did. Religion does not grow like exogenous plants, by external accretions as trees, but like endogens that grow from the centre.

2. He did not tarry long on that verse when he did reach it. In our day we frequently meet those in our congregations, who have been taught faith and repentance, but not obedience; persons who would gladly be baptized for the remission of sins if their duties were made plain. In all such cases we are obliged to develop the subject of baptism, explaining its design, mode and proper subject, much more fully than would be necessary in the presence of an unconvicted impenitent audience. Such persons are already enjoying newly created affections, and desire some open act of personal obedience to give them a proper embodiment. Were I in a community of freelovers who contend that marriage consists in spiritual affinities, and that there is no need of a legal ceremony to be pronounced by a minister, I would be particular to teach the necessity and propriety of such ceremony. They might try to convince the people that I had an interest in the wedding fees, but this should neither prevent my teaching the truth nor my accepting said fees. But were I in a community who were disposed to be sticklers for the legal forms of marriage, and yet were very prone to lack the affectional conditions necessary to make a happy marriage, my teaching would assume a very different character which I need not now explain. An unconverted people lack that condition of heart that must always antedate their baptism, and the first great effort of the preacher before such a people, is to prepare their hearts for the solemn ceremony of baptism. This was Peter's plan. His preaching first convicted their "wicked hands" of a terrible sin—guilty of deicide—alarmed their fears—"what shall we do?"—and created a readiness and haste even, to accept the terms of salvation without a

cavil. We are often mistaken as to the real wants of our audiences. It is a mistake to imagine that more information as to the design and action of baptism constitutes the prevailing want of most people. This is truly, and frequently a want, but not often the prevailing want. More knowledge of sin and its punishment in general, and of their own sins in particular, and of the nature of Christ's death, and atonement, is the prevailing want of every congregation. Whenever you can mellow the heart with a sense of its own sinfulness and nothingness, and insulate the eyes with tears of love and sorrow—yes, *love and sorrow*—blessed kindred in a penitent heart—how easy, how pleasant to say, "Repent and be baptized." To be brief; the pith of this second paragraph is laid in the fact, that Peter filled 23 verses with gospel truth calculated to extort the sinners cry for help before he uttered the 38th verse, the moral of which is, that when we are preaching to impenitent sinners we should neither "hasten on" to the 38th verse, nor remain there long, unless the circumstances, as above stated, should justify it.

3. Another noticeable feature of this sermon is the thoroughness of its results. "They were pierced to the heart." "They gladly received the word." Then, as an unailing consequence of a sound conversion, they "continued steadfastly," for "*fear* came upon every soul." They were daily in the temple, with "gladness and singleness of heart," "praising God." Oh! this modern tearless "coming forward!" that sobless sitting there! that metallic, unmellowed tone in the confession! the joyless baptism! It's enough to make an angel shiver. Call this the legitimate outworking of the model sermon! May heaven and earth rebuke the slander. If this be a model sermon in doctrine, it should also be a model, both in the manner of preaching and in the thoroughness of its results.—We should seek, first of all, to thoroughly arouse the soul; to dart a surprising light into its darkest caverns, and then, if it does not publicly cry out for relief, it will

"gladly receive the word," and joyfully obey it. We need a deeper work in our preaching; we need to plow deeper and break up the fallow ground; then will the converts be more thankful to God, pray more, give more and work more. The best exhorters are not those who, by a sort of mental friction, rub *themselves* up into a healthy complexion; but those who reason on, and urge temperance, righteousness, and a judgment to come; who are not too tame to threaten the finally impenitent with the damnation of hell, as a concomitant to the preaching of the love of God. This will generate a friction of the soul against its own sins; a nausea of sin, and a ready joyfulness in receiving the word.

4. Contrary to the general impression, this sermon is not destitute of the element of terror. The preacher declared that "whosoever should call on the name of the Lord should be saved." Saved! saved from what? From sin and its wages; death, banishment, torment, and every woe that enters into the definition of hell. Again save yourselves from this perverse generation, whose "wicked hands" have crucified the Lord. These expressions are to be regarded as mere intimations of the destiny of the wicked, rather than as a full proclamation of it. Whole mines of gold are intimated to us by the presence of a few particles on the surface. An iron mountain is detected by a little ore oozing from its side. All the different geological strata are determined by their occasional outcroppings, which intimate the existence of many leagues of the same formation beneath. Even so "He that believeth not shall be damned" is a short sentence, but a whole hell slumbers among its fearful words.—Malte Brun says that in Siberia there is a singular lake, called the "*Murmuring Lake*" from a dull, threatening sound said to come up from its bottom, audible to those who listen quietly on its surface. The noise was thought by some to proceed from the roll of subterranean fiery billows. Whatever may be the fact or the philosophy in the case, it illustrates the deep undertones

of this pentecostal sermon, which although to the hasty reader it seems but a gentle wooing to the love of God; issues, nevertheless, a warning proclamation to the impenitent, to beware of the "*Murmuring Lake*." If we had no other hint of punishment in the sermon, the result of its delivery demonstrates that the element of fear was, in some way, largely impressed into its composition by the preacher.

5. This view of the case is corroborated by the fact, that Peter preached the death of Christ for our sins. The most precious truth on earth is, not that *Jesus died*, for Cæsar died, and so did Cicero, a few years before; but that "*Christ died for our sins*." For our sins? Why die for them? Had we anything to fear from our sins? Oh! the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! He knew the nature and extent of our sins in all their cubical proportions. Neither sin nor its reward was a sinecure with God. There was sufficient cause for the death of Jesus. It was a maxim of good taste among the ancient theatricals, never to introduce a god upon the stage unless to perform some part worthy of a god. Christ did not violate this maxim; the work to be done required a God. And is sin or its reward a cheap affair? It's a terrible thing to be damned, and "he that believeth not shall be damned." Did the Pentecostians understand this? If ever a people heard ringing in their inner ears all the syllables of perdition—hell with the variations—it was this people, alarmed into an impatient demand for the terms of salvation. Cicero says that to be eloquent, one must be a universal scholar, that he may lay under contribution every art, every science, and all literature to furnish him words, arguments, illustrations and imagery, and so focalize every ray of light upon the point he wishes to make luminous. Judging from the triumph of this first gospel sermon, we would be led to infer that the Holy Spirit collected all his energies, and in one victorious speech concentrated the most powerful truths, and most stirring imagery of heaven

and hell, of time and eternity upon the fears and hopes of the multitude, converging all the powers of God, and focalizing all the religious influences their souls were capable of receiving.

6. Finally: it may be objected that if intimations of punishment so gentle were sufficiently then, why not now? We must remember that Peter's audience were Jews, believers in heaven and hell, "devout men;" and that apart from the consideration, that we have but a skeleton of his sermon, it may be safely affirmed that our age, characteristically anti-hell in its general faith, requires more teaching on this subject than almost any other century of the Christian era. Every system of modern infidelity is placed upon the anti-hell and anti-atonement basis. Mr. Owen's system of irreligion, the German Neologists, all the cheaper sort of Unitarians, the Destructionists, Universalists, and all Skeptics from the coarsest Spiritualist up to the most refined circles of deistic Philosophers, whether dressed up in Bloomers, ventilating on women's rights, or rioting in the blessedness of free love—all are opposed to this doctrine. These all lecture, write, preach, quote scripture, argue, ridicule and in every other way infuse their pet theory into the public mind; and have so far laughed some good preachers out of countenance, that they seldom, and then very irresolutely, defend the doctrine. Hence, in the estimation of sinners, the doctrine, if believed at all, stands at such a discount, that but little fear of God is before their eyes. It's not worth as much on theological 'change as Southern scrip. Therefore were we to admit that the model sermon did not make this truth as objective as we have been recommending, there are still reasons in our own circumstances requiring it to be placed in high relief that did not obtain in those days.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

THE BEAUTY OF THE SOUL.

BY JOHN P. MITCHELL.

There is an earth-born beauty, it fadeth in an hour,
'Tis fleeting as the rainbow, or dust upon the flower;
It glitters in its splendor, and dazzles for a day,
But, like the mist of morning, it vanisheth away.

It liveth but a moment in Time's destroying breath;
The hour that sees its glory may also see its death.
As the blush upon the rose, or the blue upon the grape,
Is the splendor of a beauty that wears an earthly shape.

As transient is its glory, as foam upon the wave,
And all who own must lose it at the portals of the
grave;
At the touch of death, 'twill wither as leaves in Au-
tumn's frost,
And all who bow before it are with its glories lost.

Woe to those who worship beauty formed in earthly
mould,
Or in homage fall before it, "all that glitters is not
gold;"

Too often 'tis a cover for a false and wicked heart,
And love that's founded on it in a moment will de-
part.

There is another beauty which cometh from on high,
Its splendor never fadeth, its glories never die;
It never, never changes—'tis the beauty of the soul—
It lends to earth its presence, but heaven is its goal.

It cheers us when we suffer beneath affliction's rod,
And tells us to look upward, and put our trust in God;
Above the dying pillow of a weak and suffering friend,
It shines in all its glory, which knoweth not an end.

It speaks not as the beauty which owes to time its
birth,
But is better known by actions of good upon the earth;
Its power is felt, as gently it stealeth o'er the heart,
And a love once founded on it will ne'er from it de-
part.

He who bows before it, owes allegiance to a power
That will only shine the brighter in dark affliction's
hour;
Stand by him while he struggles on Time's remorse-
less wave,
And renew its holy presence in a home beyond the
grave.

HOWARD, Centre Co., Pa., April 18, '63.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

LECTURE V.

The Authority of the Apostles of Christ.

This evening I call your attention again, and further to the qualifications of the apostles to exercise the important functions entrusted to them, Matt. x: 18-20. And ye shall be brought before Governors and Kings for my sake, and for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour, what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. John xvi: 7-15. Nevertheless 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 unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not in me: Of righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no more: Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all the 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.

To whom has the Lord ever made such promises as these—that they should take no thought how, or what they should speak, even when their lives were in peril? To whom but the apostles, did Jesus promise that the Holy Spirit should be in them, guiding them into *all the truth*? This

promise was fulfilled to a word by the Savior. The Spirit of his Father the Monitor, was to come to *them* and guide *them* into ALL THE TRUTH. All that truth for man's instruction unto salvation they communicated in the words taught by the Holy Spirit. How we are to regard these apostles is thus stated by the Lord himself. Matt. x: 40. He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. 1 Cor. v: 20. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

The inspiration of a man does not affect his private character in any manner, different from that of any other person, who should hear the communications made by him. Paul had to keep his body under, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when he had preached the gospel to others, he himself should be a cast away. 1 Cor. ix: 27. The Savior gave power to heal sicknesses and to cast out demons. Mark iii: 15. Judas Iscariot was among the number. The power to perform miracles was not conferred on him because he was a good man, nor did the possession of that power reform him. Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this he spake not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. John xi: 49-52. This is the man who condemned Jesus to be worthy of death afterwards. Balaam was a prophet of God and vainly tried three times to curse Israel, and instead blessed them every time. Even his donkey was inspired to speak with a man's voice and rebuke the prophet. Numbers xxii: 21-35 and xxiv: 10-13. Should an inspired man now appear among us, it would not neces-

sarily follow that he is a good man, according to these cases just cited. Our ministers at the courts of St. James and St. Cloud, Messrs. Adams and Dayton, may be men of excellent private character, or they may not; that does not affect their official acts, as ambassadors of this government at their respective courts. They presented credentials at those courts proving that they were the accredited agents of our government, and not of their private characters. The apostles in like manner have presented credentials of their ambassadorship; signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit according to the will of God. They had power to treat with all nations, and with every creature. They discharged the duty, left the treaty written, and have returned to the court sending them. Peter in his personal character was guilty of dissimulation.

Satisfied with the plenary authority of the apostle to deliver the terms of salvation for all men in all time, our next inquiry is, have the apostles successors in office? The proof of this remains to be given by those who affirm it. In the absence of such an effort, we may be able to present some of the difficulties in the way of its proof.

1. Do those who plead for succession, claim it for any besides Peter? They do not, so far as I am informed. Who can show why the others are not as justly entitled to successors as Peter? Jesus had twelve apostles. Matt. x. 2; Rev. xxi. 14; and Matt. xix. 28. Their names are repeatedly given, and John says of the New Jerusalem, that it had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Jesus promised them twelve thrones, on which they should sit. I have been able to count about 260 successors as claimed to be to Peter alone. Allowing the same number to each of the others, we should have a grand total up to the present year of grace, of 3120. To make this mean twelve, would require as strange an arithmetic as the work on chem-

istry, which can transform the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper into the very body born of the Virgin Mary, crucified on Cavalry, and raised from the dead the third day.

2. Peter instead of being primate among the apostles, was with John made a legate to the brethren in Samaria. The other apostles sent them. Acts viii. 14. Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John. Had he been Pope he certainly would, not only have remained at Jerusalem, but would have sent some of his subordinates to Samaria. It is an imputation against the Holy Spirit by which they were all inspired to send Peter if he was chief and popish superior to all the rest of the apostles.

3. Peter was present at the meeting of apostles, elders, and brethren in the meeting in Jerusalem, convened for considering the question of the necessity of circumcising the Gentiles. Peter neither presided according to papal custom, nor did he even speak until after there had been much disputation. He at length arose, and declared how God had made choice among them a good while before, that the Gentiles by his mouth should hear the word of the truth of the gospel, and believe. The sentence that was given at the conclusion of the discussion was pronounced by James, after he had stated his reasons for his decision. The language of his decision was that employed by the whole of the apostles, elders, and brethren, in the letters they wrote to the Gentile converts.

4. Peter's conduct was called in question by the church in Jerusalem. Acts xi. 13. He had to rehearse the whole matter of his visit to Cornelius' house, and appeal to the six brethren who accompanied him to satisfy them that he had not done wrong. When was a Pope of Rome, or one claiming to be a successor of Peter, found defending himself thus in presence of the church? The fact is, this whole story in the Romish Church of the supremacy of

Peter over the other apostles, like the authority assumed by the Pope, is all a mere farce to deceive the people.

5. No successor to Peter or any other apostle is needed. The work assigned them they finished. 2 Pet. 1, 2. This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance; that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior. 2 Pet. i. 15. Moreover, I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease, to have these things *always* in remembrance. John xx. 30, 31. Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book; but these 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.

Whatever may be said in denial of the power of the apostles of Christ, whose names are recorded in the New Testament, one thing is certain, and that is, that no man, nor class of men, from their day to this, knows any thing of whose sins are forgiven in heaven, except as he believes their testimony. All the popes, and cardinals, and archbishops, and ecclesiastical conventions on earth, have utterly failed to prescribe any thing for a man to do to be saved, that the apostles have not prescribed, as far as divine interposition gives any assurance. The Lord is himself the head of the apostles, as he is of every thing in this world, and that which is to come. The apostles are the foundation of the church, with Christ the chief corner-stone; to whom be blessing, glory and honor forever.

J. M. HENRY.

THE LAST REQUEST. ✕

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 You are so kind and true;
 Not all of this earth's powers, mother,
 Can change my love for you.
 Then from your tender hands I'll take
 These emblems of God's love,
 And they shall bind our hearts, mother,
 When I'm at home above.

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 Life's dream is nearly past;
 I'm sure that the bright hours, mother,
 Are stealing from me fast:
 A little while and night will come,
 With all its dismal gloom,
 Then take of these bright flowers, mother,
 And place them on my tomb.

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 They fill me with delight;
 Shall I find in Eden's bowers, mother,
 A garland half so bright?
 Why, yes; I ought to know myself
 That there they ever grow;
 So bring to me my flowers, mother,
 And kiss me—then I'll go.

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 It is my last request;
 They'll drink the April showers, mother,
 When I am gone to rest;
 But I shall not forget their smile,
 And how they cheered my heart;
 Then bring to me my flowers, mother,
 I'm ready to depart.

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 A cloud is gath'ring now;
 As o'er my heart it lowers, mother,
 The death damp chills my brow:
 But lay these roses by my cheek,
 Then in their magic spell,
 I'll dream my life away, mother,
 And gently say, farewell.

Come bring to me my flowers, mother!
 Night has already come;
 I see the golden towers, mother,
 Of that bright heav'nly home—
 Where I shall dwell in perfect peace,
 And be forever blest;
 Then bring to me my flowers mother,
 I'm going home to rest.

W. T. MOORE

FRANKFORT, Ky., April 18, 1863.

Handwritten note:
 The young girl asked
 her mother to bring a bunch
 of flowers to her that night look

BIBLE TRANSLATION.

No religious movement of our time is of more importance than the undertaking to produce a pure version of the Holy Scriptures, and we rejoice to receive anything throwing light on the subject, calling attention to it, or in any way awakening the public mind in reference to it. We have but one aim in the matter, and that is, to obtain as pure and accurate a translation as possible, in the English language. The Bible Union has published a revised version of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which has passed the inspection of the Final Committee. We have been publishing specimens of Bro. Anderson's translation, at sundry times, for a year past. A few weeks back, we published a specimen, beginning with the first of Luke's testimony, side by side with the same portion revised by the Bible Union. Touching this portion, Bro. Wyckoff, Corresponding Secretary of the Bible Union, wrote the following letter:

NEW YORK, March 25th, 1863.

ELD. G. W. RICE,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

My Dear Brother:—Your favor of the 20th inst. is received. Bro. Buckbee read to me a large portion of the translation by Bro. Anderson, and we compared it with that of the Bible Union, and also with the original Greek.

I was forcibly struck with this fact: that, in almost every instance in which Brother Anderson differs from the Bible Union, the Greek is obviously and indisputably on the side of the Bible Union, and Bro. Anderson has departed from the words of inspiration. If you wish, I will undertake to show this in successive numbers of your paper.

Affectionately,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

This letter was forwarded to Bro. Ander-

son, by Bro. Rice, in our absence, and returned with the following letter:

MERCER Co., Ky., April 7, 1863.

DEAR BRO. RICE:—I have received your communication; have taken a copy of Wyckoff's letter, and return you the original.—Open your columns to him, and give him fair play. The charge he makes is one of a very grave character, for which he must be held to strict account. My version must stand or fall on its merits. So must theirs. The question now is, which shall stand. I have said, and still say, that the men who made that version have done justice to neither Greek nor English. We will see before the controversy ends, where the truth stands. I am impressed with the belief that the hand of God is in this matter—I make my appeal to him. The Lord looks upon the matter, and will give the victory to those who love his truth. As David says, In the name of my God I will set up my banners.

I am out in the country; have not seen the brethren in town. But the version is mine. I am the responsible man. I will only add one word more—I can say to Wyckoff as a certain king of Israel once said to a king of Judah, "Let not him that girds on his armor boast himself, as he that puts it off." I am ready for his criticism, and by God's grace, that version of theirs shall be known in its true light.

Yours very truly,

H. T. ANDERSON.

This letter, with the following letter from Bro. Rice, was forwarded to Bro. Wyckoff:

CINCINNATI, April 9, 1863.

DEAR BRO. WYCKOFF:—I forwarded your letter to Bro. Anderson. It has been returned to me with the following reply, which is herewith enclosed. After you have read and taken a copy of it (if you wish to do so), please return the original to me. I sent the *original* in your case to him, and now send the *original* in his case to you. Our brethren have criticised the Bible Union version very severely, and think they will have in a few months a

much better one to offer the people. We have often and again said as much in the columns of the American Christian Review. We certainly cannot and will not shrink from the severest criticism. A translation must now stand or fall on its own merits. This is the view we have taken of the one by the Bible Union, as well as the one of Bro. Anderson. Bro. A. is the translator. There are other competent men assisting in other departments.

You say in your letter, "I was forcibly struck with this fact, that in almost every instance in which Bro. Anderson differs from the Bible Union, the Greek is obviously and indisputably on the side of the Bible Union; and Bro. Anderson has departed from the words of inspiration. If you wish, I will undertake to show this, in successive numbers of your paper."

We have been aiding Bro. Anderson in various ways, assisted in holding up his hands in his undertaking; and not wishing in any way whatever to impose on the public mind, offering as gold that which is not gold, we most cheerfully and gratefully accept your offer, and now ask you to furnish as many articles as you think the subject demands. Our columns are now thrown open to your criticisms. Bro. Anderson will be allowed the same space in defense of his work; and if it becomes necessary for him to examine the version of the Bible Union, the same space will be allowed you to respond in its defense.

Hoping to receive your first number soon, I remain yours, most fraternally,

G. W. RICE.

Thus the way is now opened for some valuable discussion, and that, too, from parties able to do justice to the subject, and, we humbly trust, in a style worthy of a great work. The proposition is a very clear one. It is simply, "that in almost every instance in which Bro. Anderson differs from the Bible Union, the Greek is obviously and indisputably on the side of the Bible Union, and Bro. Anderson has departed from the words of inspiration."

This is a very plain and tangible affair, and we trust we shall have some valuable discussion. Our prayer is, that truth and righteousness may prevail.

The New Translation.

NO. I.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Your favor of the 9th inst., cheerfully opening your columns for criticisms upon the "New Translation," which you compare in your paper with the work of the Bible Union, is thankfully received. I will begin with the first chapter of Luke, which you publish in parallel columns with the Revision from our Final Committee.

The great object of the Bible Union is to ascertain and express the exact meaning of the inspired original. This is undoubtedly the object of the New Translation, and by this test it must be tried. In applying this test, I refer, first, to what appears to me a most striking and unwarranted deviation from the words of the Holy Spirit, in the commencement of the SECOND VERSE.

The original reads: *kathos paredosan.*

The Common Version translates this:—"EVEN AS THEY DELIVERED."

Our Revision has it: "AS THEY DELIVERED."

The New Translation makes it: "AS THEY WERE DELIVERED."

Here, then, is a fair opportunity to bring the test to bear. The difference is palpable and indisputable. "They delivered" and "They were delivered" are the two renderings. They cannot both be right. Which is in accordance with the original? The verb is *paredosan*. Does it mean, "They delivered," or "They were delivered?"

The verb is in the third person plural of the second aorist; indicative; active. The verb, *didomi*, from which it comes, is one of the most common and familiar in the Greek language, and every schoolboy who studies the grammar is drilled upon it. I never heard of a Greek grammarian who express-

ed a doubt that the form was active. To change active to passive without authority, and without any apparent reason, is a license in the translation of the Sacred Scriptures, of which I trust the revisers of the Bible Union will never be guilty. It would certainly stamp their work with a character, which probably would entirely preclude its circulation.

In the *third* verse, the inspired penman uses the words, *pareekolon theekoti*.

The common version translates this:—"HAVING HAD PERFECT UNDERSTANDING."

Our Revision has it: "HAVING ACCURATELY TRACED."

The New Translation makes it: "HAVING OBTAINED EXACT INFORMATION."

Here, again, is a marked and palpable distinction. Which is right: "Having accurately traced," or "Having obtained exact information?" Both cannot be right. Both cannot express the meaning of the Holy Spirit. *To trace* is not *to know*. *To trace* is not *to obtain exact information*. The one may sometimes lead to the other, but to assume that they are the same in meaning, would be to confound language, and substitute obscurity and error for plain and simple truth.

The original word comes from *akolonthos*, a follower, supposed to be derived from *kolonthos*, a path. The word itself means, *to follow with, to accompany, to go in the same path or track, to trace*.

Here is undoubtedly, in the figurative use of the word, the quest for knowledge, but it is stretching its meaning beyond all propriety, to translate it: "Having obtained exact information." It is taking a liberty with the inspired word of God, for which there appears to me no justification. The Bible Union strives to come as near as possible to the exact meaning of the inspired Scriptures, and prefers this to all inferences and surmises.

The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is our motto. If it were not, we could easily make the phraseology of the Revision more smooth and elegant.—But we prefer the word of God to all the

glosses of human wisdom and all the graces of polished rhetoric.

Affectionately,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

DR. LILLIE A DISCIPLE OF CHRIST.

We are rejoiced to learn, from the notice of Brother Burnet's meeting in Iowa City, which appeared in our columns a week or two back, that the learned and highly accomplished Dr. Lillie, some years since employed by the American Bible Union, as a reviser of the English version of the Scriptures, and who, if we mistake not, prepared the incipient version of 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelations, as published by the Bible Union, was immersed by Bro. Burnet, in Iowa City, and is now identified with the Disciples of Christ. In our debate with Mr. Merrill, some five years since, we made honorable mention of this distinguished gentleman and scholar, commendatory of his manliness and independence, in giving his aid in making a pure version of the English Scriptures. We believed then that the righteous principles adopted by the Bible Union, and the researches in which he would be involved, would work for him a good which he did not then see. We do not now remember precisely the reference made to him by Mr. Merrill. It was, however, anything else than commendable, ascribing to him mercenary motives. We took it as an evidence, when we learned that the Doctor was employed in the revision of the English version, in the Bible Union, that he was a sincere man, and more than once remarked, in private conversations, that we thought the work in which he was engaged would result, not only in aiding in the translating of the

Scriptures, but in *translating himself* out of the kingdom of sectariandom and into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Thanks to Heaven, such has been the result. The Doctor is now the Lord's free man. His hands are unfettered. His noble soul and great heart, unhampered by human traditions, enjoying the broad, expanded and gracious system vouchsafed to man by the Author of his existence. He is no longer cramped, trammled down and bound by any human creed, confession or formula.—He is no longer bound by any law but the one God made. He now stands on the loftiest summit, occupies the most elevated position, and most glorious mount attainable by man in this world. When the Lord speaks, it is his privilege to hear. When he finds the Lord's truth, it is his privilege to believe. When he finds the Lord's commands, it is his privilege to obey. He is now free as the Lord made him, and has the privilege to declare the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Jesus, without the interference of any human law, rule or regulation; any Synod, Conference or Council of uninspired dictators. He will now find himself girded as with the everlasting hills, surrounded with the almighty power of truth, and the everlasting arms underneath.

Many ecclesiastical changes are made, scarcely deserving a paragraphic notice.—What if a Unitarian should go over to a Universalist? We do not see that it is a matter of any consequence any way. What if a Methodist should go over to an Episcopalian? We do not see that it is a matter of any consequence. In the same way, many similar changes may occur of no importance to the world, or amounting to comparatively nothing. But not so the case in hand. In this case, we find a man of mature years, extended experience, great reading, profound learning and distinguished position, making a change which repudiates infant membership, infant baptism, sprinkling and pouring for baptism, all human creeds, confessions and disciplines of every sort, and condemns all human relig-

ious designations and divisions among the people of God; and, on the other hand, endorses immersion, the law of God, the religious designations found in the New Testament, and union among all the people of God. This is a change that means something, a transition that will be felt for good and that will tell on the cause of righteousness.

What man of learning and profound understanding would not rejoice to make the noble transition he has made? He, in this transition, renounces that narrow, exclusive and partisan name, *Presbyterian*, rejected by the whole religious world except one comparatively small party, and accepts the common ground name, *Christian*, or *Disciple*, admitted by every party in so-called Christendom to be right. He repudiates that narrow, selfish and unpopular creed, styled "The Presbyterian Confession of Faith," not endorsed by a single party in the world, save the comparatively little party, styled *Presbyterians*, and accepts the broad, expanded and glorious book, made for all the world—the common ground book, admitted by all to be right—infallibly safe—the *New Testament*. In his transition, he repudiates that doubtful, disputed and unsafe ceremony, styled *infant baptism*, never endorsed by anybody for the first two hundred years of the Church, not mentioned in the Bible, nor generally endorsed now; and accepts and endorses, first in his own submission, and then in his teaching, that which he can find in the Scriptures, and which all parties admit to be right—the *baptism of believers*. He abandons *sprinkling* and *pouring*, for baptism, which have always been in dispute, doubt and uncertainty, since they were first introduced, and are not mentioned, as *baptism*, in the Bible, and never endorsed by only a small portion of the professed Christian world; and accepts and endorses, first in his own submission, and subsequently in his teaching, the common ground practice of *immersion*, practiced by the original church, by the fathers, admitted to be valid by all of any note from the apostolic age to our own time;

endorsed by the Lexicons, the classics, the history of the church, and the learning of the world. Instead of advocating, supporting and perpetuating the present divisions, excusing them and apologizing for them, he now advocates the union of all the saints, standing on the statement of the Lord,—“There shall be *one fold and one Shepherd*,” and joining in the prayer of Jesus, that those who believe through their word *all may be one*, as he and his Father are one, that the world may believe that the Father has sent him.

In his new position, he makes no terms himself, accepts none made by any other man, but accepts the terms given by the Lord himself, maintains them and stands by them. We come to Jesus to know what shall be preached, what shall be believed, what shall be done, what it shall be done for, what the Lord purposes to do for us, and all about it. The effort we are making is to return to the Lord, to follow him, be his Disciples—be Christians—no more, no less. We aim to belong to the Church of Christ, no more, no less. We desire to abolish all sectarian parties, do them all away, and collect all the people of God in all the world, and unite them under Christ. This glorious work we are now engaged in. It is going on most successfully and triumphantly, and the results are glorious. The good, the pious, the pure in heart, from all parties, are coming and acknowledging no master but Jesus, no authority but his law—the perfect law of liberty—no guide but the inspired Scriptures. They are ridding themselves of everything in religion that is human, or that is of man, and receiving everything that is Divine, or from God. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, or for teaching.” If the Scripture is given by inspiration, and profitable for doctrine, we all know that when we receive it for doctrine, we have “sound doctrine,” the true doctrine and the only infallibly true and safe doctrine in this world. We know that those guided by it are guided safely, and if they follow its infallible directions, they will

reach the haven of eternal rest at last. If we make chapters of essentials and non-essentials at all, let them be these, that all that is from the Lord is essential, and all that is not from the Lord is not essential; and, with this definition, let us hold on to the essentials and abandon the non-essentials.

The controversy is not about the gospel, and the divisions are not about the gospel. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., are not divided about the gospel. *They all believe the gospel*. What, then, do they dispute about? and about what are they divided? We answer, *their additions to the gospel*—their Baptistism, Methodism and Presbyterianism. They all admit that a man can be a Christian and not be a Baptist, a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, and be saved, but that a man cannot be saved and not be a Christian. Let us unite, then, on that without which we cannot be saved, and which never divided the people of God, *Christianity itself*, and abandon all the additions, such as Methodism, Baptistism, Presbyterianism, etc., which have divided good people and involved them in controversy ever since they were brought into existence.

Truly do we welcome Dr. Lillie to the fellowship of the saints and the household of the faithful, and invite him to draw the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and do service for our King. Let us reinstate the Word of God in the hearts of the people, abolish sectarianism, and unite the people of God into one fold, under one Shepherd, and make a noble effort to convert the world to Christ. Let us preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, and 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. B. F.

HALLUCINATIONS.

Apparitions, spectres, signs and dreams, seem to control and direct the conduct of a large class of mankind. No age has been free from one delusion or the other. Reason and revelation are exotic plants to the larger portion of the world. Fanaticism and error are indigenous to this earth. From time immemorial, true religion has had to contend against fantasies, and illusions, and ecstasies, and trances, and dreams and visions. Our own age has by no means been free from these moral and social disorders. The gospel of Christ has been fearfully infected by their foul contact. Superstition has to a large extent neutralized the purity and power of God's revelation. Bible intelligence has, however, dispelled many superstitious notions with marked effect, so that there are good grounds to hope that the day of sights and scenes, and spooks and spectres, will soon pass away. Sensuous evidence, in the matter of conversion, such as disordered imaginings, spiritual incubations, spontaneous regenerations, angelic interpositions, and holy reveries, is instantly rejected, as belonging to the mystic times of past generations. Bible preaching and Bible translation, and Bible investigation and Bible reading, are sifting out every human abomination. It is found that a conversion that does not result from a conviction of God's revealed word and truth is no conversion at all.

I have been led to indulge these reflections by reading an article in the *Eclectic Magazine*—a reprint of foreign literature—entitled, "*Illusions and Hallucinations*," in which a very satisfactory solution is given of the causes of so many mental and moral disorders. This writer in the *British Quarterly* declines discussing the religious aspect by saying:

"We have already noticed the influence of the prevalent belief of any age in pro-

ducing or determining the nature of hallucinations. It will readily be conceived how inordinately powerful is the effect of unrestrained religious enthusiasm, especially when aided by ignorance, superstition, and the unnatural restraints of a secluded or conventual life. But we have designedly refrained from discussing the hallucinations so produced, except in the most incidental manner."

But for the benefit of religious zealots, and for the enlightenment of fanatical bigots, as well as for the sake of our common humanity, he should have dwelt upon this part of his subject in an especial manner. And although he does not himself make the application as we would like, he, nevertheless, presents the principles and explanations in such a manner, that the meanest capacity may know what he is driving at. The author does not deny the phenomena of hallucinations, which may all be accounted for on psychological or physical principles, but he shows that they all have an earthly origin, and have no connection whatever with the spirit world. He presents quite a variety of forms in which illusions and hallucinations make their appearance, but I must content myself on one or two forms. I will here quote a paragraph:

"The determining causes of hallucinations naturally divide themselves in two classes, the *moral* and the *physical*. As predisposing causes, the former, the moral, are all powerful; they are also chiefly concerned in the direct production of such delusions as occur in an epidemic form. In these cases the hallucinations are transmitted by the influence of educational and social ideas, by the force of example, and by a true moral contagion. Profound pre-occupation of the thoughts and prolonged concentration of the mind on one subject, are eminently favorable to the production of hallucinations; and those are the most subject to them who by an ill-directed education are unceasingly excited, whose organization had become very impressionable, and in whom the imagination has been abandoned to its own impetuosity. The

marvellous and horrible tales that are told to children are also a fruitful source of this subsequent impressibility."

Let me classify these causes and see how many of them, either directly or indirectly, have had a bearing on modern revivals:

1. Influence of educational and social ideas.
2. Force of example.
3. Moral contagion.
4. Profound pre-occupation of the thoughts.
5. Prolonged concentration of the mind on one subject.
6. Marvellous and horrible tales.

Who has not noticed in certain localities, where big meetings have been raging, how a certain class have been operated upon, and every other part of the audience remain as unperturbed as a staring barbarian? Why are not the same subjects made to rave at other meetings, under a different religious education, where more Bible knowledge and less passion is exhibited? The children of parents, molded in certain religious beliefs, and domestics fashioned in the same mold, are magnetized by some boisterous, mercurial exhorter, who is well advised of the singularities and peculiarities of the doomed audience before him. This deluded class of people have been brought to believe that "religion" can be found under a tree, in the barn, in the cellar, in the garret, in the field, and on the road-side. They have been taught that conversion is as startling and as instantaneous as a flash of lightning, unsolicited and unlooked for. They have been taught to expect certain appearances, certain unearthly feelings and twitchings, certain tokens or signs, and no recorded plan of God's mode of salvation could make them believe the contrary. They have wedded themselves to dreams and phantoms, and to them the word of God is a cold and airy abstraction. They are moved only by the evidence of the natural eyes and ears—what they don't see and hear they won't believe. And hence God is called upon to "come sensibly near"—to "come down with all his power"

—to "baptise them with the Holy Ghost"—to "come quickly and speak peace to the soul"—to "roll down balls of fire"—to "send down the arrows of conviction," etc., etc. Do such people walk by faith at all, which is the only principle on which God will accept the person of any man? So far as Bible testimony is concerned, they might as well be in heathendom at once. What is all that, just enumerated, but an appeal to the fears and fancies of an unthinking and vacillating people?—And you once get them into that way of belief, beyond the pale of reason and revelation, and you get them into a position where reason can't touch them, and where revelation becomes a dead letter. Pride and passion rule them—not faith and love—these are only incidental, and merely serve to complement the vague principles of the "inner light" and the "self-consciousness" of the faithless pharisee. The doctrine that men must go through a purgatory of doubt and dismay, before they can exercise faith in Christ, is a doctrine that has been as fruitful of dreams and devils, and of mist and myths, in the past century, as the superstitious dogmas of the Papal power in her palmiest days of priestly intolerance.

Who has never witnessed this "moral contagion," above alluded to, where there is manifestly more of the mesmeric influence of man at work than the workings of the Holy Spirit. In that battery of "seekers of religion," what mean those continued responsive amens? that constant contact of person? that fiery friction of the rubbing of hands? that uninterrupted singing and sighing and groaning? those meaning glances and significant noddings of the knowing ones? Who has never seen the workings of this moral contagion in places where all the interested ones seemed to be paralyzed by the positive power of animal magnetism, until many, pale by exhaustion, fall helpless and prostrate; or overcome by the the awful delineations of the wrath of God, or carried into the other world by a representation of exstastic scenes, they swoon away into an

inglorious state of mesmeric bewilderment. And this they call the "power of God—unto salvation," I suppose.

I recollect that not long ago, in a certain town, and at a certain meeting, where I happened to be in attendance, I was invited to take my place in the pulpit. I took my seat by the side of him who was to harangue the people. The brethren sat upon one side of the pulpit, and the women on the other, both sides approaching close to the speaker; the preacher struck up a hallelujah metre, and instantler went off into a rapture; men and women struck in simultaneously; the preacher began to weave and see-saw; he fixed his eyes in empty space—so did the brethren; the preacher kept time by the patting of his feet—so did all the brethren; the voice of the preacher grew loud and shrill—so did the voices of all the sisters; an ineffable sanctity spread over every countenance; and as strain after strain continued to leap out of their throats, and the tones of the anthem to rise higher and higher, and all began to weave and see-saw in glorious concert, I must confess, skeptic as I am, I too *felt* as if I could leap, and hop, and clap, and dance a holy dance. That was "moral contagion." When I got outside of this battery I *felt* as if I had just come out of dream land. I came pretty near being hallucinated! You have seen chickens stagger around after being brought to market and cut loose, have you not?—Well, sir, after I was cut loose, I staggered round considerably. It is amid such contagions as this, that unsophisticated people, who are largely gifted with the marvelous, see heaven opened, and angels coming down, and that sinners see hell opened and demons coming up.

"An individual who believes that he sees supernatural sights is not slow to communicate his conviction to others who are not more enlightened than himself. The anecdote has been often quoted of the man who exclaimed that the statue upon which he and many others were looking bowed its head. All those who were present immediately asserted that they had seen it move."

Go into certain communities, where the least possible gospel is preached or known, and there visit a modern love feast. And then as that "brand snatched from the everlasting burning" begins to detail his conversion—the particular place where, and the precise time when, and how a dark cloud obscured his vision, and how a gleam of light shone through it, and how a white-robed angel touched him, and a voice spoke peace to his soul, just see how the eyes of the uninitiated innocents dilate, and how the young prick up their ears, and how they watch and wonder whereunto all this will lead. How long will it be before the "example" of these big bodies will run the little bodies through the same gauntlet?

Not long ago I was shown an old house, which, when it was first constructed, and before it was occupied by the family, was the scene of one of those old fashioned rave-up and tear-down religious meetings. A forward fellow by the name of "Sammy," who still lingers on this mundane sphere, daringly, and with no fear of the penalties of purgatory before him, clambered up on to a beam, extending itself across the building, and there tigerlike, stretching his huge length along, he watched, until in the midst of the melee of singing and shouting, and tilting and tumbling, a girl overcome by "the power," incident to such meetings, was prostrated and stretched, and looking up intently in the direction of the beam, whereon Sammy lazily lay, she cried out in a stentorian voice, "*I see Jesus! I see Jesus!*" Whereupon the inexorable Sammy, stretching on his long neck, screechingly responded, "*No you don't—it is I!*"

"Concentration of mind on one subject" has made thousands of monomaniacs. Our asylums are filled with them. Devotees of science, men of unstatiated ambition, misers and lovers, and phrenzied religionists, each in his place, get mad, and become crazy on one point. Many cases could be given in illustration of the foregoing. One engaged intently in contemplation of a given subject, so as to lose sight of all outside influences, can be wrought up to such a hight, as even

to pray for signs or tokens of approbation. A case is given in the *Eclectic*.

It is related of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, that when a certain book of his was approaching completion, "he devoted to it every spare moment that he could snatch from business. In doubt as to its publication, he, on one occasion, prayed audibly for a sign to guide his decision, and affirms that he had no sooner concluded, than he heard a loud but agreeable noise in the heavens, and saw also, in the most serene sky possible, the place whence it came. This, he says, gave him great joy, believing as he did that his demand was granted.— Be it remarked that the work in question has by no means a Christian tendency, and this anecdote is often quoted against others where similar hallucinations have been supposed to imply supernatural interference for a given purpose."

I once heard a case like this. A young man, very much disturbed about his soul's salvation, and incessantly keeping his mind upon it, related, that when in the field ploughing one day, the horse suddenly stopped still, and a fox appearing just then, began to run rapidly round horse and plough, and that every time his honor, the fox, made one circuit around the parties, the expectant sign-seeker, *felt one sin pop out of him*, and as fleet-footed fox continued to run his mysterious rounds, the sins of the young sibylline kept popping out until every last sin had finally popped out of him! Many such cases could be related, but this must suffice. Why did not this young man go, or why did not some of his spiritual advisers tell him to go to the preaching of the apostles for the knowledge of salvation, instead of sending him to spiritual hieroglyphics as undefinable as a Delphic oracle, and as silly as the oft-told tales of a Gipsy wanderer?

"Hallucinations," says our author, "will almost always be found to reflect the beliefs, the passions, the prejudices, and the manners of the age in which they occur. They vary, therefore, according to the amount of civilization and culture in the people."

M. Boismont sums up the moral causes of hallucinations as follows: "The mode of development of epidemic illusions and hallucinations, refers them especially to moral causation. Education, beliefs, the dominant ideas of the epoch, the varieties of civilization, all require special consideration in any search after these causes.— Amongst the moral causes which exercise a powerful influence over hallucinations, we must enumerate the belief in the power and operation of spirits and demons, witchcraft, magic, vampyrism, ecstasy, etc. All passions, fixed ideas, great preoccupation of thought, may be the source of hallucinations, and more especially the passions of excessive fear and remorse."

How much of all this has been engrafted into modern religious "revivals!" Some one of these notions has been made an integral part of a majority of modern conversions. Education makes the whole difference. Why is it, that in certain localities, where twenty-five years ago, a certain quantum of sickly stuff could be preached, stories and legends could be narrated, sensation harragues could be made, mystic theology could be dealt out, blind fanaticism could be evoked, and night visions and day dreams would be approbated, and "mourning-benches" sacredly consecrated, that now in those same places, and in the same Churches, such things are not only not tolerated, but openly rebuked? Because people have learned to read the Bible aright, have received the key of interpretation, and can discriminate between a revelation of God, and a revelation of a disordered brain. "Getting religion," "getting through," "obtaining a hope," etc., are mystic terms seldom used in many sections at this day. In those places they begin to preach words as well as Spirit, testimony as well as feeling, baptism as well as faith, confession as well as experience. But a few days ago, I heard a Methodist preacher declare that a certain person in his Church had been "converted to God by the preaching of the Word, accompanied by the Holy Spirit!" What a marvel! and certainly a

lively indication of retrograding from mist, but progressing toward the truth of the Bible. We as Disciples, then, have not altogether labored in vain. The gloomy clouds are by no means dispelled, but gleams of lovely light begin to break through. Pedobaptists, too, are frequently obliged to immerse converts, who imperiously demand it. It would be a strange spectacle, indeed, in certain quarters, to see converts stand up and relate how they were instantaneously converted in a corn-field, or under a tree, or asleep in bed! This kind of conversion is now almost exclusively confined to the illiterate and superstitious.

"History also tells abundantly of epidemic hallucinations; the Crusades were especially rife in such portents. "Scarcely was the signal for the first crusade given than the apparitions commenced; every one recounted his visions, the words he had heard, the orders he had received. The people, the armed multitude, perceived in the air signs and portents of all kinds; but it was especially when the Crusaders had penetrated into Asia that the prodigies multiplied." They saw on all hands the saints descending and fighting for them at the head of angelic hosts."

M. Boismont remarks: When a man is subjugated by superstition and terror, there are no ideas so grotesque that they may not become realities. One of the most singular aberrations of this kind is that which is known under the name of *vampirism*, of which we find the traces even in the Talmud. This epidemic reigned about the commencement of the eighteenth century, in many parts of Hungary, Monrovia, Silesia, and Lorraine. The peasants who were the subjects of it, believed that after death their enemies had the power of appearing to them in various forms. Some dreamed that these malevolent spirits took them by the throat, strangled them, and sucked their blood; others believed that they really saw these cruel monsters. * * * Mystical ideas of an expansive character, exalting the imagination, produced these various ecstasies to which we have referred;

and which had, as characteristics, celestial visions of all kinds. It is to the same influences that we must refer the apparitions and the aural illusions of the 'dance,' of the convulsionaries of St. Medard, the ecstasies of Cevennes, the possessed of Loudon, and others of the same kind."

JOHN F. ROWE.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. II.

MR. EDITOR:—In the second verse of the 1st chapter of Luke, the New Translation has taken a liberty with the position of object and subject, for which I know of no justification.

The inspired original says, "As they delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word."

"As they delivered them." Here the object of delivered is "them," *the things fully believed among us*. Of this no one at all conversant with the Greek can doubt for a moment.

The object of an active verb the New Translation changes to the subject of a passive verb. If the Holy Spirit had made the change, we would have bowed in submission. But we object to such power being assumed by men.

Outside of the Roman Catholic Church, few persons can be found who would yield to the exercise of authority, which thus undertakes to remodel the direct and positive form of phraseology employed by the Spirit of all Wisdom and Grace, and substitute a construction of man for the words of inspiration.

In the same verse the subject of a verb

is changed into the object of a preposition. This is another direct violation of the original. If such things are permitted, then we are at liberty to *make* sacred Scripture, not to translate it.

Thus the plain, literal, undeniable rendering of the inspired Word of God, "They delivered," is changed to the human device "Were delivered by those," and this New Translation is published as an *improvement*. If this is an improvement, it improves, not the work of man, but the work of God. It alters the Truth as given by the Holy Spirit.

But there may possibly be cases, or such at least may be imagined, where the idioms of the two languages may be so different from each other, as to furnish a plausible excuse for a change of construction. No such excuse exists in the present instance. The idioms of the two languages perfectly agree in their forms of construction in this case, and the change is, therefore, as violent as it is unnecessary.

The particle "de" is used as a conjunction or connective, at the beginning of the 6th verse. The Common Version and the Bible Union Revision translate it "AND." The New Translation omits it altogether. There is no reason or justification for such omission any more than there would have been had the New Translation left it out at the commencement of the eighth verse, where it occurs in precisely the same relations, and where that Translation retains it, and translates it "AND."

Here again, as in the other cases, the attempt to improve upon the Revision results in a departure from the inspired original. The excellence of a translation of sacred Scripture consists in bringing the reader as closely as possible into mental contact with the meaning of the original. If practicable, the very image of the thought should be daguerreotyped upon the mind. As an example of this, in the first verse of this chapter occurs the Greek verb "Epecheireesan," derived from the noun "Cheir," HAND.—The image or figure of the hand is striking and expressive, and has been very properly

retained in the Common Version and Union's Revision in the apt phrase, "Have taken in hand." But the New Translation endeavors to improve upon this, by substituting the expression, "Have undertaken."

How tame and inexpressive this, in comparison with the original! The beautiful and forcible image of the HAND is entirely ignored, and a word employed instead, which from the service that it here performs, reminds us of the business of the *undertaker*, who *buries* that of which he undertakes to dispose. The image employed by the Holy Spirit is effectually buried by this New Translation.

But there is a still stronger objection to the use of the word "UNDERTAKEN" in such a connection. The word indicates something venturesome or hazardous, and prepares the mind for a failure. If a man says, "I undertook to write a history, or to make a poem," the idea is immediately suggested that he did not succeed. There is no such implication in the inspired original, and there ought not to be any in the translation.

Thus far, then, we see in the New Translation:

1. The unnecessary and unwarranted substitution of a passive verb for an active.
2. The confounding of "accurate tracing" with *obtaining exact information*.
3. The change of the object of a verb to its subject.
4. The transfer of the subject of a verb to the position of an object of a preposition.
5. The entire omission of a word in translation, without cause or necessity.
6. The concealment of a striking and expressive image or figure of the original.
7. The substitution of a word suggesting ideas altogether foreign to the original.

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

INDIANAPOLIS, April 28, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

A few days since, I noticed in the "Review" of the 21st inst., your reply to a query about the "spirits in prison." As you are eminently a man for both sides of the question, permit me a few words in reply to your reply. I will note your points in their order. After quoting 1st Peter, iii: 18-20, you say:

1. "This preaching was done in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing."—This, you assume and I deny. So far, we are even; but I further affirm that the "when" and the "while" in the 20th verse refer respectively to the "sometime" of the disobedience, and the "days of Noah," and not to the time of the preaching.

2. "Christ did not do this preaching *in person*, but *by the Spirit*." * * * "He went and preached to the spirits in prison." To this first clause I assent, if by the "*in person*" you simply mean in the flesh. It was without doubt by (in) the Spirit, but not by Noah. The second clause, however, demands particular attention. Take the 19th verse: By which (Gr. *in which*—please note this, for we complain bitterly of the sects because they use *by* and *with* when it should be *in*). By (in) which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.—Now, what are here affirmed? (1) He went—who? Christ. (2) What did he do? preached. (3) To whom or what? spirits. (4.) Where were those spirits? in prison. Now notice that he preached to *spirits*, and not to *men*. And I here take occasion to suggest, that there is not an instance in the Bible where the word *spirit*, and specially the word *spirits*, is used in the sense of, or put in place for the whole man. On the contrary, when Paul designated the whole

man, he used also the words *body and soul*. The word *spirit* is ever made to stand out in bold relief, from all other terms; it is not even to be confounded among us of a pure speech with the sectarian idea of *soul*. Our Savior, in correcting the impression made upon his disciples on a certain occasion, said: A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. Luke xxiv: 39. And in this instance, uses the same word, only in the singular number. This is, doubtless, reason enough why Christ went *in the spirit*, because he preached *to spirits*.

But these spirits were *in prison*. What prison? The original word (phulakee) signifies a watch or guard, or literal prison-place; and in the New Testament, with scarcely a shadow of variance, it means a literal prison-place in this world, where men may be watched or guarded, or in the next world, where spirits may be watched or guarded.

3. "No preaching was ever done by the Spirit without employing a human agent," etc. Now this you assume, and a very bold assumption, too, it is. It is simply that reckless style many of our preachers have of affirming what God will do, and what he will not; what he can do, and what he can not, with as much assurance as if they had entered into and understood the secret counsels of the Almighty—a style which leading men, like yourself, ought rather to correct than to encourage. To say God does not preach to men here without "human agency," would call no question with me. But to say what God does, or does not do, in the spirit-land, is quite another question. And the simple fact that He has not *revealed* to us what He does, affords us not the slightest ground for affirming what He does *not*; yet no more common thing occurs than to hear splendid sermons built up, having no better foundation than the *absence* of revelation.

4. Here you assume again that Noah did all the preaching, and in Gen. vi: 3, you make the time Noah preached to be 120 years. Now, I assume that the 120 years referred, not to the time men should live

till the flood, but to the average age of man in a general sense *after* the flood; accordingly, we find that in less than three hundred years after the flood, men lived about 120 years; at a later date, man's life was shortened to "three score and ten," in a general sense, and remains so till this day. But again: it was *while* the ark was preparing, according to your theory, that Noah did his preaching. Let us see (1) Noah was 500 years old when Ham was born, Gen. v: 32. (2) Ham was a married man when God told Noah to build the ark, Gen. vi: 18. (3) We know that Shem was 97 or 98 years old at the time of the flood, Gen. xi: 10. (4) Ham being next younger than Shem, must have been, therefore, about 95 years old when the flood came. (5) But Noah was only 600 when it came, so that he could have been but three or five years at most, and probably, by a close calculation, it would be shown that he was only one or two years building the ark, a remarkably short time to preach to the then whole world.

5. That their disobedience was in the days of Noah, that is, 600 years of it out of 1656 years, I do not question; or that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness," I do not doubt, though I should not have known it but for Peter's allusion to it in another place, for in Genesis God says nothing about sending Noah to preach to the ante-diluvians, but rather to build an ark and get out of their way; but that Noah did the preaching that Peter says Christ did, is the very thing for you to prove.

6. "It is a most unlikely thing that the Lord would attempt to reveal to man a dispensation of grace in the intermediate state," etc. Now, here is the solution of the whole matter. Those who adopt Bro. Campbell's theory have become terribly alarmed because Jesse B. Ferguson, in attempting to explain a passage of Scripture, went too far, and destroyed both himself and the true meaning of the passage, a very natural result to those who "wrest the Scriptures." You call it grace for the intermediate state, etc. There are a "thousand and one" allusions to the

"unseen world," but no distinct *revelation*. What do you do? explain them out of the way, or make them allude to this world? yet they are just as "obscure expressions" as this. Take, for example, 1st Peter, iv: 6, and it will also be obscure, unless you let it *mean* what it *says*. The whole error consists in concluding that, because Christ went and preached to spirits, therefore man can; or that, because Christ preached to a whole world that never before heard of him, therefore, those who die under the gospel, yet without accepting it, will have "another chance." No, no, Bro. Franklin; let the passage stop where Peter does, and it will do no harm. No man more heartily repudiates than do I, the terrible delusions of "Restorationism" or "Universalism." But it would indeed "be infinitely better to say *we do not know what the passage means,*" than to use terms as used not "anywhere else in the Bible." In shunning Scylla, let us not run into Charybdis. Above all things, let us avoid the sectarian method of disposing of what conflicts with our preconceived notions, simply by explaining it out of the way.

7. Here you assume that the Savior could not have done this preaching between his death and resurrection, because "he went to paradise." But does it follow, that because he went there, he staid there? Surely he did not always stay there, and there is very abundant lack of proof that he staid there the three days, specially when Peter says he went and preached to the spirits in prison. Again: you say "the wicked dead are in *tartarus*." This may be so, but how do you prove it? You say, too, that "the angels that kept not their first estate are in *tartarus*," and it would follow, then, that the wicked dead and the wicked angels are together: but how do you prove all this? So much asserted and nothing proved might do for men of small calibre, but for great men, it cannot be tolerated for a moment.— Now, I agree with you that the wicked angels are in *tartarus*, and that (2d Peter, ii: 4) is the only time the word occurs in the New Testament. But what about the wick-

ed dead? I don't know much about them. I remember about the "rich man," but he was in "hades," and I suppose our Savior was also in "hades," for David says, Psalm xvi, thou wilt not leave my soul in "hades;" and Peter reaffirms (Acts ii: 27-31), that he did not leave his soul in "hades," and certainly it could never have been left there if it never went there; and if he went there, he might have preached to the "spirits in prison," as Peter says he did. "All who have passed over the boundary line of time, etc." includes vast millions that never even heard of Christ in this world, and if the Scriptures intimate that they may have heard of him in "hades" or "in prison," I have not the slightest objection. But it does not follow that I shall intimate anything else to any child of Adam living under the gospel, than that, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Last of all, is it not strange that Peter connected this preaching so directly with the time of Christ's death in the flesh? He could have told us in plain terms that Christ preached by Noah, but he says he—Christ—went, etc. He speaks of Noah and the "old world" and "the world of the ungodly," in his 2d Epistle; but he says Noah,—not Christ—and world—not spirits. This simple association of terms is of itself sufficient, if not to support my theory, to at least demand a better one than yours.

In the hope that these thoughts may be received in the same spirit in which they are submitted, and assist at least in stimulating to a careful research into all Scripture truth, I remain your brother

In the contention for the faith,

O. A. BURGESS.

REMARKS.

I. We cheerfully insert the foregoing for several reasons: 1. When it is manifest that a man thinks he has done a clever thing, we take pleasure in giving him the benefit of it. 2. We are always willing to be corrected. 3. Because the foregoing speaks with authority.

II. The foregoing is a kind of negative article, the author not seeming to know very definitely what the passage in hand *does* mean, but simply knowing what it *does not mean*. He is very delicate about taking any definite, tangible, or decided ground; but he enters the arena objecting, wavering and slightly opposing. He is only successful in one thing, and that is, starting difficulties, creating doubts and rendering uncertainty more uncertain; shedding no light, explaining nothing, but darkening counsel.

III. The article contains almost a Greek criticism on the word *en*, and a modest hint that "we complain bitterly of the sects because they use *by* and *with* when it should be *in*." Indeed! and does our worthy brother tell us when it should be *in*, and when it should be *by*? He certainly does not.—He surely does not assume that the Greek preposition, *en*, should *always* be translated *in*. We have no Greek authority at hand, as we are from home; but our recollection is that when the preposition, *en*, refers to the *place* where anything is done, it should be translated *in*; but when it refers to the *agency* by which anything is done, it should be translated *by*. In the case in question, the preposition does not refer to the *place* where he went and preached, but to the *agency* by which he went and preached.—Jesus was put to death *in* the flesh, but quickened *by* the Spirit, by which (Spirit) he went and preached to the spirits in prison. If our brother reads it, "preached *in* spirit," then we inquire what the meaning of Christ preaching *in* spirit is? Will he explain this mystery to us?

IV. Bro. Burgess says, "If by 'in person' we simply mean in the flesh," he assents to it. But we do not mean that, nor can we see how any one could think of such a meaning as that from our language.—Christ, in person, was in the body, in the flesh, put to death, and separate from the body while the body was in the tomb, and went to Paradise. But he did not, in person, preach to the spirits in prison, or to any body else, so far as the history informs us, except while he was in the flesh.

V. Bro. Burgess, in the exuberance of his learning, makes some nice distinctions. He says, "Now notice that he preached to *spirits*, not to *men*. And I here take occasion to suggest, that there is not an instance in the Bible where the word spirit, and specially the word spirits, is used in the sense of, or put in place for the whole man." We have not the means at hand to determine how far this suggestion is correct. We know the word soul, is used for the whole person, as when it is said, eight souls were saved in the ark. If a part is thus used for the whole, when the soul is the part, we see no reason why the spirit, as a part of man, might not be used for the whole man. Of course "the word *spirits* is not in a single instance used in the sense of, or put in place for the whole *man*!" But that the word, *spirits*, is used for *persons*, in the passage in question, may appear yet, on close inspection, whether it is so used in any other place or not. Let us look at it. "By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which (*spirits*, not *men*,) some time were disobedient!" When were these *spirits*, not *men*, disobedient? When once the long-suffering of God waited *in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing*, wherein few, that is, eight *souls*, were saved by water." What was it that was disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing? Bro. Burgess says, "*spirits*, and not *men*," for "there is not an instance in the Bible where the word spirit, and specially the word spirits, is used in the sense of, or put in place for the whole man."—Those that sinned then, or were disobedient, in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, were "*spirits*, and not *men*!"—But let us hear Peter again about these "*spirits* and not *men*." "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to *men in the flesh*, but live according to God in the spirit." 1 Pet. iv: 6. The reader will remember the suggestion of Bro. Burgess, that this preaching was to "*spirits* and not *men*;" yet Peter says, the gospel was preached to them that they might be judged

according to *men in the flesh*! Was the gospel preached to them in hades—to *spirits* and not *men*—that they might be judged according to *men in the flesh*?

VI. Bro. Burgess informs us that the "when" and the "while" in the 20th verse refer respectively to the "sometime" of the disobedience, and the "days of Noah," and not to the time of the preaching. The disobedience, then, was in the days of Noah, but the preaching was some twenty-five hundred years after! What did they disobey? a gospel that was not preached to them for twenty-five hundred years after, when they were shut down in *tartarus*, with the angels that sinned, in prison! That is a likely state of ease. True, "when" and "while" refer to the sometime of the disobedience, in "the days of Noah," and it is true that Noah was a preacher of righteousness. It is true also, beyond dispute, that he preached by the Spirit, and that this preaching was done in the days of Noah. It is true, too, that the spirits, to whom Peter refers, were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, and that the gospel was preached to them that they might be judged according to *men in the flesh*. What, then, is wanting to make out the case?

VII. Bro. Burgess intends no Restorationism or Fergusonism; no, not he. He only maintains that the gospel was preached to "*spirits* and not *men*," in *tartarus*! Well, what is the gospel? The *good news*. And what is the good news preached for? Peter says it was that "they might live according to God in the spirit." No matter whether he *intends* any Restorationism or not; if he defends one of the main perversions or misinterpretations of Scripture, used in support of it and to induce the people to believe it, he is so far sustaining and encouraging it. Let men be induced to believe that the gospel was preached to "*spirits* and not *men*," in *Tartarus*, in prison, and they will soon find Peter's reason for the preaching, that "they might live according to God in the spirit," and soon be Restorationists, talking of "another chance." A more mischievous

sophistry could not well be invented, no matter what the intentions of the man advocating it.

VIII. For weakness, we have not met with anything surpassing the reasoning of Bro. Burgess, to show that Noah did not have time to preach to the ante-diluvians! Yet he finds no difficulty in finding time for Christ to preach to them during the short time of his separation from his body! "If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?" If Noah could not preach to the ante-diluvians in the time he had, how could Christ preach to them in the much shorter time, while he was separate from his body?

IX. Bro. Burgess has hit upon the happy conception, that the meaning of the expression, "yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years," refers to the average age of man in a general sense! If we understand him, it means this: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his average age shall be about an hundred and twenty years."—That would be a profound reading! The antithesis is certainly between the time when the Spirit should strive with man, and the time when the Spirit should not strive with man; and not between the time when the Spirit should strive with man, and the average age of man. During the one hundred and twenty years, from the time the Lord declared to Noah that he would destroy the world by a flood till the destruction of the world, the Spirit of the Lord did strive with man; after the expiration of the one hundred and twenty years, the Lord abandoned him; the Spirit did not strive with him; but he was destroyed by the flood. In view of this, the Lord said, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." See Gen. vi: 7. There is nothing about the average age of man in the whole passage.

X. In reference to our statement, that "No preaching was ever done by the Spirit without employing a human agent," our worthy brother administers the following authoritative reproof: "Now this you assume, and a very bold assumption, too, it

is. It is simply that reckless style many of our preachers have of affirming what God will do, and what he will not; what he can do, and what he cannot, with as much assurance as if they had entered and understood the secret counsels of the Almighty." This language is not reckless at all, but mild, persuasive and humble; perfectly modest and unassuming! Were it not unbecoming for one to speak with freedom to his superiors, we should humbly demand, where the ground for all this? We made no assertion about what God can do, or cannot do. We simply made an assertion in reference to what has been done—mere matter of fact.—Has our statement, or assertion, been invalidated? Certainly not. Did Bro. Burgess try to show that it was incorrect? He did not. Our assertion is, that "No preaching was ever done by the Spirit without employing a human agent." Let a case be produced, where preaching was done by the Spirit without employing a human agent, and it will settle the matter; but blustering about "reckless style" settles nothing.—There is a way to settle questions of fact.

XI. The spirits were in prison when Peter spoke of them, and (2 Pet. ii: 6.) he says the gospel was preached to them that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. Did Christ preach to the spirits while they were in *hades*, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit? If Bro. Burgess says he did, let him not say anything against Restorationism.

We are satisfied that, in his article, our brother is handling tools with which he is not acquainted, and in doing so, is badly cutting his fingers.

B. F.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. I.

BRN. FRANKLIN & RICE:—

While I deem it proper to postpone my reply to the "Bible Union" till they have brought their entire argument to a close, yet, to the friends of a *faithful English version of the New Testament*, I wish to say a word now touching this discussion. I do not wish to interrupt in the least the regular course of criticism, nor do I now write to induce the slightest change in the spirit or the method of the Bible Union attack upon my translation. I shall wait till their quiver is emptied, and the bow is relaxed in their hands. Then I will claim for myself the same patient hearing that I now propose to give to them. I pledge myself, however, to deal with every criticism that they may see proper to make in a way that shall be satisfactory to all lovers of the truth. In the meantime I desire my brethren especially to read carefully these critiques of the Bible Union; to give them that respectful consideration which is due to the productions of such men, and to file away the papers for future reference. When I have finished the examination of these criticisms, I shall, if it be not then thought a useless task, invite the Bible Union to a candid and critical examination of their own "Four Gospels."

I wish to say also that my letter to Bro. Rice, published in the "Review" of last week, authorizing him to open the columns of his paper to the Bible Union, was written without any thought of its public appearance as a part of this discussion.—Hence, anything in that note that may savor of discourtesy to any member of the Bible Union, was entirely unpremeditated on my part. Such expressions are hereby modified and made to conform to the style

courteous. In the meantime I will give to their first critical effort, an examination that will enable me to brief in my future notices of their criticism.

They charge that I have departed from the words of *Inspiration*. In order to persuade men to think so they reason, in substance, as follows:

1. I have, they argue, in translating *kathos paredosan*, changed the active, AS THEY DELIVERED, into the passive, AS THEY WERE DELIVERED, and thereby given another meaning.

2. This, they intimate, I have done "without authority, and without any apparent reason."

3. Therefore, I "have departed, in this instance, from the words of *Inspiration*."

Before I examine the premises from which they attempt to draw this conclusion, I would enquire, What is meant by a "departure from the words of *Inspiration*?"

I cannot suppose they mean to convey the idea that a translator should use the *same words* that are in the original. This would be to transcribe, not to translate. Nor can I suppose that these learned gentlemen mean to convey the idea that a translator should not depart from the *etymological forms* of the original, but must always reproduce these in the English. For even the Bible Union "Gospels" themselves are full of such departures from the forms of the Greek; and the translator must, of necessity, thus depart in many instances if he would be either faithful or perspicuous. I conclude, therefore, that they mean that I have departed from the *sense* of the original; that I have failed to bring out the exact thought of the Sacred Writer; or that I have not expressed it so clearly and fully as they have. Indeed, the Secretary emphatically says, that the *exact meaning* of the Inspired Writer is the *test* of a version, and he proposes to apply this *test* to the passage before us. I like his test, for it is the only proper one. To that test I will cheerfully submit my entire translation; and by that test I shall, in due time, if God spares me, subject the Bible Union "Gospels," and

this I will do for the sake of Him whose word is truth, and who speaks as no man ever spoke.

1. The charge then is, that in the second verse of the first chapter of Luke's Gospel, I have changed *active* to *passive*—translating *kathos paredosan* by "As they were delivered," instead of "As they delivered;" in doing which *I have departed from the meaning of the Sacred Writer.*

Now, applying the test of the Secretary, by which he proposes to determine the correctness of the translation, the question arises: Have I given the exact meaning of Luke in this verse? I affirm that I have; the Secretary denies it. Here, then, is a simple issue made up.

Now, the whole Bible Union are perfectly familiar with the fact, that the active and the passive form of a sentence express precisely the same thought, *provided* the object of the active-transitive verb is made the subject of the passive. And the Secretary well knew that I had observed this principle strictly in expressing Luke's thought by means of the English passive form. For example: The two statements, "*The Bible Union revised the New Testament,*" and "*The New Testament was revised by the Bible Union,*" express the same meaning. If the subject of the active sentence, on the other hand, is retained as the subject of the passive likewise, a change in thought is made; which departure from syntax, however, the Secretary well knows, does not occur in my rendering. For example: "The Bible Union revised the New Testament," and "The Bible Union was revised by the New Testament," present a difference of thought that is quite striking. But let us apply the *test* which he has proposed, and thus try the interesting issue before us:

THE BIBLE UNION revises thus: "*As they delivered them to us, who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word.*" We translate thus: "*As they were delivered to us by those who were, from the beginning, eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word.*"

Admitting, for argument's sake, that their own version expresses Luke's meaning clearly and exactly—which it does not do—I respectfully challenge the Secretary to show, for truth's sake, *where* the difference in thought lies." For he insinuates "that it is palpable and indisputable."

Now, one *might*, ignorantly or disingenuously, counterfeit a difference by *assuming* that the subject "they," in the passive sentence of my rendering, means the same thing that it does on the subject of their active rendering. And perhaps he might even persuade a careless reader that there is a "palpable difference" in meaning, were he to take advantage of the accidental recurrence of the word "*they*," which is the subject in both clauses, and suppress the simple fact that *they stand for different things*; and then quote, for comparison, *the isolated verbs* in the manner following:

"*They delivered;*"

"*They were delivered!*"

But it would poorly serve the interests of any good cause to attack or to defend in this style, and a critic would compromise himself by doing it. But how, then, can such a difference in meaning as that alleged be otherwise made out? For the Secretary of the Bible Union knows that in my sentence "*they*" stands for what is the *object* in his active sentence, and that, consequently, the meaning remains the same. It follows, then, conclusively, either that he has forgotten the familiar, grammatical principle, that an active and a passive form of sentence convey precisely the same thought, when the object of the one is made the subject of the other, or that he has been led by the zeal of criticism to see what is invisible, to feel what is not "palpable," and to dispute what is not "disputable."

How plain would all this have been to the mind of the reader, had the Secretary boldly placed the two contending clauses in full, side by side, as I have done! Had this been done by the Secretary, his own "school-boy" would have seen that the difference in form of sentence, involved no difference in meaning. Suppose *William*

affirms that "Brutus killed Cæsar," and Henry declares that "Cæsar was killed by Brutus." What would be thought of the critical acumen of the man, that should strenuously maintain, that there is a "palpable and indisputable difference" in meaning between them; that both cannot be right; and one must be wrong? And what would be thought of his candor, should he, in order to make such a difference appear, quote William as saying "He killed;" and Henry as saying "He was killed;" and on this verbal distinction of the parts, rest his proof of an alleged difference of meaning in the statements of the two men?—But I must hasten to the examination of the other premise of the Corresponding Secretary; who, after arguing that I have, in the passage before us, by changing the active form of the verb into the passive, produced a difference in sense, goes on to intimate that I had neither "authority nor apparent reason" for so doing. In reply, I affirm that I had good reason for adopting the mode of expression that I did adopt; and good reason, with me, is good authority. Here, too, we have another plain, simple issue made up between us.

2. I affirm that there is good and sufficient reason for the form adopted; he denies that there is any *apparent* reason for it. I will both give a reason, and make it apparent to the Secretary. I now give their translation of this verse again.

"As they delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word."

This sentence of the Bible Union, as it stands, is not good English—it is not clear—it is turbid—it but obscurely expresses the thought of the inspired writer—and to many minds, it may convey a false idea.—Indeed, if an ordinary English reader interprets it according to its obvious syntax, he will be misled as to Luke's meaning. Let the sentence be at once submitted to the "test." Let the Secretary give this verse to the young people around him to read, or to any English scholar, and then ask, What persons were eye-witnesses? By the laws

of good arrangement, is not the pronoun "us" the antecedent of "who?" If so, are not the "us" also the "eye-witnesses?"—Does this rendering of the Bible Union clearly and satisfactorily express the meaning of Luke? We speak not of what the Secretary calls "graces of polished rhetoric," "smooth and elegant phraseology," which things, he seems to think, must be set aside in some degree, when we are to speak God's Truth in English. I speak not of these things; but does the sentence of the Bible Union convey one thought, or two?

May not "*who*," in their rendering, syntactically relate to "*us*?" If so, is not the "exact meaning of the inspired writer,"—which is the Secretary's own *test* of a translation—obscurely and awkwardly expressed by their version, if expressed at all? Away, then, with such blemishes on the fair face of God's Word!

But, in order to make apparent this one reason for a different structure of the sentence, I would say, in conclusion, that according to the *ascertained* sense of the original, the pronoun "*who*" ought to relate to the agents that "delivered;" but in the awkward structure which the Secretary defends, it must, by the laws of English grammar, relate to the "*us*" who received. If, now, we assume their translation to be good English, then it follows that the Bible Union has departed from the words of inspiration. But if, on the other hand, the ascertained sense and meaning of the inspired writer is, that the things mentioned in the previous verse were delivered to Luke and others, by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, then has the Bible Union made a *palpable and indisputable departure from English syntax*.

Is it possible that the Bible Union has adopted, as a principle of revision, the notion, that in order to express the thoughts of Inspiration, the purity of language needs not, and in some cases must not, be attended to? Must a translator, in order to be faithful to the Greek, be false to the Spirit that that speaks to us through the Greek? Must

he, in order to give us God's thoughts faithfully, employ English obscurely? If they have not adopted such a principle, what means the remarkable criticism of their Secretary, which we have now exposed?—And what means the equally remarkable declaration with which he seems to apologize for the style of his version? "The truth," says he, "the whole truth and nothing but the truth, is our motto. *If it were not, we could easily make the phraseology of the Revision more smooth and elegant.*"

Now, the truth, the precious truth that lies embalmed in the Greek, and this truth ascertained and expressed, is our motto.—And we are sure, that the more plainly we perceive and the more heartily we appreciate this truth, the more clearly, smoothly and elegantly will we be able to express it in our own noble language.

May God help us to give to the people a version that will thus express His own glorious, life-giving thoughts!

Yours truly, H. T. ANDERSON.

P. S. With respect to the participle of the verb "parakolouthein," I have to say, that I gave to it the secondary sense, which is the true one in this instance—"Having obtained exact information;" and I will weigh the Bible Union in the balances with Alford. Alford says, in his note on this participle:—"Having traced down, (by research) and so become accurately acquainted with." The reader can judge what difference there is between the two expressions—"Having become accurately acquainted with," and "Having obtained exact information."

H. T. A.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. III.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The purpose of the Bible Union Revisers has constantly been, to reflect the meaning, and, as nearly as possible, the phraseology of the Holy Spirit. They have not felt at liberty to rewrite any part of the New Testament. In whatever respect the original varied from what might now be regarded as a good style of writing, they have allowed that variation to appear. Therefore they have not changed the ideas which Luke was commissioned to express, nor altered (unless compelled by the difference of idiom) the form of expression.—The New Translation evidently has not the same regard to the words of inspiration.

As another instance proving this, we cite their translation of the Greek verb *Anataxasthai*.

The verb is derived from the noun *Taxis*, an arranging, especially of soldiers, a drawing up in rank and file, a putting in order, an order of time, of men, or of things, &c. The verb itself means, to set in order again, to go regularly through again, to put in order, to arrange, &c.

The Common Version and our Revision concur in translating it in the present connection: "TO SET FORTH IN ORDER."

The New Translation makes it: TO COMPOSE. The latter is not the meaning of the word.

Webster defines COMPOSE thus:

1. To form a compound, or one entire body or thing by uniting two or more things, parts, or individuals; as to compose an army of raw soldiers, &c.
2. To invent and put together words and sentences: to make as a discourse or writing; to write, as an author; as to compose a sermon or a book.
3. To constitute or form as parts of a whole.
4. To calm, to quiet, to appease, to tranquilize, &c.
5. To settle, to adjust, as to

compose difficulties. 6. To place in proper form or in a quiet state. *In a peaceful grave my corps compose.* The 8th definition is declared obsolete, and the 9th and 10th are confied to printing and music.

In all these definitions there is nothing whatever corresponding to the meaning of the Greek verb ANATAXASTHAI. The distinction between the two words is very marked.

To compose an army, is to make it up of smaller bodies, or of individuals. ANATAXASTHAI is to draw it up, in order of battle. The spirit of this difference pervades all the minor uses of the words, the one meaning *to make up, to settle*: the other, to arrange in order. The word employed by the Holy Spirit has no reference to *composition*, but to *arrangement*. To substitute the former for the latter, is not to improve a translation, but to pervert sacred Scripture.

The next word employed by the New Translation is equally unfortunate. The original term is dieegeesin—narration.

The Common Version translates this: A DECLARATION.

The Union's Revision has it "A NARRATION."

The New Translation makes it "A HISTORY."

It would be easy to show that the translation adopted by the Union, has the authority of the latest and best lexicographers, of which authority the New Translation is destitute. The noun is derived from a Greek verb DIEEGEOMAI, *to set out in detail, describe, narrate*, and its distinctive, appropriate, and, I may almost say, its exclusive meaning is narration. The exception is that, in a speech, it signifies *a statement of the case*. The appropriate Greek word for *history* is the one from which it is derived: HISTORIA.

A history is properly a connected narrative of facts and events with their causes and effects. No such thing appears to have been intended by the inspired writer.—Were evidence of this not abundantly manifest from the word which he has selected

to express his meaning, it would be furnished beyond controversy by the next word in the Greek.

Peri, *concerning*.

The Roman Version and the Union's Revision both translate this familiar Greek preposition, "CONCERNING."

The New Translation entirely ignores its existence. This it was obliged to do in order to employ the word "HISTORY" to translate the preceding term. "To compose a history concerning the things," was too absurd a connection of ideas, and the word "concerning" would reveal to the English reader too clearly the real meaning of the Evangelist. It is probable that no *history of the things*, was ever written or ever attempted in the time of the Evangelists.—From all their narrations, with whatever could be supplied from other sources, attempts have been made in modern times to make a history of the things: but the books which the Evangelists have left us, are not properly described by such terms. They are, as Luke properly describes them, "Narrations concerning the things," frequently stating only isolated facts, and sometimes omitting both cause and effect, as well as historical comment. The fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning" in connection with them. They do not profess to be the "history of the things believed," but only narrations of facts and incidents that relate to them. And it becomes the translator of sacred scriptures to let this appear to the English reader, as it is clearly and undeniably manifest to the intelligent reader of the Greek.

We regard the suppression of the word, PERI, by the New Translation in such a connection, a suppression so complete that the English reader does not even suspect from the translation that there is such a word, or any word, in the Greek, as A VERY GRAVE FAULT. It is taking away a word which God has revealed, and which is necessary to the correct under-

standing of His truth, and giving no intimation of the removal of so much of divine truth.

W. H. WYCKOFF.

THE WORK OF THE APOSTACY.

Jesus says, "I am the way and the truth and the life."—John xiv: 6. Again, he says, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me." He further says, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and ending, the first and the last." Once more, he says, "I am the resurrection and the life." Again, he says, "I am he who was dead and am alive, and behold, I live for ever and ever, and have the keys of hades and of death; I can open and no man can shut, and can shut and no man can open." Paul says, "As a wise master builder I have laid the foundation, and other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The first preachers preached Jesus—preached Christ—determined to make known nothing but Christ and him crucified—to glory in nothing but the cross of Christ, and all the converts they received were required to confess that they believed with all the heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Among the first things we ever heard against disciples, we heard it objected that they did not sufficiently honor the Savior. This we heard expressed many times, a few years since. Little did we think, when we heard this, that the very men who urged this objection were more liable to the same charge than any other class professing to be Christians. Little did we feel then that one of the main obstacles they are interposing in the way of the success of the Gospel, and one in which they are now committing a great sin, is found in their persistent, continued

and most determined refusal duly to honor our Lord Jesus, the anointed of the Father, full of grace and truth, and their persevering effort to keep him in the back-ground, or out of view. We have matured what we are saying, and say deliberately, that one of our main charges against sectarians is that they ignore the Lord Jesus, the Christ, keep him in the back-ground, or measurably out of view, and give him no adequate prominence in their religion. Especially at those points where his prominence, in his appointments, is most impressive, and calculated to affect the hearts of the people, and, without his prominence, the appointments are empty and unmeaning ceremonies, in their practice is our gracious Lord kept out of view, and his prominence avoided. This only needs a few examples to verify all we are here saying, and these shall be forthcoming.

In view of the Scriptures quoted, and any amount more similar to these, nothing is clearer than that Jesus is the soul of the Bible, the foundation of the Church, the rock of which we sing, that is higher than I—that God has highly exalted him, set him far above all principalities and powers, given him a name above every name, both in Heaven and on earth, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue should confess that he is Lord to the glory of God, even the Father. He who honors the Son honors the Father, and Jesus says, "He who sees me sees the Father." He is now exalted to the Heavens, seated in the throne of the Almighty, and crowned Lord of all, that in him should all fullness dwell. Such is but a feeble sketch of the exalted position of him whom God has constituted head over all, and blessed forevermore. Let us now see how sectarians honor him, how much importance they attach to his name, faith in him, his authority and his appointments, which bring him more closely to the hearts of the people.

1. What confession does the Lord require of one who would become a Christian? There it stands, in the words of Peter,

sanctioned by the Lord himself: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." There it stands, also, sanctioned by the inspired John: "These things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name."—John xx: 30, 31. There it stands in the confession of the Ethiopian officer: "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." To receive a person on this confession is to receive such person on Christ, or on faith in Christ. This is placing Christ at the head, the Lord over all, and making the entire issue of receiving a person in reference to him. The great question is concerning Christ. "What think you of Christ? Whose Son is he? Do you acknowledge and receive him as the Christ, the Son of the living God?" If you do, this is the faith upon which you can become a Christian. This is the grand foundation proposition that has all Christianity in it. For believing, confessing and maintaining the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, many of the first Christians gave their warm hearts' blood in their martyrdom. In this way they honored Jesus, the Christ, to the extent of their power.

What does a modern sectarian think of this confession? He says, *it is not sufficient*. Which one of the modern parties will receive a man on this confession? Which one of them will receive a man to baptism on the confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God? Do they not all say *that is not sufficient*? That something more must be added? What must something be added for? Because that confession and submission to it only makes a Christian. It only brings a man to Christ, and they will not receive a man upon Christianity, or upon Christ, without something being added. What do they want added? Some peculiarity, or peculiarities, which make them a party, and distinguish them as such. For instance, there is no *Methodism* in the confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, or in complete

and perfect Christianity; hence there is no question but a man can be a Christian, in the full sense, and not be a Methodist, or even know what Methodism is. If a man is a Christian, and *no more*, you must add something to make him a Methodist. In the same way you must add something to the Christian to make him a Presbyterian, and something different from what is added to make a Methodist. This *adding to the Christian* is what the law of God does not allow, and these additions to the Christian are what the parties dispute and divide about. The reason, then, they are not united is that they do not honor Christ by confessing him, and uniting on him, but dispute and divide about their peculiarities. They are like Moses at the rock Horeb; they do not sanctify, or *set apart*, the Lord in the eyes of the people. Moses said, "O, you rebels! must we bring you water from this rock?" The Lord said to him, "Because you sanctified *me not* in the eyes of this people you shall not go before them into the land which I have promised them." In a similar way many of the leaders of the people will not be permitted to lead them into the heavenly Canaan, *because they sanctified not, or did not set apart, the Lord Jesus, the Christ, in the eyes of the people*; but they have sanctified, or set apart, their own peculiarities in the eyes of the people. They will not receive a man on the faith that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, but they will receive him on faith in their peculiarities, though their peculiarities may be rejected by every religious party in the land, except their own.

II. In baptism, or when *baptizo* is translated into English, in *immersion*, we have the representation of the death, the burial, and the resurrection of Christ. As Christ died literally, the sinner dies to sin; as Christ was buried in the grave literally, the penitent is buried in immersion; as Christ rose from the dead literally, the convert rises from his immersion to a new life. Thus, in the true order of things, in the sinner's turning to the Lord, he is brought into contact with the Savior, at

three of the most impressive and touching points in his whole history, viz.: In his death, in his burial and his resurrection. In a large portion of sectarian practice these three forcible figurative representations are entirely set aside, obscured or destroyed. Let us take a glimpse at them separately:

I. As Christ literally died, so we *die to sin, cease to sin, and are separated from sin*. In the system of infant membership prevailing so extensively now, this figurative representation of being dead with him is entirely lost. Infants are not in the likeness of his death at all, nor in any way impressed by his death. They know nothing of his death, are in no way affected by its power, or influenced by his death. They are in no sense "in the likeness of his death," and cannot be said to be "dead with him." In no connection we can have with the Lord in this world are we more impressed than "in the likeness of his death." This impression is all lost, set aside and destroyed by an empty and unmeaning infant membership.

2. Jesus was literally buried in the tomb. We are buried *with him* in immersion. Where and when is there such an impression made upon a human being as when he realizes that he is buried *with his Lord* in immersion? This brings the Lord into his mind as he lay in the tomb, as he in like manner is buried in immersion. This impressive figurative representation is all lost, set aside and destroyed, by that empty, unmeaning and wholly unauthorized ceremony, substituted for the ancient practice—*sprinkling*. Who is impressed with that solemn scene, the burial of Jesus, when witnessing sprinkling? Certainly no one. No impression is made upon the soul, in view of the burial of the Lord, in witnessing sprinkling. There is nothing in it representing a burial.

3. Christ literally rose from the dead. Like as Christ rose from the dead, so we also *rise* from our burial with him in immersion, to walk in a new life. In sprinkling this is also lost. There is *no rising*

with him, and the wonderful impressive representation of his resurrection is lost. Those sprinkled are not in the likeness of his resurrection.

In the true practice we are in the likeness of his death, of his burial and of his resurrection, but sectarianism strikes out this wonderfully forcible representation, and keeps the death, the burial and the resurrection of our Lord out of view, as if devised with the express intention of striking the Lord Jesus, the Christ, out of their religion, and that, too, at the very points where we would be more likely to be impressed by him than any others; at his death, his burial and his resurrection.

III. The assembling of the Saints on "the first day of the week," or "the Lord's day," is in memory of the Lord's resurrection on that day, and continually brings the Lord's triumphant resurrection to view, as often as they assemble on that day. The assembling of Christians on the first day of the week is the celebration of the Lord's resurrection. This brings the Lord to our view in a most impressive manner every time the Saints assemble, and their attention is called to the matter. Modern sectarianism sets all this aside, talks nothing about celebrating the Lord's resurrection, and in no special manner brings the Lord to view, in the assembling on that day; but talks about "the holy Sabbath," exhorts to the "keeping of the Sabbath," and delivers solemn sermons on Sabbath-breaking, and procures civil enactments, from sinful civil rulers, to enforce the keeping of the holy Sabbath! In all this solemn and Pharisaical farce, without a shadow of foundation in the New Testament, the Lord of life and glory, in his wonderful and victorious resurrection, calculated greatly to impress the hearts of the people of God, is kept out of view, ignored and slighted. He who honors the Son honors the Father also.

IV. The communion, on the first day of the week, is the celebration of the Lord's sufferings. In the breaking of the loaf, we have the breaking of the body of Jesus

brought impressively to our view; and in the pouring of the wine, we have in the most impressive manner possible the pouring of the blood of Jesus for our sins, represented to our view. This the first Christians did when they came together on the first day of the week. Indeed, they came together on the first day of the week to break bread. What has sectarianism done with this impressive institution, intended weekly to bring our Lord before us, in his great sufferings for us? In some instances it has been turned into monthly communion; in others into a quarterly communion, and in some into an annual communion. This is the manner in which our Lord is honored in these sectarian establishments, and the manifestation of sectarian love for Jesus. B. F.

A SERMON,

BY N. J. MITCHELL.

"If ye then be risen with Christ seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God the Father."—Col. iii: 1.

The term *since* substituted for the word *if* will better express the idea of the Apostle. He does not mean to express a doubt in regard to the congregation at Colosse, having been raised with Christ; but rather to affirm the proposition. Having been raised it is clear, to our mind at least, that they must first have been buried. But they were risen with Christ. Therefore, they must have, previously, been buried with him. This fact—the fact of their burial with Christ is affirmed in the 12th verse of the 2d chapter. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him, through the strong belief of the operation of God that raised Christ from

the dead." The *burial*, then, is in baptism. Is this a figurate or a literal burial? One rule of interpretation is, we are to understand a passage in a literal sense, unless there is an insuperable difficulty or bar in the way. Is there any difficulty in understanding the word buried in a literal sense? Not the slightest difficulty. For since the world began was any person baptized, in the primary and fair meaning of the term, without being buried? It is an insuperable difficulty to understand it in any other than a literal sense. The element in which the subject is buried is water. "See, here is water, what hinders me to be baptized?" "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we." What are we to understand by the phrase, "*buried with Christ in baptism*?" They go down into the water, both the administrator and the subject, and he baptizes him. Literally there are the two only in the water, Christ is not there literally, to be seen by these bodily eyes; nevertheless, he is there with the candidate. In what sense? Christ is said to dwell in the heart of the believer by faith. The system of the Gospel—the plan of salvation is addressed to man as a being capable of believing. Hence, faith is the *principle* of action in man. This *principle* must be possessed by the subject before any other mental exercise or bodily act can be performed acceptably to the Author of Salvation. Hence, Paul to the Romans, speaking of the Gospel in regard to its development for the benefit of all nations, says, "which, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." There is one prime truth—a great central truth—which is the alpha and omega in the plan of human redemption, as developed and vouchsafed to lost and sin-cursed humanity. This great truth is that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God. There are three facts which were declared, and elaborated by the Apostles, in confirmation of this great truth. The facts in themselves are of

little importance to humanity, save as they regard Jesus the Christ. His death was necessary to the remission of the sins of many. The remission of the sins of "the many" is necessary to happiness here and hereafter. In his death he shed his blood. This blood was that of the new covenant. This covenant was sealed—ratified by the blood of Jesus. The provisions of this covenant were "made sure to all the heirs of promise." Without the shedding of blood there is no remission. Having expired on the cross to expiate sin by the sacrifice of himself, he was taken down, wrapped in linen white and clean and buried in the tomb of Joseph of Aramathea. Here are two great facts which transpired in accordance with the Scriptures of the prophets. Silence reigned in and around that sepulchre, save and except the noise made by the stately tread of the Roman cohort which constituted a guard to prevent any one from taking the dead body away, and then report that he had arisen from the dead. But a third great fact—yes, the most marvellous and interesting fact that ever occurred in the annals of humanity, occurred on the morning of the first day of the week, immediately succeeding the burial of Jesus of Nazareth. The Angels rolled the rock away; the Roman guard fell as dead men to the ground; the Son of the Most High rose triumphant from the iron grasp of the ruthless monster, and from the cold and lonely precincts of the narrow house. These great facts Paul announced as glad tidings. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached to you, wherein you stand, and by which you are saved, unless you have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, that he was buried and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures."—1 Cor. xv. Now, Lazarus died, was buried, and remained under the power of death four days. Jesus said, "Lazarus, come forth." He came forth at his bidding, with grave clothes on and a

napkin about his face. This showed the power of Christ as the Son of Man, having dominion over angels, demons and men, over the Devil and all wicked spirits, and over death. Still, the death, burial and resurrection of Lazarus was never announced as the gospel of salvation. The great facts are stated, proved and sustained by indubitable testimony. The sinner hears, and believes with all his heart that Christ is the Son of God. He sees, by faith, the Son of God in unutterable agony on the cross. He beholds his bleeding wounds, one in each hand, and one in each foot, and one in his side that pierced his heart.

"Five bleeding wounds he bore, received on Calvary,
They pour effectual prayer, and strongly speak for me,
Forgive him! O, forgive, they cry, nor let the ransomed sinner die."

The sinner says, "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief."

Now Christ enters into and dwells in his heart by *faith*. His language is, what must I do? The answer is, repent and be baptized. Evangelical (gospel) repentance being a change of mind which results in reformation. The first act in pursuance of said change is to go into the grave with the Divine Redeemer, not literally, of course, but he is buried with Christ in baptism. He rises to walk in newness of life. Christ was in his heart by faith, and, therefore, with him when he made the noble confession of the faith, he was with him when he went down into the water, he was with him when he was buried in baptism, he was with him when he was raised, and will be with him through all the weary pilgrimage of this inconstant life, if he continue to obey him. He will stick closer than a brother. Neither tribulation, nor distress, nor angel, nor life, nor death, nor any other creature, shall separate him from the love of Christ. He is dead—dead to this wicked world, and his life—his true life, is hid *with* Christ in God; when Christ, who is his life, shall appear, then shall he appear with him in glory. Has any one used his influence where he knew it was operative to dissuade a penitent believer from being buried with

Christ in baptism? If so, would it not be better, far better, that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than thus to offend one that believes on the Savior? How dare a poor, sinful, dependent mortal, through the influence of carnal and selfish motives interpose his authority between the Blessed Redeemer and one who wished to acknowledge the authority of the peerless names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in the Heaven appointed institution of immersion? Who was it that said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned?" Who has rendered the baptism of the believer null and void by the substitution of a few drops of water from the fingers of a Priest, dribbled upon the forehead of an unconscious babe? Just as well baptize an idiot, for neither can be a believing subject. But the day will come when those who trifle with the commands of Him who possesses all authority in Heaven and on earth shall stand before Him and answer for the deeds done in the body. "It is not every one who says Lord, Lord, that shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that does the will of my Father who is in Heaven." Unpardonable ignorance cannot, of course, be excused; yet it is much more tolerable than that spirit that says, well, we know that Christ so commanded, but we will change the ordinance somewhat, it will not alter or affect the substance. Baptism is a non-essential at any rate. Presumptuous mortal, how dare you thus speak and write and talk concerning the positive commands of the King of kings and Lord of lords, who in His time will show who is the only Potentate. "He will smite his enemies with a rod of iron, and dash them to pieces as a potter's vessel is broken." But you, my dearly beloved, who are risen with Christ, having been buried with him in baptism, continue to seek those things which are above. Set your affections on things above. "Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for the bread that endures unto eternal life." You that are rich in this world, O,

trust not in uncertain riches, but in the living God. You that are not rich, remember that they who will be rich pierce themselves through with many sorrows, which drown men in perdition. You that are poor, remember that God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom that He has promised to them that love Him. Yes, some of you may be in penury and scarcely know where to get the wherewithal to feed and clothe your loved little ones. Then it will be all the easier for you to transfer your affections from earth to Heaven, and patiently wait in hope for that auspicious day when the righteous nations that have kept the faith shall meet together in the sun bright clime, where your once aching and weary head shall receive a crown beset with diamonds and brilliants more glorious and beautiful than kings or queens of earth ever wore. You that are well to do in this world, see that you do good and communicate, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Give to the poor, and thereby lend to the Lord. Remember that the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof, as well as the cattle upon a thousand hills; and what have you that you have not received? But permit me to say to all, rich and poor, and those in moderate circumstances, set your affections on things above, so that when you are called to leave all below, you may with joy meet the summons, and go where your real treasure is.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. IV.

Luke commences with the word Epeideeper.

The Common Version and the Revision translate this: "FORASMUCH AS."

The New Translation makes it: "SINCE."

Here is a marked difference. "Forasmuch as" refers to a cause of reason for what follows. "Since" only denotes when the event occurred. "Forasmuch as" does not exclude the idea of time, but directs attention to what precedes as having a bearing upon what succeeds. "Since" refers to the former merely as fixing a date, as that the latter took place *after* the former events.

The Greek word, Epeideeper, has both uses. The question in the present case must be, which use was designed by the evangelist.

The natural and obvious inference from the connection is, that Luke refers to the fact of "many" having written upon the "things believed" as suggesting to him the ide of doing it also, especially as he had carefully traced the facts. "Forasmuch as may have," "it seemed best to me also."

This, we think, would strike every unprejudiced mind in reading the Greek. If this be not the force of the connection, there seems to be no reason whatever for alluding to the fact that others had written upon these subjects. There was no occasion for fixing a date. There was nothing doubtful about time.

Under these circumstances, the change by the New Translation from "FORASMUCH AS" to "Since," appears to me not only no improvement, but a marked deviation from the evident import of the original.

We have now examined in the introduction to the Gospel by Luke every word and phrase in which the New Translation differs

from the Bible Union's Revision, except two. These now demand our attention.

In the third verse, the Common Version says: "To write in order to thee."

The New Translation has it: "To write them in order for you."

The Bible Union Revision reads: "To write to thee in order."

No Greek scholar will for a moment dispute, that the Union's Revision has given the literal meaning of the Greek, and that just so far as the New Translation differs from it in this case, it differs from the Greek. There are only three Greek words in the phrase. Their meaning is not disputed: "In order," "Thee," and "To write."

The New Translation interpolates "THEM" and changes "Thee" to "You." Are these changes required and justified by the circumstances of the case? We will show that they are not.

The word "THEM" thus interpolated, can have only one antecedent, "All things."—The New Translation says: "Having obtained exact information of all things from the very first, to write them in order for you."

The evangelist John says: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

Yet here the New Translation makes the evangelist Luke declare, that he had "obtained exact information of all things from the very first," (the birth of Jesus) and had written all of them in order.

We decidedly object to such rendering of sacred Scripture. No one has the right to interpolate a word into the writing of an evangelist, making him responsible for such an assertion. To change "Traced" into "Having obtained exact information" was unauthorized and unjustifiable, but the fault was venial in comparison with this interpolation of a word, which imposes upon an inspired writer an assertion of such magnitude, and so opposite to the fact.

The change from "Thee" to "You" is of a different character. As it involves not merely this individual case, but the numerous class of cases throughout the New Testament in which the second person is addressed in the singular number, it would be improper to pass it over with a few remarks, or to attempt to dispose of it at the close of an article. I therefore reserve it for the commencement of the fifth number of this series of articles.

Respectfully,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

CONTINUATION OF MIRACLES.

HUTSONVILLE, ILL., May 4, '63.

BROTHER FRANKLIN:—

I see a piece in your paper on the 17th and 18th verses of the last chapter of Mark. In giving your views on it you say: "Nobody wants miracles but skeptics. They seek signs, follow delusions, and are carried about by modern humbuggery." I hope you don't pretend to insinuate that seekers after truth are skeptics, do you? If so, you will find me one also. Will you please to give the public your views on the 28th verse of the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians, in connection with the 11th verse of the 4th chapter of Ephesians? By so doing you will much oblige your brother in search of truth. J. T. STARK.

REMARKS.

It is not skepticism to *seek after truth*, nor to seek to understand the Scriptures; but it is skepticism to insist on the necessity for miracles in our time. Miracles had their day, did their work, did it effectually, and it needs not to be done again. They arrested the attention of the world,

called it to Christ, his apostles, his Church, and his religion, and proved that Christ came from God, was divine, the Son of God; that the apostles were inspired; the Church divinely authorized, and the religion of Christ true. This being once proved, never needs to be proved again. The same proof that once established it made it credible, and gained for it the credence of mankind so largely, only needs to be exhibited to others, in the preaching of the gospel and the practice of the Church, to gain the credence of mankind to the end of the world. When the rich man, in Hades, desired one to go from the dead to testify to his five brethren, the answer was, "They have Moses and the prophets; if they believe not them, neither would they believe though one rose from the dead." We now have Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, with the record of all the testimony confirming their wonderful missions, and the man who believes not them may seek signs, prate about miracles, and follow spirit-rappers till doom's day; but he certainly would not be converted if one would rise from the dead. If a man can not be moved by the trembling earth, the rending rocks, the sundering of the vail, the darkness of the sun, for three hours, when Jesus died; his resurrection from the dead; the resurrection, in all probability, of about one hundred and forty-four thousand immediately after he rose; his appearance to above five hundred brethren at one time; his ascending into heaven, in open day, in the presence of his chosen witnesses; the stupendous displays of supernatural power, in open day, in presence of the vast mixed multitude on Pentecost; the turning from their established religion of three thousand Jews the first day; the turning of five thousand, in a short time after, in the city of Jerusalem, where they had the best opportunity possible to know the truth of all the apostles were saying; the filling of all the cities, towns, and country places the whole length of the Mediterranean Sea, and throughout the Roman Empire—we say, if a man will not believe in view of all this,

he would not believe if one would rise from the dead. You need not talk of any signs and wonders to convince such a man. The first thing that will reuse his stupified soul, quicken his calloused heart, and bring him to spiritual consciousness, will be the sound of the trumpet of God, and the imperative summons, "Arise, you dead, and come to judgment." Then, and not till then, will such men believe, and, for the first time, commence praying. What a prayer, too, they will pray! "O for the rocks and mountains to fall on us, and hide us from the face of him who sits on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb."

Never was there such a grand display of evidence surrounding anything, claiming the credence of man as that connected with Christ and his religion, and never did man take such a responsibility as he does in rejecting Christ and his religion. He risks the loss of everything, without the possibility of gaining anything.

1 Cor. xii. 28, reads as follows: "And God hath set some in the Church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." These were all supernatural gifts in the primitive church. No time had elapsed for qualifying men for these important offices in the Church by ordinary means. For the time being, they were supplied by supernatural means. But in the last verse of the same chapter, after speaking of spiritual gifts, he says, "Yet show I unto you a *more excellent way*."

Eph. iv. 11, reads as follows: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." What did he give these for? "For the perfecting of the saints; for the work of the ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ." How long? "Till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." This clearly implies that there would be a time when these supernatural gifts would cease.

That time was, when the Church passed the period of infancy and childhood—its incipency—came "to a perfect man." This is evidently that to which Paul alludes, 1 Cor. xiii. After stating that "prophecies should *fail*, and tongues should *cease*," he says, "when I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." This also alludes to the incipient state, while all the offices were supplied by extraordinary gifts, or by miracle; but "a more excellent way" was to follow that, when the church was to come to the knowledge of the fulness of Christ, "to a perfect man," when prophecies and tongues should cease, the necessity for them no longer existing. Men, since then, are qualified for all the offices in the church by ordinary and not by extraordinary means. We have no evangelists, shepherds and teachers now, *made such by miracle*, nor have we miracles now in any form, or any use for them, except *in history*, and the fulfillment of prophecy before our own eyes, uttered eighteen centuries ago. We do not see Jesus turn water into wine, heal the sick, open the eyes of the blind, give hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, raise the dead, or feed five thousand persons by a miracle; but we have that which shows his divinity equally as much. We have his words, uttered forty years before Jerusalem was destroyed, declaring that the devoted city should be razed to its foundation, not leaving one stone upon another, and trodden down by the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, and that the Jews should be carried away captive among all nations. This prediction stands fulfilled till this day, before the eyes of all nations, showing that he who uttered it *knew all things*. Blessed be his name. He who who does not believe now is worse than the Jews, for Paul said, "blindness *in part* is happened to Israel," for blindness not *in part* but *in full*, or total blindness has happened to him. We have now the sacred record of the miracles performed in confirmation of and establishing the New In-

stitution, and the fulfillment of prophecies uttered eighteen centuries ago, taking place in our own time. The people of the apostolic time saw the miracles. This we do not see. But we see the fulfillment of prophecies, which they did not see. Thus the evidence is as convincing in our time as it was in theirs.

Everything commences, or comes into existence, by extraordinary means, but is perpetuated by ordinary means. The first human pair was brought into existence, not in infancy, else they would not have lived but a few hours, but in the full strength and maturity of manhood and womanhood, by a miracle. This was extraordinary. All the rest of the race have descended from these and peopled the earth without a miracle. The first church was brought into existence by miracles; but she has propagated her species without a miracle. The first church was officered and instructed by miracle, but the church now is officered and instructed without miracle.

Whatever men may say about miracles, one thing is certain, and that is, *they do not exist now.* The silly pretenses of Romanist, Mormons, and Spiritualists, are but the silliest, weakest, and most stupid and shallow pretenses, compared with the stupendous displays of supernatural power at the crossing of the Red Sea, the Mount Sinai, the mount of transfiguration, or the glorious Mount Olivet, when our Lord ascended up into heaven. Well may the Lord condemn and punish men who turn aside from all these genuine miracles of the Bible, and follow the foolish and idle pretenses of the imposters of modern times.

B. F.

THE ANALOGY BETWEEN THE ANCIENT AND MODERN SECTS.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Dear Sir:—There may be, and doubtless are, monarchists under republican governments, and republicans under monarchies; but these are only exceptions to the rule, which do not disprove the correctness in either system. I do not hesitate to say there are many pious and devoted persons under all the sectarian governments, as well as some evil and ungodly sectarists, who profess to be governed by their Bible alone in religion; but these are exceptions, as in the former case, which do not disprove the proposition. But this does not excuse a good man for remaining in a sect, while the warning voice, like thunder, cries, Come out of her, O, my people, that you be not partaker of her plagues.

I am willing to admit that we are surrounded with sects of great respectability and influence, such as Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists, etc., etc., of whom I would not utter one reproachful word. But most, if not all of these sects sprung from the hot-beds of Catholicism; and I ask, how can pure streams issue from a corrupt fountain? who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean thing? Not one, the Book says. The fact of these and many other sects springing from this aged mother is obvious to all unprejudiced persons, as well as the time, place and circumstances of their birth are matters of record. They have all been born since the Lutheran Reformation, except the mother. They all hail from Rome, and not from Jerusalem, who is the mother of all true Christians. The first seven chapters of Acts. Gallatians, iv: 26, Jerusalem is the mother of us all.

The sects have taken their articles of faith and the principal part of their govern-

ments from the Romanists. The Athanasian creed is the foundation of every Protestant creed in Christendom, and they all bear its *exact image*. But is the Roman sect the one that was organized in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and of which the twelve apostles were members and foundations? Revelation, xxi: 14. I positively assert it is not. Can, then, the broken off branches of that old mother be the component parts of the congregation of Jesus Christ, founded in Jerusalem? Certainly not.

But what have these orthodox branches done in two hundred years for us? In that time there have sprung from the pink of orthodoxy, the Presbyterians, some eight or ten conflicting sects, and every faction that has been born of them, and which has influence sufficient, takes off a branch, and raises a new *sprig*, hostile to all the rest, and still *dignified* with the name of a branch of the Church. There is not a generation in which the best of factions does not fall to pieces by the weight of its own corruption. But what can be said for our Baptist brethren, who mainly took their confession of faith from the Presbyterian sect, and in less time than the former have split into some dozen sects, that neither can move with or have any sympathy for each other? This Baptist family is like many other families, the most bitter in their *family quarrels*. The Methodist branch of the Church have outdone all the other branches of the sects. In about one hundred years they have succeeded in manufacturing some eight or nine "branches of the Church."

I do not say that sectarians are infidels. But I do say that I believe that sectarianism is infidelity, and that it has been the cause of more infidelity than any other thing, except sin. The prayer of Jesus was, that all that believed on him through the apostles' word might *be one*. Who can read the reports of our missionaries, and the complaints of the heathen, telling them, first *be united* among yourselves, before you deluge our country with partyism and blood. You have two wars to our one; you come

here and rob and kill us. How can your religion be so good, then? But what astonishes me is, that many pious and good people of all the sects see and acknowledge all these evils, and yet live in the bosom of corruption and confusion. Like one of the Catholic Fathers in Luther's day, being asked why he lived in the Romish Church, after pointing out her errors, replied, *Deus non dedit mihi spiritum Lutheris*—God has not given me the spirit of a Luther. Neither leaders nor the led, as sects, can amalgamate. They cannot cohere or stick together.

If there were a union on a creed which man's vile hands have formed, it would be a party still, and, of course, would fall to pieces directly. As it was not the wish of our Savior to unite all the Jewish sects, but only to demolish the middle wall of separation, so that they might flow together as individuals, this is our wish and effort. We must blot out sects, and return to original ground—we must all give up something; let us all sacrifice our sectarian errors on the altar of truth, by returning to the *Bible alone*, as the only rule of faith and practice, containing the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

What short-sighted mortals we are, to think our new-born *isms*, such as Calvinism, Arminianism, Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Universalism, etc., etc., are true,—not considering these are creations of yesterday in comparison of Christianity; which existed purer hundreds of years before any of these *isms* were born, than it has ever done since. We must blow away these dense mists of error with the balmy breath of truth, and return to the long-forgotten constitution, the New Testament.—In doing this, we have nothing to lose, but shall be all gainers. But we shall never do this till we are free from the pernicious idea that all our Christianity has come to us through the corrupt sect of Rome and her branches or daughters.

The Christian congregation is built upon the Rock Christ Jesus, the Son of the Living God—the Roman Hierarchy is built on

Peter, traditions and Popish Councils; and her daughters are built upon creeds and the commandments of men. The mother congregation at Jerusalem continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching, prayers, and breaking the loaf, etc. Rome and her branches continued steadfastly in the teaching of the traditions. The record of pure Christianity in the New Testament is a very different thing from the bloody record of the Roman wars, massacres, inquisitions, tortures, murders, persecutions, burnings, and wholesale butcheries of the Mother of abominations for twelve hundred years past.

J. CREATH.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. V.

The first and greatest desideratum in a translation of inspired truth, is that it conveys the exact meaning of the original, in the clearest possible light. Whatever adds to that meaning, interpolates human thoughts under the guise of divine revelation. Whatever takes from that meaning, diminishes the instrumentality ordained by God for the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of saints. Whatever obscures that meaning, so far conceals from man the truth which God has given for his spiritual benefit.

The substitution of the plural form for the singular, in address, combines these various evils. It adds to what God has said. He speaks to one, and uses a pronoun, which designates only one. When "You" is substituted for "Thou," it makes God speak to more than one, and thus adds to the meaning; it takes away the distinctive application of the truth and thus dimin-

ishes its force; it obscures the purpose of God, and thus hides the truth.

Take as an example the first twelve verses of the third chapter of John. Our Savior begins by addressing Nicodemus, but soon proceeds to apply his remarks to the whole company. The change from "Thee" and "Thou" to "Ye" and "You" is striking and significant. If "You" is substituted for "Thee," and "Thou," this remarkable transition will be entirely lost. Nothing will be left to show us that there was any one present with Jesus and Nicodemus. The words intended for all, will be applied to him alone. To him will thus be added what does not exclusively belong to him, and from others it will be taken, and all the peculiar force and beauty of the argument, so far as they depend upon the change of persons, will be hidden from the reader. And all this will be the result of changing in the translation the meaning of the original.

Take another example.

Matthew xvi: 19. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c.

Substitute in such cases "You" for "Thee," and make it "And I will give unto you the keys," &c.

Every one would readily admit that such a translation would take from Roman Catholics their favorite argument about "Saint Peter and the Keys." But have we the right to take away an argument from any errorist by concealing from the English reader what God has revealed for the benefit of all?

The Bible Union says:—"Let the whole truth come out as God has given it. We are willing to stand or fall by the truth of revelation."

It would be easy to multiply examples, but the case does not require them. The principle itself is clear. In many scores of cases in the New Testament, the substitution of "You" for "Thou" or "Thee" would obscure the sense or diminish the force of the meaning conveyed by the original. Often our Savior, when addressing a

multitude, or a company of disciples, singles out an individual and directs his words personally to him, in order to give vividness and particularity to his remarks: and in this the apostles imitate him in their Epistles. All this would be entirely lost by the proposed change. Indeed such a change, thoroughly carried out, would render a commentary necessary to accompany the New Translation in order that the English reader might know in each case, whether the original used the singular or the plural.

It is true that in ordinary conversation we use the plural form for the singular. But the *look* and *manner* supply the necessary distinction. It is also true that, except in very solemn or very emphatic language, we generally use the same form. But as the choice of expression is our own, we can and do usually so form our phraseology, that the reader is in no danger of making a mistake. But the case is entirely different where the modes of expression are already fixed in another language, and we have only to transfer them to ours, and where the utmost care is needed lest some form or shade of truth or of the application of truth, shall be lost or obscured. The gravest solemnity and the most forcible emphasis also distinguish these sacred writings. Nothing in fact in the circumstances of the case, requires or justifies the proposed change, and to make it, when not required, or justified, and when it manifestly darkens the light of the inspired original, is the very opposite of improving the translation of the word of God.

There is still another and a very important view to be taken of this proposed change. If adopted shall it be carried out in all cases?

If this be done, then every address to God, must employ the plural form, and we must call Jehovah "You." Are we prepared for such language? Even to say "Hallowed be your name," would shock the sensibilities of every pious heart.—How, then, can we call God "You?" If, as some propose, we should make ex-

ception in the case of Jehovah, as an address to Him is too solemn for such a familiar and undignified usage, what shall we do in the case of our adorable Savior? Shall we use "You" or retain the accustomed appellation, "Thou?" Shall Peter say to his Master: "You are the Christ," or "Thou art the Christ?" Shall we honor the Son less than we honor the Father?

And if we retain our appropriate usage in both these cases, then why make a distinction between these cases and others which the original does not make and does not authorize? And why adopt a method of translation, which cannot be consistently carried out without shocking the pious, and which destroys the distinctions that God has made, and makes those which he did not intend?

Leaving this strong range of argument, I will close this article by referring to the first six verses of Philemon. Substitute in them "You and" "Yours" for "Thee" and "Thine," and the third, fourth, fifth and sixth verses, are addressed to Apphia and Archippus, as well as to Philemon. Substitute them throughout the Epistle and you will need a commentary to inform you whether it was Philemon, or all three to whom Onesimus is returned. If any one has any doubt of the propriety of the use of the singular pronoun, when one person is addressed, let him read that epistle carefully. Let him note the striking distinction in consecutive verses, (21st and 22nd) between "Thy obedience" and "Your prayers" and say whether he wishes all such distinctions obliterated.

Respectfully,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

ROMANISM.

LECTURE VI.

One Holy Apostolic Church.

I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore, he saith, when he ascended up on high he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now, that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which the head, even Christ; from whom the is whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.—Eph. iv: 1-16.

I have read this passage this evening for the purpose of calling attention to the consideration of *One Holy Apostolic Church*. Romanists would wish to change but one word in the above—Apostolic, and substi-

tute Catholic. Then there would be a statement of the four grand characteristics of the papal institution. The Church of Christ certainly is one, according to Paul's statement that there is one body. Christ is the head of that body. One head on several bodies, if that were possible, would be monstrous. Equally monstrous would several heads on one body appear. Jesus prayed that those who believed on him by the word of his apostles might be one, as he and his Father are one. The plainness of the oneness of the Church, as taught in the Word of God, is such as to produce general conviction that there is one Church only in the world. Catholics boldly assume to have that unity, and that it is visible. Protestants declare the Church to be one, but invisible. This their divisions compel them to do. What does any man know of an invisible Church in this world? Distraction in the minds of thousands, not members of any Church, is strong and sad proof to them that the Church's divisions are seen. Why then may not its union be seen? Is Satan more powerful in embarrassing than God in assisting the Church?

The Jews were united before Pilate in demanding the crucifixion of Jesus. That alone did not make them acceptable to God. Neither does the unity of the Church of Rome prove them the people of God. A single feature of the primitive Church does not prove identity. Seven things at least characterize the Church of Christ on the subject of unity alone. From its commencement to the close of time, the Church is one with reference to our entire race, in all latitudes and circumstances. Eph. iv: 4—"There is one body." Eph. ii: 19, 22—"Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom the whole building, fitly joined together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God

through the Spirit." 1 Cor. xii: 12, 20 and 27—"For as the body hath many members, and is one, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ." And if they were all one member, where were the body? "But now are they many members, yet but one body?" "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." But I forbear making further quotations for the present, on this point, though the Scriptures abound with teachings similar to these.

2. This *one Church* is *holy*. This word means purity, freedom from sin, immaculate, etc. Rom. i: 7—"To all that be in Rome called saints," i. e. holy persons. 1 Cor. i: 1-2—"Paul and Sosthenes * * * unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." 1 Cor. iii: 17—"If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." 1 Pet. i: 15-16—"But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, be ye holy, for I am holy."

The foregoing, to proceed no farther, indicates with satisfactory clearness to every one who seeks to please God, that the Church is holy. How the Romanists can claim their Church to be pure and free from the grossest sins, may seem surprising to some. Let it be remembered that nothing is too strange or great for that Church to assume. But it is not her characteristics we are directly seeking, but those of the original, apostolic, primitive Church. Those composing that Church 1800 years ago were regarded as a holy priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people. So now they must be characterized by good works.

3. We have assumed the *one holy Church* to be *apostolic*. To be apostolic it must be such as the apostles founded, and would unite with were they here in person now. It should be like the Church they have

described in their writings. Can that be the Roman Catholic Church? If so, her character, as seen now and read in history, will be like the Church described by the apostles of Christ. All the apostles belonged to, or were at least present in, the Church of Jerusalem. This is true of no other locality known to history. If the presence and teaching of the apostles were contended for as necessary to constitute an Apostolic Church, the Jerusalem Church may justly claim to be apostolic in a sense no other ever was. They laid the foundation, which is Jesus the Christ, and erected thereon a stately spiritual building. That Church became, not the mother of Churches, as Rome proudly claims she is, but the mother of Christians. "Jerusalem," said Paul, "is free, which is the mother of us all."—Gal. iv: 26. All apostolic congregations, from that day to this, are like that one at Jerusalem. Her history is recorded in the first seven chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Who pretends now, in defending either the doctrine or practice of Romanism, to appeal to that portion of sacred history? Who can find there anything about transubstantiation, infant baptism, adoration of holy bread, the use of pictures and images, etc., etc.? No one. The second chapter of Acts gives a history of the founding of the Church, that all must admit was apostolic. If a Church was to be found now precisely like that one, in doctrine and conduct, who could deny it to be apostolic without knowing he was on the side of unbelievers? Then the apostles remitted and retained sins; and the manner of doing so is made so plain that I need not detain you to show how. There is no resemblance to the manner in which those who claim apostolic succession do so now. That Church cannot be apostolic that denies the power of the apostles of Christ to remit and retain sins. This is done, however, when any prescription is given for pardon different from theirs. The apostles chosen by Jesus when he was on earth, with one exception, still belong to his Church, having never

been excluded by him or any one acting under his authority.

4. In the word *Church* is centered everything of a religious nature, in the mind of a Catholic. With him it is the source and center of power. His faith is in the Church, and his prayers are offered up to its deceased members. The living successors of the apostles he thinks are in the Church, and to them he pays a deference never allowed by Jesus' apostles to be paid to them. He believes just what the Church teaches, and asks no questions whether it is approved by the Lord. With him the Church is infallible, and to deny what her doctors and priests teach is heresy. He boasts of her antiquity, and unbroken history from the apostolic age, as if these matters were of the first importance to his salvation.

If the salvation of men depends on their ability to trace an unbroken succession of bishops from the time of the apostles, very few, if indeed any, could now be saved. The man who desires to be a Christian need not go to such trouble. To be a Christian he only need to ascertain from the inspired record of the New Testament what was necessary then to become a disciple of Christ, and do it. He who does so in these days will not be long in finding a place for membership in this country, with a Church earnestly and solely striving to teach and practice according to the Jerusalem model.

That model presents us with the following, among other things, as characteristic of the Church:

1. It was composed of immersed, penitent believers, who called on the name of the Lord.
2. They had extraordinary officers. These were apostles and prophets, as shown last evening. These still exercise their authority in the Church by their written testimony.
3. They had ordinary officers. Overseers and deacons. These also the Church still has. The word *elder*, when used to denote an officer, means the same as bishop

or overseer. Titus' i: 5-7—"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a *bishop* must be blameless as the steward of God." It is easily seen here that *elder* (*presbuteros*) and *bishop* (*episkopos*) mean the same thing. Again in Acts xx: 17: Paul called the *elders* (*presbuteroi*) of the Church. In the 28th verse he calls them overseers (*episkopoi*) of the flock of God, charging them to feed the Church of God. From these and many other passages in the inspired record we learn nothing of a single bishop having rule over one congregation, much less having dominion over a district containing a number of congregations. One bishop to a number of churches is a monstrosity in the kingdom of Christ. A plurality of bishops existed in every congregation where there were rulers at all, so far as can be learned from the Divine history.

We have now no less than three establishments, each of which claims to be catholic—Greek, Roman and Anglican. They cannot all be catholic, holy and apostolic, unless they are united at least. This they are not, and cannot be, without yielding some of their peculiarities. Not one of these has all the marks of the "One, Holy, Apostolic Church" of our Lord Jesus, the Christ, in either doctrine or practice; in organization or worship. The obliteration of all their proceedings from the page of history, would leave the world, with the writings of the apostles and prophets in its possession, as well off for salvation as they seem to make it. The apostolic congregation must expect to live and do good, without aid from any of these unauthorized institutions, whose strongest claims to regard are founded on their pretended succession, antiquity and numbers.

J. M. HENRY.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. II.

BRO. FRANKLIN :—

The Cor. Sec. of the Bible Union returns, in his second communication, to the criticism of the phraseology of Luke i. 2, as it occurs in the New Translation; and, laboring *ad nauseam* upon its passive structure, discovers two other changes from the Greek to the English language, which, with characteristic haste, he calls "alterations of the truth!"

Having already discussed the propriety of expressing Luke's thought by the use of the *passive* form of the English sentence, in preference to the *active*; and shown that the active form adopted by the Bible Union is both obscure and ungrammatical, conveying the false idea that Luke and his associates were the "eye-witnesses"—it would seem to me to be trifling with criticism to proceed now to justify the position given to subject and object, in my rendering of that verse, since this arrangement is necessarily involved in a correct structure of the English. Simply to lay bare a criticism of this sort is, I think, the only refutation of it that sober controversy requires; and this I have already done in my reply to the Secretary's Paper "No. 1."

The next feature of the New Translation which is assailed is the omission of some word to stand as a representative or translation of the Greek particle *de*, in the beginning of the 6th verse of this chapter. It is enough to say in reply, that here there is no occasion for any English representative; and that this is often the case with this particle, the Secretary might himself have known from the fact, that in other passages of Sacred Scripture, even the Bible Union themselves have ignored its existence, and refused to translate it! This they have done in such passages as the following: Matt. xiii. 1; Luke iii. 11. Every

Greek scholar understands the nature of this particle, and he will doubtless be surprised at this criticism from the pen of the Cor. Sec. of the Bible Union. For the benefit of the English reader, however, I would add that it frequently serves to indicate the introduction of some new matter, incident, or train of thought into composition; and to attempt to translate it at all would, in some cases, be useless, if not ridiculous. But those who trammel themselves with arbitrary rules of translation, and who think that idiomatic Greek should be affected by solecistic English, and who are more zealous to reproduce forms of speech, than faithfully to give the thoughts of the Spirit, frequently embarrass themselves with such Greek contrivances as this particle "*de*." Regardless of the fact that it is sometimes best translated when not translated at all, they drag the English language for words that they imagine will correspond to it in position and meaning; and often, on the same page, give to it the most varied and opposite significations.—To illustrate the character of this little word, and, at the same time, to show the importance that should be attached to the criticism which we are now noticing, I would state that so Protean-like is this "*de*," in the opinion of the Bible Union, that they have ventured to translate it, in this first chapter, sometimes by the conjunction *and*, and sometimes by *but*; now by the word *then*, and then again by the word *now*: and having exhausted, it would seem, the resources of the English tongue in order to translate, or rather to *monument* it, in other places, they determine at last to depart *themselves*, from "the words of Inspiration," and to leave it untranslated entirely! But, to close this notice of the Secretary's suicidal criticism, I would merely add, we translate this particle *when the sense requires it*; and when the sense does not require it, or an attempt to render it into English would give nonsense, *we let it alone*, as the Bible Union have done in other passages, and ought to have done in this.

The next and last critical note, with which the Secretary favors us, concerns the translation of the Greek verb *Epecheireesan*. This verb is from a noun signifying "hand"—and *this hand*, says the Secretary, very gravely, *is a striking image!* Assuming that there is no effort on his part to appear facetious, but that he sees really a rhetorical and not merely a pugilistic image in the figure of the hand, I confess myself unable to appreciate what he calls the *beauty* of this Bible Union rendering. To say of a writer, that "he took in hand to set forth in order a narration concerning anything," as the Bible Union would phrase it, may, by reason of this image, "strike" some persons "with force;" but a serious and tasteful reader will hardly suppose that such English is *the work of the Holy Spirit*. But I respectfully submit to the Secretary, whether his partiality for the faint rhetoric of "the hand" in *Epecheireesan* does not involve his Version in a fatal departure from the sense and meaning of the Inspired Writer. He argues that the New Translation, by using the expression "Have undertaken," implies that "The many," who undertook to set forth in order, *did not succeed*; but that the Bible Union Version, by translating it "Have taken in hand," *contains no such implication*. Now, admitting that the word "undertake" suggests any such notion as *failure*, I would ask the Secretary to inform those for whom he is writing, whether "The many" whom we represent as "having undertaken," and whom he represents as "having taken in hand," did succeed or not? Will he please to answer? The Secretary even here, as elsewhere, charges upon his own version "a departure from the words of Inspiration."

But this is not the only difficulty in which our Critic involves himself and the Society which he represents. Will the reader have the kindness to turn to Acts ix. 29? We read there that the Grecians *went about to slay Paul*. The Greek word there translated "went about," is this same verb which the Secretary insists should be rendered "taken in hand," in order to pre-

serve *the figure*, and to avoid suggesting the idea of *failure*. The reader may now try "the image" and "the implication" to his own satisfaction. The "striking figure of the hand" here must please our critical opponent; for, in this instance, the purpose was to *kill Paul*. But what shall we do with "the implication of success" which goes along with "the image" in his rendering? For the Grecians actually failed even to "strike" Paul with their "hand." They simply *undertook* to kill Paul; but he escaped to Tarsus!

Will the Secretary find fault if, in conclusion, we apply his method of criticism to his own Version? In this same chapter of Luke, verse 78, we have the Greek words *splangchna eleous*, which the Secretary, by means of what he calls a "human device," translates by the phrase *tender mercies*.—Here certainly, according to his own reasoning, are both a departure from the words of Inspiration," and "a concealment of a striking figure" of the original.

1. *Splangchna* is a noun, but the Secretary has changed it into an adjective, which is a very different part of speech. To use his own language, he, in this instance, "undertakes to remodel the direct and positive form of phraseology employed by the Spirit of all Wisdom and Grace, and substitutes a construction of man for the words of Inspiration!"

2. The Inspired Greek, as the Secretary would say, requires *splangchna* to be modified by *eleous*, but the Bible Union chooses to reverse this order of the original, and to make *splangchna* modify *eleous*. In the somewhat emotional style of the Secretary, we might say—"Had the Holy Spirit made the change, we would have bowed in submission. But we object to such power being assumed by man!"

2. *Splangchna* literally means "intestines," "bowels;" of this no one "at all conversant with Greek can doubt for a moment." "Now, the very image of a thought should be daguerrotyped on the mind," says the Secretary. But instead of the image of the original, the "human device"

of "tender" has been employed by the Bible Union, which, "from the service that it here performs," reminds us of the pretty pun on the word *undertake*, with which the Sec. of the Bible Union, in his second paper, relieved the dignity of Bible controversy; but which we confess our inability successfully to imitate! Thus it appears, by force of the Secretary's own reasoning, that, in rendering one single verse of this chapter, the Bible Union Version contains:

1. The substitution of an adjectives for a neun!
2. The change of a governing to a governed word!
3. The concealment of a striking figure or image of the original!

Yours truly,

H. T. A.

that some of the flowers turned *pale* while others *blushed* and so gave up the effort.

"But when the patient stars looked down
On all their light discovers—
The traitor's smile, the murderer's frown,
The lips of lying lovers—
They try to shut their saddening eyes,
And, in the vain endeavor,
We see them twinkling in the skies
And so they *wink* forever."

And no wonder; for right under the eye of God, the eyes of "ten thousand times ten thousand angels," before the eyes of good men, and the glaring eye-balls of demons, eager for fresh meat in hell, men have persisted in sin not only till flowers paled or blushed, and stars would shut their eyes, but even till Jesus grew pale in the garden, blushed on the cross and closed his eyes upon a guilty world.

"To shame our sins he blushed in blood,
He closed his eyes to show us God."

Oh! sin, sin; would that we could convince men of its "exceeding sinfulness"—then how deep would be their repentance, how joyful their obedience, how happy their Christian life and how sure their heaven.

Were I to discuss the main issues between us and the Universalists, or any other anti-hell sect, I would make the nature of sin the fulcrum of all my arguments with them. All the distinguishing theories of Universalists, Restorationists, Spiritualists, Soul-sleepers and every other kindred sect of Religionists, Philosophers, or Infidels arise from an inadequate conception of *what sin is*. They regard it as no very serious matter at most—the soul wounds inflicted by sin will either, like flesh wounds, heal up of themselves, by the recuperative energies of nature alone; or they can be cured by human sufferings on earth, in Limbo, in Purgatory, or in Hell; or else their sins can be balanced off by as many good works and have a little left in their favor; or in some other way the whole affair of sin, what's of it, can be managed without much inconvenience. Nor are such notions confined to those sects, for the disobedient generally entertain these

PREACHING HELL—SINFULNESS OF SIN.

NO. V.

MR. EDITOR:—Oliver Wendell Holmes, in his "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," has introduced a delicate little story, a fable illustrative of the leading thought in this article. The stars all, in consultation with the flowers, agreed to devise some means of shaming the world out of their sins. It was thought if they could in some way keep thousands of eyes turned upon men, both day and night, their object would be accomplished. So it was arranged for the flowers to watch by day and the stars by night. At break of day the flowers began their vigils. From hill and vale, from field and lawn, they turned their pure eyes upon men to shame their sins, but no man regarded those gentle hints: their conduct was still so base and immodest

or kindred opinions. These all must be made to feel their sins to be terrible evils, incurable wounds, ineffaceable stains to be cleansed only by the blood that has purified the souls and whitened the robes of all God's saints.

It is a fearful thing to sin even against God's natural laws. The heinousness of any given sin may always be measured by its ruinous effects. It might seem a very small sin against nature to rip open a jugular vein. It could be done in a moment, by the exertion of a single ounce of muscular power. But pain, death, bereavement, mourning and all concomitant sorrows are the measure of this transgression. God, who knows the nature of this sin against one's body, has fixed the penalty of death, both as a protection to life and as an *exponent* and *definition* of the evil of sin itself. The wages of sin, both in nature and religion, is death. If some superior being had power to cut the centripetal cord that binds the earth to the sun, what language would equal the enormity of the crime?—earth's tangent flight, disordered day and night, the loss of seasons, disrupted seas, the chill of the fearful apogee, the dragging of other planets from their orbits, the consequent congregation of ruined worlds, with all the contagious whirling confusion it would generate in the works of God; all this would but articulate His estimate of the sinfulness of such a sin in nature. And can a man cause a little one to stumble, to fly from its true orbit around the Sun of righteousness, dragging others with it into a common ruin, and not incur the vengeance of an insulted God? Is a sin in the moral universe less sinful than in nature? Shall a world destroying angel be convicted and punished for high crime and the soul destroyer be less criminal? Is a soul worth less than a world? As it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, so it is a fearful thing to sin against him. The very nature of sin is destructive; it disintegrates the soul, degenerates its powers, mildews the affections, and works an abortion out of all

God's high purposes with the heart. Nor can its nature be changed; its essence, its centre and circumference, its warp and woof are all constitutionally, inherently and eternally the same—opposed to God and evolving death in all its ways.

The evil of sin is not removed, and scarcely mitigated by our having sinned only a few years, or having committed but few sins. Neither the laws of God in nature, nor the laws of civil authorities, ever exempt us from punishment on this account. Is the murderer excused for a single assassination, because it was the only one? Must a man fall from the steeple a dozen times before he may expect the penalty? Does the thorn pierce your flesh a hundred times before the violation acquires sufficient consequence to give you pain? Why are men sensible enough in everything but religion? It must be from this stand point that God calls some people fools. And why not, since the same person that justifies the executive in exacting capital punishment for the first and only murder, expects to offend his God for half a life time, and then scarcely be liable to a penalty. A sand in the eye will immediately intimate its presence, for nature never delays her penalties till the fortieth sin is committed. Now, if the laws of nature, as well as those of civil government, are defended against a single infraction by prompt and unfailing intimations of God's displeasure, how can we hope for impunity, though we sin but once against the moral universe? Why expect to escape on account of the fewness of our sins? Every sinner ought to know, and every preacher should declare, that had there been but one sinner to be saved, and had he sinned but once in all his life, it would have required the same sacrifice, the same spiritual enginery, as to save the many from their many sins, for without the shedding of blood there is *no* remission. To keep but one man alive on earth, and that for a single year, would have required the same sun and moon, the same seasons, and the same general arrangements as to preserve

us all for a century. Think not then of the fewness of our sins, for the whole sad spectacle of the manger, the garden, the cross, and the grave must transpire to blot out a single sin. Such is God's estimate and definition of the "exceeding" sinfulness of sin.

As to those who really do commit fewer sins than others, two remarks may be made. Their sins are many more than they suppose, nine-tenths of them having been forgotten; and secondly, such persons having generally had better advantages than others in parental and religious instruction, have much less excuse—hence their sins, few or many, are all the more offensive to God. Beware, preacher; be not deceived by these men—away down in their hearts there may be found a latent opposition to God which all your preaching may never subdue. It behooves us to study the human heart—to understand its excuses, its defenses, its shields. We must learn the best means of approaching the citadel to storm it. We must teach by illustrations from Scripture, nature, history, science, and from common life, the nature and enormity of sin, and not conceal the fearfulness of "falling into the hands of the living God." We may convince them of the terms of salvation, of the nature of the ordinances, that heaven would be an elegant situation, and so on; but if we cannot subdue the heart, they will neglect our preaching, and inwardly despise our ministry.

The evil of sin is greatly augmented by its leavening and contagious character.—Each sin, like a single thread of a garment, draws the whole web of vice after it. Every national war has been generated by some one thought excogitated from the brain of the author of the evil. As every great river takes its rise in some feeble spring, which rolling on and receiving new contributions till it becomes an irresistible current; so a single wicked thought finding expression in words and deeds, and becoming contagious, gathers new accessions in *cumulo*, until it not only destroys the heart that begat it, but involves a whole people

in ruin. A single bad life or a bad book may begin a disintegration of souls that will ultimate in their irremediable overthrow. As Abel has not yet ceased to bear witness to the truth, so Paine has not yet ceased to lie, for the current of lies and evil influences put in motion by the "Age of Reason" is still in high flow with many who receive not the truth in the love of it.

David says "there is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God." That's a beautiful river, the river of heavenly influences on earth, that had its origin in Eden, received contributions from Abel, Enoch, Noah and all the Patriarchs; it was widened and deepened through all the centuries of the Jewish age; was swelled into magnificence and grandeur by Christ and the Apostles, and will roll on till it gladdens the whole earth; and when it shall have filled to the brim the cup of bliss on earth, it will overflow into heaven and gush from beneath the throne, a "river of water, clear as crystal," and make glad the whole city of God. But oh! that other river that rolls with the impetus of increasing sin; that, leaping from the lip of time, discharges its dark waters through the Cocytus, Stix and Phlegethon, intensifies hell, and completes the damnation of all its unhappy inhabitants.

If such be the cumulative power of sin here and hereafter, it should be powerfully developed by every preacher, believed by every sinner, and fled from as from the wrath of God. That "sin is exceeding sinful" is thus proclaimed by the voice of civil government, of God in nature, and in the Bible. Of this the world must first be convinced, or the Gospel will seem to be destitute both of power and of all meaning.

Another brief article on the nature of punishment, and why no one should be ashamed to preach it boldly, will close the present series.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

THE WAY OF SALVATION.

NO. II.

Young Jones, when he was fourteen years old, accompanied his mother to hear her favorite preacher on the *Way of Salvation*. The discourse was regarded by his mother as a great sermon. The text was as follows: "Christ came to save that which was lost." The subject was divided as follows:

I. To show what is meant by *being lost*.

II. To show what is meant by *being saved*.

III. To show what the consequence will be if we are not saved.

The subject was discussed as follows:

I. *What is meant by being lost?* To be lost is to be in a state of nature separated from God, unpardoned, unsaved. It is to be in an unconverted, unregenerated and sinful state. In this state man is totally depraved, utterly dead in trespasses and in sins. He is sinful in all his parts, wholly inclined to evil continually, and wholly averse to good. His whole nature inclines to evil, and only evil all the time. He cannot think a good thought, or do a good thing, till he is quickened by the regenerating power of Divine grace. He cannot believe, repent, or do anything acceptable to God till he is quickened by the Holy Ghost. This is the condition of all the world in an unregenerate state.

II. *What is meant by being saved?* It is to be pardoned, justified, or delivered from sin. To pardon, justify or deliver from sin is an act of God. He performs this act for the creature upon the condition of faith. "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Faith is the gift of God. God gives faith by His Holy Spirit. Before he gives faith the sinner can do nothing. But when, by the in-

fluence of the Holy Ghost, the sinner is quickened, made alive, God gives him repentance and enables him to believe, and, when he believes, he is justified by faith.

III. What will be the consequence if we are not saved? The consequence will be that we shall suffer the second death—the second separation from God—a banishment from God and the glory of His power forever—go away into everlasting punishment—be tormented day and night forever and ever—in the fire that shall never be quenched where the worm dies not.

On their way home the following conversation took place between Mrs. Jones and her son:

Son.—Ma, where did I get my nature from?

Mother.—My son, you inherited it.

S.—Ma, what do you mean by that?

M.—I mean, my child, that it came from your father and mother, or that it came to you by inheritance from your father and mother.

S.—Were yourself and pa sinners when I was born?

M.—No, my child, we were both professors of religion—both Christians, I trust.

S.—Well, ma, how then did I inherit a *sinful nature* from my parents, if they were Christians when I was born?

M.—My child, do you not know that I have read to you from my book of Discipline that "all men are born in sin?"

S.—I know you have ma, but how could I obtain a *sinful nature* from my parents if they were not sinners?

M.—My son, the Scriptures say "we are brought forth in iniquity," and that means that we were born in sin. That is the reason that the prayer was offered at your baptism, that you, being delivered from God's wrath, might be received into Christ's holy Church.

S.—Ma, who prayed for me when you had me baptized, that "being delivered from God's wrath I might be received into Christ's holy Church?"

M.—The minister, my dear.

S.—Ma, did the Lord answer that prayer?

M.—Certainly, my child; the Lord hears the prayers of His people, and that prayer was offered for you at your baptism.

S.—Then I am a member of Christ's holy Church, and delivered from the wrath of God! If I had died before you made me a member of the Church and I was delivered from the wrath of God, I would have been lost; but now I am a *Christian*!

M.—No, my child, you are not a Christian, nor a member of the Church. You must be born again.

S.—Then that prayer in reference to my being delivered from the wrath of God and made a member of Christ's holy Church, was not answered. What good did my baptism do, ma, if I am yet in my sins?

M.—My son, you are too young to understand these great matters?

S.—Ma, I am distressed. You say I am a *sinner*, and must be born again. Then, if I die a sinner I will be lost! You must explain this matter to me. How did I inherit a *sinful nature* from my parents if they were Christians when I was born?

M.—My child, I cannot explain these matters to you. You are too young to understand them. You must come to the Lord and seek salvation.

S.—Ma, the preacher to-day said I cannot think a good thought or do a good thing—that I cannot believe, repent or do anything. Is this true? Yet, if I die in my sins, I will be lost! Who made this *sinful nature* of mine, which inclines me wholly to evil all the time?

M.—The Lord made our nature, my child.

S.—Ma, did the Lord make for me a *sinful nature*, inclining me to sin continually, and then does He punish me for the sin this sinful nature which He made inclines me to commit?

M.—My son, you are too young to understand these matters.

S.—Still, you say, I am a sinner and will be lost if I die in my sins! Will I be lost because I cannot understand; because I

can do nothing? Ma, this makes me unhappy! I am in sin and can do nothing to be saved, and will be lost if I die in my sins!

M.—You must pray to the Lord, my child, to give you faith.

S.—If I pray *without faith* will the Lord hear me?

M.—No, my child, you must “ask believing.”

S.—How can I ask believing before the Lord give me faith?

M.—My son, I am distressed about you. I am afraid you are running into skepticism.

S.—*Skepticism*! Ma, what is that?

M.—It is unbelief. A *skeptic* is a man who does not believe the Bible, believe in Christ, or the Christian religion.

S.—Ma, I am not, then, a skeptic, for I believe the Bible and believe in our Savior, and in religion. What makes you think that I am a skeptic?

M.—Because, my son, you ask so many perplexing questions, and trouble me so much.

S.—Ma, I am not asking questions to perplex or trouble you, but because I am in trouble myself, and know not what to do. You say, the Lord made a sinful nature inclining me to sin continually, and that he gave me no ability to do any good, and yet if I die in my sins, I will be lost! What am I to do? I cannot avoid being troubled and asking questions about this matter!—You say, I inherited my sinful nature from my parents; but I cannot see how I inherited a sinful nature from them, as they were *Christians* when I was born! If they were *holy*, why did I not inherit a *holy nature* from them? Why may not a holy nature be inherited as readily as a sinful nature?

M.—My child, what are you talking about? Who ever heard of a holy nature being inherited?

S.—I never heard of a holy nature being inherited, but if the sinful nature of parents may be inherited by children, inclining them continually to sin, why may not a holy

nature, where it exists, be inherited by children, inclining them to holiness continually?

M.—My child, I never heard such questions as you ask. But one thing, my dear, you know; and that is, that the minister told you to-day, that you can do nothing till you are regenerated by the Holy Ghost.

S.—I know he did, and I am some consoled by that; if I *cannot* do anything, and am lost, it will not be *my fault*. The reason will simply be, that the Holy Ghost did not do for me what I could not do for myself. Still, I cannot see why I should be lost for not being a Christian, when it is not in my power to be one. If I *cannot* be good, why did you, several years ago, whip me because *I was bad*, and make me promise to *be good*? If I inherited my bad nature from yourself and pa, and *cannot* be good, it is cruel for you to punish me for being bad. And, then, can it be that the Lord, whom you have taught me is so great, wise and good, will punish me for being bad, when he knows I *cannot* help being bad, or for not being good, when he knows I *cannot* be good?

M.—My son, I know not what to do with you. I know not what to do with your questions; I see the minister is stopping at our gate. I will get him to explain these matters to you.

In a few minutes Mrs. Jones, her little son and the preacher were all in the house seated, when the following conversation ensued:

M.—Bro. Wise, I am glad you have called. My son has been asking questions all the way home. I do not know what to think of the child. I never heard such questions as he asks.

Minister.—Young man, what is the trouble with you?

S.—I am not able to talk with you, sir, and am sorry that ma said anything to you about my questions. But I was telling ma that if I have a *sinful nature*, inclining me wholly to evil, and if, as I understood you to say, I can do nothing—cannot believe,

repent, or do anything acceptable to the Lord, I cannot see why I should be lost for not being a Christian!

Min.—You must be regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and when thus quickened, or made alive, you can repent and believe.—Before this, you can do nothing.

S.—Then, I cannot see how I am to blame for not being a Christian. Will the Lord condemn me for *being bad*, when I cannot *be good*?

Min.—See here, young man; you are running into skepticism, and you had better stop and consider the road you are traveling.

S.—That is what ma says; but how can I help it, if I am running into skepticism?—You say I can do nothing only what my wicked nature inclines me to do; that I *cannot* believe till I am regenerated by the Holy Ghost. How can I “stop and consider,” if, as you say, I cannot do anything?

Min.—My young friend, you are in a dangerous condition; I tremble for you. I regard you as on the verge of ruin. You ought to pray to the Lord to take away this stony heart of unbelief, and give you a heart of flesh.

S.—I know I am in a dangerous condition, and I am greatly distressed on account of it, and what adds to my distress is, that you say I can do nothing—that I *cannot* believe, and yet that *I will be lost if I do not believe!* You now advise me to pray, but I feel two difficulties in my way. 1. I cannot see how I can pray, if I can do nothing. 2. I cannot think the Lord will answer the prayer of an unbeliever. Will the Lord hear the prayer of an unbeliever?

Min.—Young man, who put these notions into your head? You are certainly on the broad road to ruin.

S.—I fear that I am, but I do not see how I can help it, as you say *I can do nothing!* Ma says I inherited a *sinful nature* from my parents, inclining me wholly to sin, and that I can do no good thing. I suppose that wicked nature puts these things into my

head. But I cannot help it. If I am naturally bad, cannot be good, I cannot help it, and cannot see why I should be lost for what I could not help. Will I be lost because the Holy Ghost won't make me good?

Min.—Young man, I tremble for you!—You have a pious mother, but, you appear to be making a very poor use of all her pious instructions.

S.—I tremble for myself, and am as much concerned for myself as you can be for me, and, what is worse, all you say only makes my trouble and difficulty worse and worse. You speak of my pious mother, and yet she says I inherited my sinful nature from her, inclining me to sin continually, and you say that I cannot be good.

Min.—You can pray for the Lord to have mercy upon you.

S.—You say I cannot believe; will the Lord answer the prayer of an unbeliever? Will I be condemned for not believing, when I cannot believe? If the Holy Ghost don't come and give me power to believe, is it my fault?

Min.—My young friend, I have no patience with your talk. It is most painful to hear you.

S.—I am sorry it is painful to you; but you know it is occasioned by my sinful nature, inherited from my parents. I can do nothing, and unless the Spirit gives me power to believe, I must die in unbelief. I am in great distress, but cannot help it. I want to be good, but cannot!

Min.—I am out of all patience with your talk. Good-bye, sister Jones.

B. F.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. VI.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—

The question of substituting "You" for "Thou" and "Thee," (according to the plan of the New Translation,) is one of so great moment as to justify me in again alluding to it. The heart of the meek and humble follower of Jesus pants after the knowledge of his Master's will. He says with Solomon, "Every word of the Lord is pure," and with David, "Thy word is very pure; therefore thy servant loveth it."—The words of Christ are his food—his spiritual sustenance. Let such a one take the 18th chapter of Matthew, and read it as the New Translation would make it, substituting "You" in every instance for the second person singular. He cannot fail to be impressed with the idea that the very doctrines of that chapter are changed by such a reading. *Individual* duty, which our Savior is so particularly enjoining, becomes *collective* duty. Christ, in the 14th verse, is speaking to the disciples as a body. In the 15th verse, if "You" and "Your" are employed instead of the second person singular, Christ is still made to address the collective body, and they are told how, as a body, to treat a brother trespassing against them. It is the same with respect to the doctrine of offenses in the 8th and 9th verses. Instead of teaching individuals self-denial and self-mortification, by such substitution they become instructions to the body of the disciples, how to treat members who offend. The truth is that the more this proposed change is considered, the more objectionable it appears. Sometimes it makes a speaker appear ridiculous, as in Acts xxv. 26: "Wherefore I have brought him before you, and especially before you, O king Agrippa." Sometimes it entirely confounds the

sense, as in Romans ii. 23, 24: "You that make your boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonor you God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles, through you, as it is written." Here precisely the same parties are addressed in both verses, (according to the method of the New Translation,) which is entirely contrary to the sense of the original.

Sometimes it destroys all the aptness and force of a precept, as in Luke xiv. 7, 8: "And he put forth a parable to those who were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them, When you are bidden of any man," &c. Here the vivacity of the address, that which makes the reader start as though he felt it come right home to himself, consisted in the sudden change of number: "Saying unto them, When thou art bidden," &c. This sudden transition from the general to the particular, from the multitude to the individual, is utterly lost in the New Translation. That vividness of conception by which our Savior intensified a universal moral by concentrating it upon an individual, is completely obscured, and the language tamed down to platitude. With as much reason might we change the expression, "Behold the lily of the valley, how it grows," to a more general one: "Observe the growth of the vegetable kingdom."—The speciality of the words of Jesus is one of their most striking characteristics, and he that does anything to diminish this, draws a cloud over the brightness of divine truth.

The conclusion to which I am forced, by an examination of a large number of the cases in which "Thou," "Thee," and "Thine," would thus be changed to "You" and "Yours," is, that more would be lost by it in the knowledge of sacred Scripture by the ordinary English reader, than is gained by scores of real improvements and corrections of errors in the revision of the New Testament; while not one particle of light would be added by the change to a single passage of the word of God.

The next variation to be noticed is in immediate connection with the word "You."

The Bible Union Revision says: "TO WRITE TO THEE."

The Common Version has: "TO WRITE UNTO THEE."

The New Translation substitutes: "To write for you."

The difference between the Bible Union's Revision and the New Translation, which I am about to examine, is that between "To" and "For."

The question is simply, whether the Greek "Grapsai soi," in the connection in which it stands, means, "To write to thee," or "To write for thee."

This question, we think, is decided by the facts, that the writing is addressed to Theophilus by name, and that there is no intimation of any other purpose. "The Acts of the Apostles" is addressed to the same person. In each case his name is given as the party addressed in the second person. All the Epistles are addressed to certain parties, and no translator, so far as I know, proposes to change the translation in any of the cases so as to make them written "for" the parties instead of "to" them.

It is true that every communication which any man makes by letter to another, may be said in some sense to be written "for" the party addressed; but when the party is addressed by name, and there is no intimation that it is intended for another, it is said to be written "to" the one addressed. The change, therefore, by the New Translation, in this case, as in the others, is unnecessary and improper, and contrary to the manifest import of the original.

There remains only one more phrase to be examined in this introduction to Luke's Gospel.

The Common Version says: "THAT THOU MIGHTEST KNOW THE CERTAINTY OF THOSE THINGS."

The Union's Revision says: "THAT THOU MIGHTEST KNOW THE CERTAINTY CONCERNING THOSE THINGS."

The New Translation has it: "THAT YOU

MAY KNOW THE CERTAINTY OF THE THINGS."

The first prominent point of difference in these words consists in the use of the forms, "MIGHT KNOW" and "MAY KNOW." The Revision employs the former; the New Translation the latter.

The Greek usage in such cases is peculiar. Its idiom does permit the subjunctive in subordinate clauses sometimes, as in the present instance, to be dependent on a historical tense; and the subordinate subjunctive ordinarily represents present time. But the idiom of the English language does not permit a present tense to be subordinate to a past in such cases. We say, "I WRITE THAT YOU MAY KNOW," and "I WROTE THAT YOU MIGHT KNOW."

But it is not grammatical English to say, "I wrote that you may know;" or, as in the New Translation in the case under examination: "IT SEEMED GOOD TO ME TO WRITE IN ORDER THAT YOU MAY KNOW."

A proper regard to the idiom of our language requires us to say either—"IT SEEMED GOOD TO ME TO WRITE IN ORDER THAT YOU MIGHT KNOW," or, "IT SEEMS GOOD TO ME TO WRITE IN ORDER THAT YOU MAY KNOW."

On this point we anticipate no difference of opinion among scholars. The idiom of our language is so decided, the grammatical propriety in the case is so clear, that there is hardly room for question. "I wish that you might" and "I wished that you may" are equally bad English. "I wish that you may" and "I wished that you might" are equally good English. "May" is subordinate to the present and to the perfect tense in our language; and "Might" is subordinate to the past tense, and to attempt to change this order is to introduce grammatical confusion.

Affectionately yours,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

LECTURE VII.

The Lord's Supper.

This institution has been regarded as of great importance ever since its commencement. It is one of the two rites authorized by the Savior, baptism being the other. The account of the origin of the Lord's Supper is recorded by Matthew xxvi: 26-28; Mark xiv: 22-24; Luke xxii: 19-20. I quote Matthew's record of it. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Jesus directed all the disciples present on that occasion to drink of it. He did not say, eat ye all of it, referring to the bread, but, drink ye all of it, referring to the cup. This may be regarded as indicating the Savior's beneficent wisdom to his people, in the ages then to come, to allow each disciple to both eat and drink in remembrance of him. The prohibition of "the cup" to the disciples by Romanists, is a plain and unmistakeable disregard of Jesus' command: "This do in remembrance of me." Luke xxii: 19. The Catholics have not denied the bread, as they call a consecrated wafer, to the "laity."

No higher authority can be pleaded in the universe for any ceremony than that which gives "the sacrament in both kinds" to all the disciples of Christ. Neither is there an act of disobedience plainer than that which neglects or prohibits the eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. He gave it to his apostles, not as officers extraordinary in his kingdom, but as disciples. See Matthew and Mark in the chapters already quoted.

His apostles after his ascension delivered it to the disciples who became followers of Christ through their labors. Acts ii: 42. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, and in prayers. It is the almost universal opinion of Biblical critics and ecclesiastical writers, that breaking bread, here mentioned, refers to the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist as some call it. 1 Cor. xi: 23-26. For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. From the above there can no honest mistake be made as to its observance by all Jesus' disciples.

It was observed weekly. Acts xx: 7. The language of Dr. Doddridge is so appropriate to this point, and on the above passage, that I read as follows: "It is strange, that Mr. Barclay, in his Apology, page 475, should argue from verse 11, that this was only a common meal, and not the Lord's Supper. It is well known, the primitive Christians administered the Eucharist every Lord's day; and as that was the most solemn and appropriate, as well as the concluding act of their worship, it is no wonder that it should be mentioned as the end of their assembling; whereas, had nothing more than a common meal been intended, Luke would have hardly thought that worth mentioning, especially when, Paul being with them on a Lord's day, they would so unnaturally have something far nobler and more important in view, in which accordingly we find them employed, and it is quite unreasonable to suppose, they spent their time in feasting, which neither the occasion nor the hour would

well admit. The argument which some over-zealous Papists have drawn from this text, for denying the cup to the laity in the sacrament, was so solemnly given up in the Council of Trent, that it is astonishing, any who profess to believe the divine authority of that Council, should ever have presumed to plead it again."

Mosheim, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Socrates, Pliny, Coleman, Wesley, and Nevin's Biblical Antiquities, all testify to the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper in the apostolic age of the Church. Dr. Nevin's work is endorsed and published by the Committee of the American Sunday School Union, by which men of the principal orthodox parties in this country are committed to an acknowledgment of its divine institution, and authority for its weekly observance. Indeed there is no divine precept to which there is a more general assent of learned men than that concerning the weekly celebration of the Lord's death.

To the weekly observance of it, it is objected that the statement is nowhere made, that the disciples did, or should meet on the first day of *every* week to brake bread. To this it may be replied, that the command, Exodus xx: 8, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, did not say *every* Sabbath. Yet every seventh day of the week was kept by the Jews. Disregard of the command on any Sabbath would have been punished; and the plea that the law did not say *every* Sabbath day would not have saved the culprit from the punishment demanded in the law against that offense. Again, Dr. Macnight renders 1 Cor. xvi: 2, thus, On the first day of *every* week let each of you lay somewhat by itself. The early Christians met on the first day of the week; and the chief purpose is declared to have been, to break bread. It is nowhere said they met on a first day of the week, but on *the* first day of the week. As often then as the first day of the week occurs, the propriety and duty of attending to this institution recurs to every one that loves the Lord who can attend to it. But it is still objected; the

Lord has not commanded me to observe it every Lord's day, the examples in the record say *the first day*. True, and the blessed Lord's kindness is shown in making it the absolute duty, else we by sickness, and things unavoidable would be compelled sometimes to disobedience.

John vi: 51-56. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

This passage is relied on as justifying the doctrine of transubstantiation. If this passage refers to the Lord's Supper, its allusion is so remote as to render an examination of other portions of the Word of God necessary, where the Supper is spoken of without doubt. The obscure and doubtful must be understood in the light of the plain and certain. Jesus did offer his body, and shed his blood, that the world might have life. Does the eating of the bread, and the drinking of the wine, in remembrance of Jesus' body and blood, give eternal life? Is that the means ordained of God to save the world? The Savior addressed this language to the unbelieving Jews. The observance of the Supper was enjoined on the disciples. We must, therefore, look for something else to be done by those whom the Savior addressed on that occasion, as the means of giving them life.

Until the ninth century, the bread and wine, used in the Lord's Supper, were regarded as symbolic of the body and blood of the crucified Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. In this century, one Paschasius

Rodbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbey, pretended to explain with precision, and to determine with certainty, the doctrine of the Church on this head; for which purpose he composed, in 831, a treatise concerning the body and blood of Christ. A second addition of this work, revised with care, and considerably augmented, was presented, in 845, to Charles the Bald; and it principally gave occasion to the warm and important controversy that ensued. The doctrine of Paschasius amounted, in general to the two following propositions: first, that, after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present; and, secondly, that the body of Christ thus present in the Eucharist was the same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered on the cross, and was raised from the dead.

This is briefly the history of the origin of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. Considerable opposition was made to it at first, by Rabanus Maurus, Heribald, and others. Charles the Bald, ordered Ratrom, and Johannes Scotus to draw up a clear and rational explication of the doctrine that Rodbert had so egregiously corrupted. The opposition came from the Catholics themselves, when the doctrine was first taught by a Catholic monk. Are we to suppose that the Church, for eight hundred years, was in such ignorance of the Lord's Supper, as the introduction of this dogma implies? If they did not understand it who were instructed by the apostles in person, what new light has been vouchsafed to men in succeeding ages, that they can know more about it?

The discussion of the question of the real presence in the bread and wine continued until the year 1215, when Innocent III. in the Lateran Council placed it among the regular doctrines of the Catholic Church. But even his authority was insufficient to silence all discussion of the question. The doctrine however gained in

popularity, until the consecrated bread came to be regarded as a proper object of worship. Why should it not be worshiped, if it be the very body of Christ, born of Mary, crucified on the hill of Calvary, raised from the dead, and gone into heaven? Here would seem a serious difficulty. If Christ's body was in but one place at a time, in the days of Tiberius Cæsar, how is it that it can now be present, whole and entire in Rome and Cincinnati, at the same moment? Faith cannot take hold of such a statement, unless it be proven by inspired testimony. The most corrupt condition of credulity is alone sufficient to receive it. Accordingly, the celebration of the annual festival of the Holy Sacrament was instituted, by the dream of a devout woman named Juliana, who lived at Liege. She declared, that as often as she addressed herself to God, or to the saints in prayer, she saw the full moon with a small defect or breach in it; and that, having long studied to find out the signification of this strange appearance, she was inwardly informed by the Spirit, that the moon signified the Church, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual festival in honor of the Holy Sacrament. This festival was first ordered in 1246, by Robert, bishop of Liege. Its observance met with opposition for some time, but now has become general with Catholics.

The bread and wine are said to be changed into the real body and blood by the consecration of the priest. With Protestants it is pleaded that the Scriptures say "this is my body—this is my blood." In explaining to his disciples the parable of the tares Jesus said, "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." Any one can see that the words, sower, seed, field, tares, enemy, harvest, and reapers, are used figuratively. The neuter verb in conjunction with words metaphorically used

may be supplied with, *signifies*, or means. This rule, tried with the language used by the Savior in the Supper, makes it easily understood. This is (signifies or means) my body. This is (signifies or means) my blood of the new covenant, shed for many, for the remission of sins.

The divine origin of the ordinance is seen in its simplicity. The perversion of it is seen in the pomp and glitter attendant upon its observance by Romanists. Let us remember its origin is from the Savior, and with solemn and affectionate hearts keep Him in memory evermore,

J. M. HENRY.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. III.

HARRODSBURG, KY., May 13, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—

The last review is at hand. It contains the first chapter of John, and the third criticism of the Sec. of the Bible Union. I notice one error in the translation. In the 9th verse, "who" should be "which." I noticed no other error. I will now reply to the criticism:

The Secretary of the Union says; "They (the Revisors) have not felt at liberty to rewrite any part of the New Testament." Does he mean that they did not feel at liberty to rewrite any part of the Greek? He must mean this, for he immediately adds: "In whatever respect the original varied from what might now be regarded as a good style of writing, they have allowed that variation to appear."

I must be permitted to remark, that, had they attempted to rewrite the Greek, and had their Greek been no better than the English of the Revision, it is certain that

the original writers would never acknowledge it for theirs. It may yet appear that they have written some things which the people will not receive. But to the main point: I shall not notice what he says of the origin of the Greek word *anatassomai*. He denies that it means, "to compose."

1. We shall weigh him against the Rev. Thomas Sheldon Green, whose lexicon is well-known among our brethren. He gives to *anatassomai* the meaning, "To arrange; hence, to compose," and cites Luke i. 1, as an example of its use. What further need have we of testimony?

2. The next word is *diegesis*. This is translated by the common version, "a declaration;" by the Union, a narration; by myself, "a history." We will now weigh the Secretary in the balances with the Rev. Mr. Green, and Edward Robinson. Green gives as the meaning of *diegesis*; "a narration, relation, history," and again cites Luke i. 1. Robinson gives, "narration, history," and cites Luke i. 1. These lexicographers are known to the learned world.

3. The third is the preposition *peri*. The Secretary says: "The Roman version and the Union's Revision both translate this familiar Greek preposition, "concerning." The new translation entirely ignores it."

Here let me say, that I would not hurt the feelings of any one, even the least of all the creatures of God. May the Lord pardon the error into which the Secretary has fallen. "The New Translation," says he, "entirely ignores this preposition." Why, reader, I have translated it by the preposition *of*; "a history of the things." But the Bible Union is not responsible for this word "concerning" which they have written only. The word "concerning" in this instance, is a special revelation to the Bible Union; for Luke was speaking not *of*, but concerning the things. Hear the Secretary.

"The fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, that the Holy Spirit has special reasons for using the word 'concerning' in connection with them."

Here then is a special revelation; for the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning." The Holy Spirit actually used the word "concerning." I have used the word "of," and am wrong, of course. The Secretary tells us a very important secret. We thought that we were dealing with the Revisors of the Bible Union. But no. The Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning." The Holy Spirit is then the author of the word "concerning."

But there is another serious difficulty. The Secretary says: "The fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, etc." Who reads these narrations; what narrations? Why, the narrations that the many undertook to set forth in order, as the Revision says. I ask, where are these narrations? They have no existence now; for they were made by men who received them from the eyewitnesses; and they are lost. But the eyewitnesses, Matthew and John, wrote histories that have come down to us. Luke is not of the many of whom he speaks, as is evident. Yet, "the fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word 'concerning' in connection with them."

Now, as we have the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John only, and have never seen a copy of those narrations which many in Luke's day took in hand to set forth in order; we cannot say whether the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning," or not.

Be that as it may; we shall now weigh the Secretary in the balances against the Bible Union, and produce four instances, in which this preposition, this familiar preposition is, by the Union, translated *of*, as I have translated it. The fate of the Secretary and of the Union is sealed; for, a house divided against itself cannot stand.

1. I quote the Revised Gospels. Matthew xvii, 13. "Then the disciples understood that he spake to them *of* (peri is here) John the Baptist."

2. Luke ii, 33. "And his father and mother marvelled at the things that were spoken of (peri is here) him."

3. Luke ii. 38. "And she coming up at that very time, likewise gave thanks to the Lord, and spake of (peri is here) him to all, etc."

4. John i. 30. "This is he of (peri is here) whom I said."

Here then, are four instances in which the Bible Union has translated this preposition *peri* by the word *of*.

We would respectfully suggest that it is probable that the house of the Bible Union will not stand long; for there is division, four against one.

Lastly: Webster gives, as the meaning of the word *narration*; "2. Relation, story, history, the relation in words or writing of the particulars of any transaction or event, or of any series of transactions or events." After so many words, "*narration*" turns out to be "*history*."

Alas! How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war are broken in their hands!

H. T. ANDERSON.

P. S.—The Secretary says, in No. II,— "Here again, as in the other cases, the attempt to improve upon the Revision results in a departure from the inspired original."

Now, I desire the reader to know that I had finished the translation of the whole New Testament, and had rewritten the gospels and Acts, before I saw the Revised Gospels, or any part of them. My translation is one that is independent of the work of the Union. As to intending an improvement on their work, such a thought never entered my mind. My deliberate judgment is, that such a work as the Revised Gospels can never undergo improvement. It must be thrown aside, and a new work be made from beginning to end. I have not borrowed, nor would I borrow, one word or sentence from that work. I have resources of which the Bible Union has no knowledge, and can never have. Let the reader know, then, that I am not to make an improvement on their work.

I desire to say, further, that what I say

in these replies, I say deliberately and with meaning. Far be it from me to aim any thing at *persons* as *such*. I would not wound any *person*. But their work is public property, and I deal with them and their work as such men and such works are dealt with in all times and places. When the wound is incurable, the limb must be amputated.

H. T. ANDERSON.

MUSINGS.

BY WILLIAM PALMER.

With a mind ever roving—a heart ever loving—
A pen ever ready to write;
I clasp it with gladness, to banish all sadness,
To soothe every sorrow—annihilate madness;
To brighten to-morrow by driving away
The clouds that darken my pathway to-day,
I muse on the hour when trouble and strife
Claimed only a tithe of my then happy life;
When the song of the bird seemed so cheerful and gay,
That I dreamed not that Summer would soon pass
away;
When I ran through the garden and played by the
stream,
Throughout the bright day that has fled like a dream.

Not fled—no, never!—while memory clings
To the loved and the lovely of time's fleeting things,
The past will return, and in spite of to-day,
Draw the mind to the scenes once so cheerful and gay;
Again place beside us the friends that forever
Have left us to cross the Stygian River.

How dazzling to-morrow—how fleeting to-day,
Time waits not for school-boys to finish their play;
His march is onward, his pathway is bright,
And leads to a world of endless delight.
Our toys and trifles we ought to throw down,
And strive to obtain a glittering crown—

The crown that awaits the pure and the just,
After the spirit has fled from its temple of dust,
When sorrow and death has ended the strife,
Which we must endure throughout carnal life;
This soon will be ended—the victory won,
And heaven will welcome each prodigal son.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. VII.

MESSRS. EDITORS:

The New Translation again omits all notice of the Greek word "PERI" in the 4th verse of the 1st chapter of Luke.

The Common Version has: "THE CERTAINTY OF THOSE THINGS."

The Bible Union Revision corrects it thus: "THE CERTAINTY CONCERNING THOSE THINGS."

The New Translation restores the error, and puts it: "THE CERTAINTY OF THE THINGS."

The difference in meaning may be seen by the following illustration:

James Adger was alleged to have murdered John Thomas. A writer traced out the circumstances of the case, and wrote to a friend upon the subject, in order that he "might know the certainty *concerning* the alleged murder." Every reader readily understands the difference between such a form of expression, and the statement that he wrote to a friend in order that he "might know the certainty *of* the alleged murder."

The certainty of an event, and the certainty concerning an event, are perfectly distinct ideas. In the present instance the Holy Spirit has selected the latter mode of expression, and no translator has any right to substitute another.

The Common Version and the Revision both say: "THOSE THINGS WHEREIN."

The New Translation has the passage: "THE THINGS ON WHICH."

In each case, the words "THOSE THINGS" and "The things" are supplied, and each translator is left to his own judgment as to which form of phraseology may be most appropriate. But this remark will not apply to the words "WHEREIN" and "ON WHICH."

The whole of the last clause in the New Translation reads thus: "ON WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED."

The difference between the Revision and the New Translation is particularly that between "In" and "On." The question is, whether it is more correct to say, "To instruct in things" or "To instruct on things." Had Theophilus been instructed *in* the things which Christians believed, or had he been instructed *on* them? A pupil may be instructed on a musical instrument, but we do not say that a man is instructed on the facts of a case, but in the facts of a case.—Instruction may be founded on certain things, whether facts or principles, but this is altogether different from instruction in those facts and principles. In the present case, Luke was about to furnish to his friend a narration concerning certain things in which he had already been instructed, and this narration was to enable him to know the certainty concerning those things. They were things about which he had been informed, that is, in which he had been instructed. In such a connection, to say that he had been instructed "on" them, is not good English, and does not express the idea of the original.

We have now finished the examination of the introduction to the Gospel of Luke. It comprises only four short verses. To recapitulate all the errors which have there been found in the New Translation, would occupy more space than you or your readers would be willing to allow. I will not aver that more could not have been crowded into so small a space; but I doubt whether there are many examples in translations of sacred Scripture, where faults so numerous, so striking, so varied in character, and so palpable, can be found in the same compass. My chief difficulty in exposing them has consisted in the necessity of explaining their nature to the ordinary English reader. Had I been concerned only with scholars, the task would have been comparatively easy. I would then have needed only to direct attention to the facts, and the conclusions would have been inevitable.

What scholar, for instance, would have mistaken an active verb for a passive, or have doubted between the object and the

subject of a transitive verb? What scholar would have needed an argument to convince him that in English a present tense ought not to be subordinate to a past, or a past to a present? What scholar would require to be shown that, in Greek, the presence of "Peri" between a noun and a genitive indicates a looser connection than if the noun governed the genitive? What scholar would not immediately discern the difference between "tracing" and "knowing?"—What scholar would not be struck with the impropriety and unreasonableness of translating "ANATAXASTHAI" by the English word "COMPOSE?"

And what scholar would need to be told that a narration "concerning" things is not necessarily a history of those things?

The greatest cause of surprise is, that all these, and the other numerous errors already pointed out, should have occurred in the beginning of the book,—the Introduction to a Gospel,—selected as a specimen of the merits of the New Translation. It is reasonable to suppose, that this part of the work has received as much study and polish as any other part. From the numerous changes made in these four verses, it is evident that it has been a special subject of consideration. No pains have been spared to improve upon the Bible Union's Revision. Manifestly, the troops thus placed in the front of the battle are picked troops, or at least they are considered not inferior to any of the rest. What, then, must be the character of the whole work, when the specimen thus prominently exhibited is found so utterly erroneous and defective?

If the glaring defects exposed consisted only in the ungrammatical character of the English employed, it might be imagined that a Greek scholar had devoted so much attention to that ancient language that he had neglected his vernacular. Or, had there appeared a perfect knowledge of the construction of our own language, and the faults have been confined to mistakes concerning the meaning of the Greek, we might have supposed, that some polished English writer had attempted to improve

the English construction, while his knowledge of the original was too imperfect to protect him from errors regarding the meaning.

But neither of these conjectures is admissible. While ignorance of the Greek is apparent, inaccuracy in English is also manifest. The rules of grammar in both languages are violated. The meaning is perverted, not from intention, (for I have no reason to doubt that the intention was to give the truth) but from a want of familiar and accurate acquaintance with the original; in other words, from ignorance of the Greek language. The English is faulty, from a want of correct information about the best usages of our own tongue.

In summing up, then, what I conceive to have been accomplished in the examination of the introduction, I express the opinion that I have done more than was reasonably to have been expected from my letter to the Editor. I have not only shown that "Bro. Anderson has departed from the original," but that he has deteriorated the English.—If I have spoken with severity of the faults which he has committed, I have been compelled to do it by their nature and their enormity. Perhaps, if they had occurred in the translation of any other than sacred Scripture, I might have been more lenient. But the Word of God is to me too precious to regard with indifference any deviation from its obvious meaning in a professed translation of its pure and momentous teachings.

If it can be proved that the Bible Union's Revision has in any case departed from this meaning, it is my purpose to do all in my power to bring it back to the truth. Therefore, if, in the examination of these four verses, I had found a single instance in which the New Translation had improved upon our revision, I would have noted and acknowledged it, and have called the attention of the Final Committee to it.

But the contrary has appeared. Every change has proved a fault; every variation an error. Instead of an improvement, the New Translation seems to me an utter fail-

ure—vastly inferior, not only to the Bible Union's Revision, but even to the Common English Version.

I will now proceed to examine the verses that follow the introduction.

Affectionately,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. V.

THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Every farmer knows that it is necessary to prepare the ground before he plants the seed. And it was known in Heaven that before the Seed or *Word* of the Kingdom of Heaven should be sown, the minds of men must be prepared to receive it. This is why that extraordinary preacher, John the Baptist, came, as a fore-runner of Jesus the Christ. Even the Prophets seem to have understood the necessity of preparing the people for the coming of the Lord. For Isaiah, whose language is quoted by Mathew, Mark and Luke, says. "The voice of one proclaiming in the wilderness;" (or country districts;) "Prepare a way for the Lord, make his paths straight, every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be levelled; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

The sacred historian does not tell us in what year of the world, or of the Jewish Era, this important personage appeared. But he states, that in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, when Pontius Pilate was Procurator of Judea, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and the province of Tra-

chonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene; and when Annas and Caiaphas were the high priests, the word of God came, in the wilderness, to John, the son of Zachariah.— And he went through all the country along the Jordan proclaiming the immersion of reformation for the remission of sins;" saying to the people: "Reform, for the Reign of Heaven is approaching."

John must have created quite a sensation, for besides the peculiar character of his preaching, he "wore clothing of camel's hair, and a leather belt around his waist; and his food was locusts and wild honey." He no doubt had also a long beard, and must have presented such an appearance as would attract the attention of people.— Such, at least, was the effect of his appearance and preaching, that "all the country" (that is, the country-people) of Judea, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, came to him, and were immersed by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins."

I will here remark, that the circumstantial manner in which Luke fixes the date of John's receiving his commission to preach, strikes me as an evidence of truthfulness and candor, such as ought to convince any one that the historian was well acquainted with public affairs, and that he wrote with a consciousness that the matters he was relating no one dare to dispute. If he had been fabricating a history, why expose himself to detection by alluding so particularly to Tiberius Cæsar, emperor of Rome; to Pontius Pilate and Herod Antipas, noted characters of that time; and to Annas and Caiaphas, prominent men among the Jews?

I will further detain the reader with a few observations on John's preaching. It is not doubted by any student of Sacred History, that John proclaimed the near approach of the Reign of Heaven. But it is not so generally believed that he immersed all the people of Judea and Jerusalem in the river Jordan; though all the circumstances related lead us to the conclusion that this was the act performed. It is contended by many that immersion is not for

the remission of sins; though taught as plainly as anything in the Scriptures. But these points have been often ably discussed, and I do not feel disposed to weary and disgust the reader, by going over the ground which has been gone over hundreds of times.

But having preferred the word *reformation* to *repentance*, I wish to give my reasons for doing so. The word "repentance" does not express the idea which is evidently designed to be conveyed by the sacred penman. For John certainly did not simply tell the Jews to *be sorry for their sins*, which is the meaning of *repent*. He wished them to *forsake* their sins, and to *reform* their lives; for he said to the multitudes of Scribes and Pharisees, who flocked to him to be immersed: "Offspring of vipers, who has warned you to fly from the coming vengeance? Produce fruits worthy of reformation, and do not say within yourselves: 'We have Abraham for our father;' for I tell you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. And even now the ax is lying at the root of the trees. Every tree, therefore, that does not produce good fruit, is cut down and thrown into the fire."

"And the multitudes asked him, saying: 'What, then, shall we do?' He, answering, said to them: 'He that has two coats, let him impart to him who has none; and let him who has victuals do the same.' Publicans also came to be immersed; and they said to him: 'Teacher, what shall we do?' And he said to them: 'Do not exact more than what is appointed you.' And soldiers also asked him: 'And what must we do?'—He answered: 'Do violence to no one, nor accuse any falsely; and be contented with your wages.'"

No one, who carefully examines the above quotations, can, it seems to me, fail to see that John preached reformation. And that immersion for the remission of sins was in order to reformation, appears to me equally plain. The common version—"baptism of repentance," is not good English.

JOHN'S TESTIMONY CONCERNING CHRIST.

The testimony of such a man as John the Baptist must be very convincing, and have a great deal of weight with the people. It was important, then that he should be a witness, and testify concerning him who was to come after him, and whose way he was preparing. John the Apostle regarded him as a witness; he says: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came as a witness to bear testimony concerning the LIGHT, that through him all might believe. He was not the Light; but he came to testify concerning the Light."

"And as the people were in suspense concerning John, and all were reasoning within themselves whether he were not himself the Christ, John answered them all, and said: 'I indeed immerse you in water; but One mightier than I is coming, whose shoelatchet I am not worthy to untie; he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit and fire:—whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor, and will gather the wheat into his granary; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.'

It happened that while all the people were being immersed, Jesus also was immersed; and while praying, the Heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in a bodily form, like a dove; and there came a voice out of Heaven:—'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am delighted.' And Jesus was himself about thirty years of age."

Such is John's testimony, according to Luke. But the Apostle John furnishes us with the following interesting account of incidents which seem to have occurred immediately after the immersion of Jesus, in which the Immerser gives important testimony concerning the Anointed One. He writes:

"Now this is the testimony of John:

When the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, 'Who art thou?' he confessed, and did not deny; but con-

fessed,—‘I am not the Christ.’ And they asked him: ‘Who then? Art thou Elijah?’ He says, ‘I am not.’ ‘Art thou the Prophet?’ and he answered, ‘No.’ They said therefore to him: ‘Who art thou then? that we may give an answer to those who sent us. What dost thou say of thyself?’ He said: ‘I am the voice of one proclaiming in the wilderness: “Make straight the way of the Lord,” as said the Prophet Isaiah.’

And those who had been sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said: ‘Why then dost thou immerse, if thou art not the Christ, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet?’ John answered them, saying: ‘I immerse in water; but there is one standing among you, whom you do not know; it is he that comes after me, the latchet of whose sandal I am not worthy to loose.’—These things took place at Bethany beyond the Jordan, where John was immersing.

On the morrow he sees Jesus coming to him, and says: ‘See the Lamb of God, that takes away the sin of the world!’ This is he of whom I said: After me comes a man who is preferred to me; for he was before me. I did not know him; but that he might be made known to Israel, I came immersing in water.’

And John testified, saying: ‘I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven, like a dove, and it remained upon him. And I did not know him; but he that sent me to immerse in water said to me: ‘The one upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descend and remaining on him, is he who immerses in the Holy Spirit.’ And having seen, I have borne testimony that this is the Son of God.”

WM. PINKERTON.

Lynchburgh, Ohio, April 26, 1863.

AGENCY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CONVERSION.

Of the many religious delusions which afflict humanity, I regard that of an abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, by *impact* upon the human heart, in order to conversion, the most dangerous and detrimental to the interests of those who desire to be saved from sin in this life and in that which is to come. It is difficult, successfully, to oppose this delusion to the satisfaction of those who, through false teaching, have imbibed it. The sacredness of the subject is of itself an obstacle nearly insurmountable in an effort to introduce correct sentiments into the honest and candid mind. Any one who has proper respect for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit shudders at the thought of resisting any of the three. The Father has revealed himself in the great work of creation, and the still greater of human redemption in the gift of his Son to the sin-cursed world. He revealed himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in short, he has revealed himself in *words* in the Bible.—The Son was made manifest in the flesh in the form of a servant and as an expiatory sacrifice died on the Roman cross. Hence, people are not expecting the Father nor the Son to operate by *contact* or *impact* upon their minds and hearts, but they do expect the Holy Spirit to thus operate. The great difficulty surrounding the subject is to discriminate betwixt the Spirit's and that of some other influence. Hence the mistakes that are daily made by the really candid and honest. The difficulty had its origin in a false position or proposition, that is, the Holy Spirit operates on the mind and heart independently of any of the external senses, there being no criterion by which to determine *when* the Spirit operates except that one which is first submitted to the reason and judgment for a decision as to its infallibility. This rule or criterion is examined by a comparison of such facts and

truths as enter the minds through the media of the senses. It is impossible to depart from such rule without exposure constantly to imposition. In the year 1831 I had a short conversation with a Mormon preacher in regard to the Divine authenticity of the book of Mormon. He affirmed that, in answer to prayer, God, by the Holy Spirit impressed his mind with the truth of the Book of Mormon; the question then arose how did he know that the impression was from God? Why was it not just as proper to refer it to *Ho Satanus*—the Adversary of God and man? He could not prove that the impression was by the Holy Spirit. I affirmed the proposition that it was made by the Devil and proved it by showing that the book of Mormon contradicted the *Bible*, therefore the Holy Spirit did not make the impression, but that Satanic influence, which *allows* a man to believe a lie, without evidence, that he may be damned because he takes delight in unrighteousness. Again I proved the proposition by showing that if the *Holy Spirit* had enabled Smith to translate from the golden plates, he would have been enabled to translate into good English, whereas, the book abounds with “down East”—real Yankee provincialisms. Again, I proved it by showing that there was a palpable error in that the book declares that the plates had lain in the ground 1200 years, and was a record of the man Nephi and his descendants and God’s dealings with them on this Western Continent. The descendants of Nephi cannot be the Europeans and their descendants because the white inhabitants of this Continent have all come here since the year 1492; therefore the Spirit should have enabled Jo. Smith to make the translation into the language of the real descendants of Nephi. Yet are there thousands of Mormons who are honest and sincere, believing themselves to be influenced by the Holy Spirit. Again, about the year 1828 Elias Hicks divided the Quakers, he cut them in two, declaring that he was moved and influenced by the Holy Spirit to bring the society back to primitive Quakerism;

one half the society believed they were influenced by the same Holy Spirit to oppose Hicks. The controversy was carried on by the respective parties, each believing themselves to be influenced by the same Holy Spirit, until their difficulty had to be adjudicated in the courts of civil law to determine which party was the true primitive Quakers that the church property might be awarded to the proper owners. Who doubted the sincerity of either party?

Again, in some religious meetings, this Spirit makes all who come under its influence Methodists, in other instances all Lutherans, in others all Presbyterians, in others all are made Baptists. In some places this Spirit produces much noise and no little confusion, in other cases everything is calm and orderly, sometimes, as is the case at Camp-Meetings, at the sound of a trumpet, blown by some fat captain of these gymnastics, the Spirit is silenced and the subject of its influence becomes calm and serene.—Again, under its influence one man “called and sent” preaches one thing, while another “called” one, contradicts the former in regard to doctrines and practices deemed of primary importance. What man of good sense and well balanced mind can look upon these things and attribute any of the effects to the Holy Spirit’s influence? No marvel that there are infidels in the land; yet the infidel has no justification for his infidelity in these absurdities and aberrations from the path of sober sense and sound reason.

The questions now arise: does the Holy Spirit operate on the human mind? If so, how? We affirm that it operates through the word of truth. First, we discriminate between *inspiration* and the ordinary influences of the Spirit on the mind. The confounding of these has done much mischief. For instance, Christ said, “It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go away I will send him unto you; and when he is come he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment.” * * *—“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is

come he will guide you into all truth." John's testimony, 16th ch. 7-13 verses. There are myriads of people, even D. D's., who apply this portion of Scripture to the world of man, indiscriminately; may we be saved entirely from such doctors. To whom was the Savior speaking? Certainly to the Apostles and to no one else, nor is the promise of sending the Comforter, as given here, applicable to any others.

"It is expedient for you"—for whom?—those to whom he was speaking. Was he speaking to the whole world? Certainly not. Was he not speaking to the Apostles? Certainly he was. Was this promise to them fulfilled? It certainly was, on the day of Pentecost, see Acts 2d ch. Had the Savior gone away? He had. Did the *paracletos*—comforter—come to the Apostles? he did. Did he reprove (convince) the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment? He did. How did he do it? by taking the things of the Savior and by showing them to the Apostles. Then, what did the Apostles do? they spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance; to whom did they speak? To the vast multitude which had come to the feast of Pentecost from nearly all the provinces of the Roman Empire. The Apostles were baptized, immersed, in the Holy Spirit, and every man heard them speak in his own tongue wherein he was born. The Apostles were under the influence of the Spirit in a miraculous manner, the people who heard them speak were under the influence of the Holy Spirit also, but that influence was through the media of hearing and seeing. "He has shed forth that which ye now see and hear." The Apostles were Christ's ambassadors, and were qualified as such by the *miraculous* impartation of the Holy Spirit. The people who came within hearing distance of the Apostles came under the Spirit's influence, through the sense of hearing. The Apostles were enabled to speak words by the suggestion of the Spirit, and the people *heard* as they would hear any other words, see 1st Cor. 2d ch. beginning at the 9th verse. Also see 1st Thes. 2d ch. 13th

verse, 2d Thes. 2d ch. 13-15 verses.—These passages and many others of like import go to show that the influence of the Spirit on the mind is exerted through the instrumentality of the word spoken by the inspired Apostles. This view of the question, which is, doubtless, the only rational and tenable view, does not make it any the less the influence of the Holy Spirit that it operates through the medium of the word of truth,—the gospel of salvation. Paul said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth"—Rom. 1st ch. and 16th verse. It is the power of God, &c." not a power, but *the* power.—Paul again says, "though ye have many instructors, yet have ye not many fathers, for in my bonds have I begotten you through the gospel." Peter says, "being born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible seed, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."

The world's Maker is the Bible's author, and there is no way of avoiding religious delusion but by observing closely the teachings of the Book of Books, examining it closely by applying those principles of interpretation which we would to any other book, of equal antiquity, avoiding all superstitious notions in the perusal of it.—There is no more *piety* in the reading of the Bible than in the reading of any other book. We read it for the sake of the facts, truths, commands, precepts, promises and threats which it contains, with the understanding that God is its Author.

The question in regard to the Holy Spirit is about as follows, namely: By the inspiration of the Holy Spirit the prophets taught their Countrymen and predicted future events. "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." "The Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ and the glory following these." The fulfill-

ment of these predictions proved their Divinity. When Christ was on earth he wrought miracles by the Spirit, for to him it was given without measure. When he went back to Heaven he sent the Holy Spirit to inspire the Apostles and to enable them to work miracles; they preached the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; the word preached was heard and the hearers brought under the influence of the *ideas* conveyed by the words; those who believed and obeyed the word, received the gift of the Holy Spirit, better known by its fruits than in any other way. "The fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness, patience, faith against such there is no law. Gal. 6th ch. But there is not an intimation in the Bible, that the Spirit operates by impact upon the sinner to convert him and make him a Christian. "But because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." A departure from the plain teachings of the Bible on this subject is the primary cause of the many errors and delusions into which honest and sincere persons are fallen. I once had a long conversation with the Shaking Quakers in the County of Warren, Ohio. They thought they were in the resurrection state and delivered from the dominion of the flesh. Yet they danced as lustily as men and women in the flesh, and perspired as freely. They claimed to be under the influence of the Spirit and solicited us very cordially to remain with them over Lord's day, and they would afford us the rare opportunity of witnessing the expulsion of old diabolos from their meeting house. Joanna Southcoat also, and her followers were, in their own estimation under the influence of the Holy Spirit. The only remedies to be applied to these religious maladies, is to apply "to God and the word of his grace, which is able to build us up and give us a place among them that are sanctified." "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past by the prophets, to the fathers, hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son."

"That which thou hast given unto me I have given unto them, (the Apostles, see John 17th ch.) and they have received the word * * * Holy Father bless all them who shall believe on me through their word."— There is no safety in being governed by anything but the word of God. But with what brazen effrontery men of wealth and learning, and consequently of influence, will depart from the plainest teachings of God's word, and yet pretend to be governed by it. For instance, who can read Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus and not know that there were a *plurality* of Bishops (English overseers) in every city or local church, also a plurality of Deacons (English servants of the church.) Now men say, with perfect *sang froid*, that one Bishop may oversee a thousand churches. I am sometimes almost discouraged. But, "truth is mighty and will prevail." In all your gettings get truth.

N. J. MITCHELL.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. VIII.

MESSRS. EDITORS:

In the fifth verse of the first chapter of Luke, the Common Version and the Union's Revision have: "THE COURSE OF ABIJAH."

The New Translation has: "THE CLASS OF ABIJAH."

Which is right—COURSE, or CLASS?

The original word is, EPHEMERIAS, the genitive of EPHEMERIA. It is composed of the preposition EPI, ON or UPON, and the noun HEEMERA, DAY. Our best lexicographers translate it: "A DAILY ORDER, or COURSE."

We are informed in Chron. viii; 14, that Solomon "appointed, according to the order of David, his father, the courses of the

priests to their service, and the Levites to their charges, to praise and minister before the priests, *as the duty of every day required.*" In strict accordance with this language, Zachariah; belonging to a certain course of priests, that is, priests whose course of service was fixed by the course of days, "EXECUTED THE PRIEST'S OFFICE BEFORE GOD IN THE ORDER OF HIS COURSE." There is nothing here, either in the origin of the word, or its definition, or in the appointment by Solomon, to justify the change of the word "COURSE" for "CLASS." The latter word does not do justice to the original, and does not indicate the priestly usage.

In the 7th verse there is another variation.

The Common Version says: "AND THEY BOTH WERE NOW WELL STRICKEN IN YEARS."

The Bible Union's Revision: "AND THEY BOTH WERE NOW FARADVANCED IN YEARS."

The New Translation says: "AND THEY WERE BOTH ADVANCED IN YEARS."

The Greek word, thus variously translated, is "PROBEEKOTES," a perfect participle from the verb compounded of PRO and BAINO, TO GO, TO ADVANCE.

The compound verb is used in such connections as the following: "The stars are far gone in heaven." "The night is wearing," etc. The connection in which it here stands leaves no room to doubt that it indicates that the parties were *very old*.

The question is then before us, whether this is better expressed by the words "advanced in years" or "far advanced in years." We think that both the circumstances of the case and the Greek word here employed denote more than is necessarily implied by "advanced in years." This phrase is rather indefinite in character, and may with propriety be applied, as it is in common usage, either to the stage of life immediately succeeding the prime, or to a more advanced period.

The participle, BEEKOTES, in the same connection, might with propriety be translated "ADVANCED." But the participle

"PRO" prefixed to it, requires something more decided. In such a position, it is of the nature of an *intensitive*. The idea then cannot be fully expressed by "ADVANCED." But the phrase "FAR ADVANCED" exactly meets the case, and is the proper translation of the Greek.

"NOW" is employed in the Revision with the words "FAR ADVANCED," but is omitted in the New Translation. This is another decided error on the part of the latter. Every Greek scholar will understand the reason why "NOW" is here used, when he is referred to the fact, that the word "PROBEEKOTES" is a perfect participle, joined to the imperfect tense of the verb "EIMI." The expression is "EESAN PROBEEKOTES." The verb is in a past tense, but the perfect participle brings up the idea to the present, and holds it there. This is expressed in our language by translating the verb in the past tense, and placing the adverb of present time "NOW" before the participle. The man who does not understand this usage, is very poorly qualified to be a translator.

The next change is as follows:

The Common Version and the Revision agree in saying: "WHILE HE EXECUTED THE PRIEST'S OFFICE."

The New Translation substitutes: "WHILE HE OFFICIATED AS PRIEST."

The book is designed for the people, and therefore, the more simple and intelligible it can be made, the more useful it is likely to be. Very few readers of the English Bible find difficulty in understanding the phrase "he executed the priest's office."—To execute an office is language with which common people are familiar. But to "OFFICIATE" is almost, as respects the common people, a new word, and may be regarded as technical. Ordinary people never use it, and we doubt whether one in a hundred understands its meaning. So far as such words are introduced into a translation where words, more simple and more familiar to the people, will equally express the meaning, just so far the truth is obscured and concealed.

"IN THE ORDER OF HIS COURSE," say the Common Version and the Revision.

The New Translation changes this to:—"IN THE ORDER OF HIS CLASS."

We have already shown that the original word means "course," and not "class." The use of the word, class, in this connection, is very unfortunate, as it entirely excludes the idea of the course of priests corresponding with the course of days, and confines the attention to a class or fixed body of men.

The Common Version and the New Translation agree in saying: "ACCORDING TO THE CUSTOM OF THE PRIEST'S OFFICE, HIS LOT WAS TO BURN INCENSE WHEN HE WENT INTO THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD."

The Bible Union's Revision says: "IT FELL TO HIS LOT, ACCORDING TO THE CUSTOM OF THE PRIEST'S OFFICE, TO BURN INCENSE, GOING INTO THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD."

Any one who carefully examines the Greek, will see that the latter has the true meaning of the original. In the New Translation, the lot of Zachariah, that is, the duty which fell to him by lot, is "to burn incense when he went into the temple." According to this, he was not obliged to go into the temple, and therefore was not obliged to burn incense. His duty was simply when he went in, that is, if he ever went in, then to burn incense. But the construction of the original makes it evident that it was his duty, which had fallen to him by lot, to go into the temple and burn incense. His going into the temple did not depend on his option. It was his duty. It had fallen to him by lot, according to the custom of the priest's office, to do it. It was as much a part of his duty to go into the temple as to burn the incense. "It fell to his lot" to do it. That is, he drew by lot this duty. And it was in accordance with the custom of the priest's office to draw lots in respect to the duty. All this is expressed in the Bible Union's Revision simply, intelligibly and accurately. But it is not so expressed in the New Translation. On the contrary, this has recurred in the present passage, to

all the errors of the Common Version, which rendered necessary the revision of this passage. So, instead of being an improvement, the New Translation is, throughout this passage, a mere restoration of erroneous translation.

Affectionately,

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. IV.

HARRODSBURG, KY., May 23, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—

I know no good reason why I should not reply to the Cor. Sec. of the Bible Union, by presenting some portions of their gospels in which English words are so arranged as, either to convey no idea at all, or one not authorized by the Greek. I have already replied sufficiently to his charge.—Not, however, intending to let his criticisms pass without notice in future, I now present some portions of their gospels, that the reader may judge of the competency of the men either as translators, (revisors I should say,) or as critics. The first that I shall notice is found Mark xiv; 21. It reads thus:

"The Son of man indeed goes, as it is written of him; but woe to that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed! It were good for him if that man had not been born."

I confess my astonishment on reading this. The Savior is made to say that it were good for him if Judas had not been born. The pronoun *him*, in the last clause, stands for the Son of man. Grammatically, it can stand for no other person. Now read the Common version, and see how obviously different in sense, and yet how obviously the sense. "Good were it for that man if he had never been born." The law—that pronouns should stand as near as possible

to the nouns which they represent—seems to be disregarded by these Revisors.

I know how they would reply to me. They would say: We have followed the letter of the Greek text. And I would say to them, that they have not given to the English reader the thought that is in the Greek text. What is the great law of translation? Is it not this? Give to him who reads, the exact thought of the original. Certainly. But a version according to the letter often presents a false idea to the reader. As proof of this statement, take a second instance from the Revised Gospels. Luke i, 54. 55. which reads thus:

“He helped Israel his servant, to remember mercy (as he spake unto our fathers) for Abraham and for his seed forever.”

Here is English that is to me incomprehensible. I candidly confess that I know not what it means. The infinitive *mnesthe-nai*, is translated literally, “to remember” without the least regard to the sense which Luke would express. Does Luke intend to say, that the Lord helped Israel his servant to remember mercy for Abraham? If so, why put a semicolon after the word servant, as they have done? But what sense is there in Israel’s remembering mercy for Abraham? The common reader will say that there is none. Truly, there is no sense in the sentence as the Revisors have it. But they have followed the exact letter of the Greek text. Yes; and have given to the common reader no idea at all. It would be well for all revisors and translators to study Paul: and I will here quote one sentence from him which is equal, and superior indeed, to all laws of all societies. Read it and think of it, ye men of Gotham.

“There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaks a barbarian, and he that speaks shall be a barbarian to me.” 1st Cor. xiv. 10. 11.

According to these words of Paul, the Revisors are certainly barbarians to me, for I know not the meaning of their words.

The two instances, given above, are specimens of their work, made according to a strict observance of the letter of the Greek text. Let the reader know, from these specimens, how competent they are as Revisors. If they cannot give the sense of the original, they are not competent as critics. But another specimen or two and we turn to Criticism, No. 4. In Matthew xii. 10, we have this remarkable improvement on the Common Version: “And behold there was a man having his hand withered.” This, I suppose, is another version according to the letter. We are taught that the man was, then and there, undergoing an operation—having his hand withered. Let us compare with this version of the Union, such a sentence as this:—“There was a man having his arm amputated.” Can any one fail to understand the meaning? How easy to have said; “There was a man who had a withered hand.”

I now give an instance of rough and inelegant phraseology, and the reader will not be surprised that the Secretary makes apologies for want of smoothness and elegance.

“If a man say to his father or his mother. It is Corban (that is, a gift) whatsoever thou mightest be profited with from me, [he shall be free.”] Mark vii. 11.

Now, the Secretary says that the truth requires such phraseology as this. We will quote his words:

“The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is our motto. If it were not, we could easily make the phraseology of the Revision more smooth and elegant.”

This is the apology for such English as we have in the sentences quoted above. I will say, that I give them credit for all that they profess. But I must rather think that two things are wanting to them. 1. Knowledge of the Greek text; 2. Knowledge of the English language. For I can easily understand, that there may exist a sincere devotion to truth, and yet but little acquaintance with Greek or English.

As an instance of want of knowledge, let me give, in addition to the above, Matthew

xii. 20. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall be not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory."

In this—"till he send forth judgment unto victory"—is an evident want of knowledge. In the first place, there is no sense in the English words—"send forth judgment unto victory." In the next place, had the revisors used proper diligence, they could have made a translation of this passage that is smooth and elegant, full of beautiful truth, and in perfect harmony with all the facts of the gospel. The Secretary may see this translation at some future time.

Since writing the above, I have read Criticism No. 4. I must acknowledge my indebtedness to the Secretary for the much good that he is doing in behalf of my version. He will certainly prove that it is one of the best of versions. It was my wish that it should be subjected to severe trial; and the Cor. Sec. of the Bible Union has tried his strength. So far he has done good in showing that it is invulnerable.

What I have written above, may be regarded as a reply to him, that is designed to unfold, in part, some of the laws which govern the Revisors. As to the word "*epideper*," which I have translated by the English word "since" I have Green, Robinson, and Liddell and Scott, for authority; and Webster gives to it the very sense in which I use it, *because that: this being the fact that*. As to the pronoun *them*, it is very certain that Luke wrote something; and I have given the true sense, by expressing this pronoun *them* in English, the word in Greek not being expressed, but understood, as every Greek reader knows.

The Revison has—"To write to them in order"—If we ask the meaning of these words, we are told, that they are "the literal meaning of the Greek." But what do they mean in English? Luke wrote something; what did he write? Why, "he wrote in order," says the Secretary. What, I ask, did he write in order. The Secretary replies—"To write to thee in order." Well, then, all that we can learn from the Revis-

ion is that it seemed good to Luke "to write in order." But whether he wrote in order, merely, or wrote the things of which he had obtained exact information, in order, or consecutively, can never be learned from the Revised Gospels. But Luke wrote, in order, or consecutively, the things, of which he had obtained exact information, and these things I have expressed by the pronoun *them*, thus—"It seemed good to me also, having obtained exact information of all things from the very first, to write *them* in order for you, Most excellent Theophilus."

The Secretary resorts to a quotation from the apostle John, in order to hide the bareness of the revised gospels. Such things only strengthen me, but expose and weaken his criticisms.

On *Thou* and *you* I will now remark, that in my version they have been used with a deliberate purpose. *Thou* and *thee* always have a meaning, in my version, in the Revised gospels they mean nothing more than a Quaker peculiarity. I use *Thou* and *thee* when God is addressed; also, in all cases of address to the Savior, when the persons, speaking to him, intend to be reverential. Even the demons say *Thou*; because the demons believe and tremble. But the Devil says not *Thou*, because he has no reverence for Jesus. *You* occurs, in all instances of ordinary conversation, or address from man to man: also, of addresses to the Savior, when no reverence is intended by the person or persons speaking. This is the style of the year 1863, the style of *the people* for whom this version is made. The people in praying to God, and in invoking Christ, say *Thou* and *thee*. In speaking to one another they say *you*.

We shall continue to examine the gospels, and intend our examinations as replies, in part, to the Secretary.

H. T. ANDERSON.

P. S. Lest the Secretary may think that I have not sufficiently noticed his remarks on the word "since" I will add a few words. He says; "'Since' only denotes when the event occurred." "Forasmuch as" refers to a

cause or reason for what follows. Again; "The Greek word, *Epeideper*, has both uses." Now let the reader notice that the Sec. says, as quoted just above; "'Since' only denotes when the event occurred."

This being so, the Bible Union can never use the word "since" in the sense, in which I have used it, which is, as given above by Webster:—"because that." If, however, I give at least three instances, in which the Bible Union has used the word "since" in this sense, then what becomes of the words of the Secretary—" 'Since' only denotes when the event occurred."

1. "It is not lawful to put them in the treasury, *since* it is the price of blood." Matth 27. 6.

2. "And evening having now come, *since* it was the preparation." Mark xv. 42.

3. "The Jews therefore, *since* it was the preparation, etc." John xix. 31.

What now becomes of the Secretary's affirmation that the word, "Since only denotes when the event occurred." I am not now speaking of the Greek word *epeideper*. I have already given full authority for my translation of that word. I am trying the Secretary's affirmation on the meaning of the English word, "since;" and this I do by the use of it in the Bible Union gospels. Here then are three witnesses from his own Revision, which testify against his affirmation that, "'Since' only denotes when the event occurred." When the very book, which he attempts to defend, testifies against him, it is time for him to do one of two things; either employ a critic, that understands what words mean; or say that his book is not defensible.

H. T. ANDERSON.

CORRECTION.

I have examined the manuscript furnished by Bro. Anderson of his translation of the Introduction to Luke's Gospel, and find a typographical error in the following sentence, "that you may know the certainty of the things *on* which you have been instructed."

It stands in the manuscript, and should have been printed, "*in* which," etc. Bro.

Wyckoff's attention is hereby drawn to this matter, that he may, at the earliest possible day, make the necessary correction in his criticism on "*on*," in the above connection. G. W. R.

SACRIFICE.

In the curse which was pronounced upon the serpent, then recognized as the instrument of Satan, for the deception he had practiced on the woman, the restoration of man to the favor of God again is faintly foreshadowed. The enmity which was now established between the descendants of the woman and of the serpent, it was enigmatically declared, should finally culminate in a contest in which the serpent, the Devil, should be completely overcome and destroyed by one of her descendants, and man recovered from the ruin which he had brought on him. This is the first intimation we have, dark and obscure as it may be, of the ultimate purpose of God in regard to the future of man.

In order to accomplish this great object. God at once instituted a remedial system, in the elements of which we discover those means which God has ordained to secure this end. These were, 1, Sacrifice, 2, the Altar, 3, the Priesthood. These elements are essential to a remedial system. They contemplate every difficulty and meet every want involved in a system that proposes to deliver man from sin, and yet destroy without mercy the evil that occasioned his ruin.

There were, no doubt, wise and profound reasons why God could not at once have restored man to his favor again without instituting a system which could only be gradually developed, and which would, therefore, run through many centuries before it could be finally completed and per-

fect. There were many things to be done before this end could be attained. The organic and inorganic systems of this world were not perfected until ages had been consumed in their development. The same consumption of time is observed in the establishment and perfection of all the systems which God has established on this earth. Christianity was not introduced until at least four thousand years after the expulsion of Adam from Eden. The Jewish institution was not ordained until nearly twenty-five hundred years after the same period. There was much to be done for man, which required the institution of just such a system as we have in the remedial plan of salvation. Man had sinned and lost Eden before he acquired a proper knowledge of God. Man learns by degrees, whether in or out of Eden. God had not fully unfolded his character to Adam in Eden. He had, no doubt, learned much; but there were some attributes of his character which could not have been called out while man was in Eden, and which were essential to be known by him, now that he was out of Eden. A knowledge of God is absolutely essential to man's happiness, and Eden with all its natural delights would have been a desert had not God been there. How much more the world, now laboring under the curse of sin? Man needs now to be taught the terrible nature and the ruinous effects of the evil in which he is now involved. He needs now to be taught the inflexible justice, and holiness of God, and made to see and realize how just has been his condemnation and how utterly hopeless he is now of life without the special mercy of God. He needs now to be taught reliance on God, and that life itself is but unrest and misery without the favor and mercy of Jehovah. He needs now to be taught what he had lost in losing Eden, and what labor and trials he must undergo on account of his transgression. It was necessary for his now future welfare that he be made to realize the practical workings of sin in himself and others. He required to know all that man knows now of the character of

God; and this knowledge could only be acquired through a system by which these attributes could be unfolded in forms and language appreciable by man. God has seen proper to develop his character by means of facts rather than by principles. He has esteemed it better for man to exhibit sin to him in man's own acts, than to expose its nature by teaching him principles alone. Such a plan of procedure required time; and hence, this knowledge being essential to man's recovery, he could not have been restored to the favor of God during the life of Adam.

Among the elements of this system of restoration, Sacrifice stands conspicuous. Without it, the altar would be without a victim and the priest without an offering. The altar and priesthood may exist; but without a victim, whose blood shall be poured out—whose life shall be given up, there can be no expiation of sin. It was, therefore, the first to be ordained, and the first step taken in the way of redemption.

Moses gives us no account of its institution. When he wrote, it was a universal custom. He speaks of it, therefore, as a thing well known to the nation for whom he wrote his history. It was instituted in the family of Adam. Of this we have positive proof in the offerings that Cain and Abel made to the Lord. These were the first sons of Adam, and were born after he had left Eden. Since the conception of such an institution, and the purposes for which it was ordained could never have originated with man, the knowledge that these sons had of it must have been obtained from their father, and he must have received it from God himself. We may be positively certain, therefore, that God ordained sacrifice immediately after man's ejection from Eden. If a remedial system were to be instituted at all, the time for its inauguration would be at this period.

There are two great classes under which all sacrifices may be arranged.* The first embraces sin-offerings and the second the

* Heb. v: 1.

thank-offerings. We have this distinction made in the first case of sacrifice that Moses records. Thank-offerings are those which are made as an expression of gratitude to God for mercies and blessings conferred on him who makes the offering. Sin-offerings have a more important signification. They look to the *spiritual* condition of man.—They have reference to his ruin by sin. These offerings are most vital and essential. They go to the very root of all the trouble in which man has been involved by sin; and evince in him who offers them a feeling of special dependence, and the realization and acknowledgment of his ruined condition. Without such a feeling existing, and maintained in the heart, man cannot be redeemed from sin. If he do not realize and confess his sins, he cannot have the efficacy of life interposed in his behalf. This was the trouble with Cain. He brought no sin-offerings, and consequently his thank-offerings were not accepted. There was no confession by him that he was a sinner before God. He came with the fruits of his toil, and offered them as a thank-offering. But these without a sin-offering are a mockery. Abel came with "the firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof." He came with a sin-offering and with a thank-offering,* and they were accepted by the Lord. In these he confessed his sins, supplicating the pardoning mercy of God, and evinced his gratitude for all his mercies and blessings. He could do no more than this, and God could accept no less. Cain was as much obligated to do this as his brother, and because he did not do it, he was rejected. His case forbids any man from supposing that gratitude for temporal blessings can secure the favor of God. The thousands of this day of rationalism, who presume to believe that a moral life and alms-giving are sufficient to secure the favor of God, find in this case a complete refutation of such an opinion.—Such offerings, unsupported by a sin-offering, are an abomination to the Lord. "The sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination

to the Lord."* The case of Cain alone is sufficient to prove this.

But the absolute importance and necessity of sin-offerings are further shown by the nature and objects of life sacrifices.—The penalty of sin is death. "The man that sins shall die." Life is forfeited by sin.—This ends his being. The law is inexorable. The nature of sin is such that he who commits it must give up his life. It is the only way by which the evil can be destroyed. This is the extent of the punishment which the law can inflict on the sinner. The death of the sinner must, therefore, satisfy the demands of the injured law. This expiates—this atones for sin. But the death of man becomes his eternal ruin. The fate of the sinning angels becomes his fate.

But should there be a purpose or desire on the part of God to release the sinner from the penalty of his transgression, his justice, truth and holiness can accept nothing that is not an equivalent of the life of the sinner. If less than this be accepted by him, the demands of justice are unsatisfied, and his honor is sullied. If his attributes remain unsullied while releasing the sinner from the penalty of his transgression, the consideration which enables him to release the sinner must be equivalent of that which was forfeited by the sinner. Hence, life only can be accepted as an atonement for sin. When the equivalent, life, is given, the sinner is then released from his sin.—He then stands before God as though he had never sinned; and, therefore, enjoys the favor of God.

But that a life may be substituted as an equivalent, that life itself must be absolutely free from sin. For if it have sinned, it cannot become the expiation for sin. It is forfeited by sin, and must itself be atoned, if atoned for at all, by a life free from sin. One infraction of law, both under divine and human governments, forfeits the life of the transgressor. The life, therefore, that is to become the expiation for sin, must be absolutely free from sin. As this

† Heb. xi : 4.

* Prov. xv : 8.

is not to be found among men, inasmuch as all have sinned, it must be sought for elsewhere.

The sacrifices which were at first ordained were animals. Their lives were offered up as sin-offerings. Their life was taken for the life of the sinner. This is called in the Scriptures an atonement for sin. It redeemed the sinner from the penalty of his transgressions.

When sin-offerings were first ordained we may reasonably suppose that they had the same import and signification as they have under the law of Moses. We have in the Law a particular account given us of the institution of sacrifice. We there learn that when a man had committed sin, he was required to bring an animal without physical blemish, and to offer it to God as an atonement for the sin he had committed. He was required to bring it to the altar of burnt-offerings, which stood before the door of the tabernacle, and to put his hands on the head of the animal and confess the sin he had committed, and then to kill it; and the priest received the blood and sprinkled it on the altar, and his sins were then forgiven him. The ceremony of laying hands on the head of the victim transferred, as it were, the sin of the man to the animal; and the animal by this act, becoming the sinner, yielded its life as an atonement, or satisfaction for the sin committed. This was all that the law could require, and the pardon of the man followed as a matter of course. If the law esteemed the life of the animal as an equivalent of the life of the man, the penalty was paid when the victim was offered, and the law could have no further claim against the man, who had committed the sin in fact.

We have said that the penalty which God had denounced against sin was death. Now if the death of the sinner satisfied the insulted law, when this was paid, the sinner was free. But for the sinner to pay this penalty would be equivalent to his annihilation—his utter and eternal destruction. Such an event could not for a moment be

contemplated. It would be the grandest failure the universe could witness. Some substitute was, therefore, a necessity; and this substitute was found in the life of one who had committed no sin, and which could therefore be redeemed from the consequences of sin without any violation of the principles of justice and holiness.* After the life has been given up, the law can demand no more. The victim may then be redeemed from the grave without violence to the law; and this redemption from the grave must follow on account of the sinless character of the victim.

The physical perfection of the animal was symbolical of the moral purity of the victim which should atone for sin. Incapable of sin by its physical nature, and physically perfect in the body, an animal is a true and beautiful type of an offering which shall eventually atone for sin.

The spotless character of the victim is an important feature of sacrifice. It most clearly demonstrates that the sinner can find no atonement in any thing he possesses in himself. Sin has forfeited all, and if he is saved from its penalty, he must be saved by means outside of himself.

It may be thought singular,—and the justice of God has been impugned for it,—that the life of an innocent being should be taken for the life of the sinner. If the life of such a being were arbitrarily substituted by God for the life of a sinner, and against the will and consent of the being so sacrificed, the act might be justly amenable to such a charge. But such is not the case. The victim whose blood forever takes away sin, gave up his life voluntarily. In the case of animals the substitution by violence was unavoidable, since the animal had no power to assent or dissent. But no violence was done to

* If death be the penalty of sin, as it is, and if those who commit no sin, yet suffer this consequence of sin, these attributes of God would require, it seems, that all such guiltless persons should be redeemed from the grave, whither they had been carried by no act of their own, and restored to life again. The victim, therefore, which becomes a full atonement, must have a nature kindred to man's, and be raised from the dead, and become the precursor of all who sleep in him, and lead them to life again.

injured innocence; no crime was committed against an intelligent, spiritual and moral being. But were the life of a being who has will and consent, taken against that will and consent, and made to suffer for crimes he did not commit, the universal conscience would revolt against the arbitrary character of such an act. Yet the life of no other being can atone for the sin of man. The life of animals was confessedly inadequate. The annual atonement called to mind the sins of the past year. And as sins were continually remembered year by year, they were never atoned for—were never blotted out of the book of God's remembrance by those sacrifices which were offered for them. "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin!"* It simply respited the life of a sinner; and had there been no means afterwards instituted to buy off these transgressions,† man would have been already lost. The reason of this is found in the essential difference that exists between the nature of men and of animals. Animals have not a constituent of their being capable of an existence independent of their body, and of existing in another state of being. So far as we know their nature, they are wholly confined to this world. Their life, therefore, can not be accepted as an equivalent of one which so far transcends theirs.

Such sacrifices as these continued to be offered for four thousand years, and during all this time no "comer thereunto was made perfect"‡—no soul was cleansed from the guilt of sin. Yet they served a rational purpose in the great plan of God. They served to teach man the terrible nature of sin, and the consequences which should follow it. They served to keep continually alive in his mind the dreadful doom denounced against sin, and at the same time to inspire a hope of a final redemption from sin. In the purposes of God they were ever pointing forward to the fulfillment of the promise made to Eve

—to the time when they would cease to be offered on account of another and a more perfect sacrifice, which should forever take away sin.

Under the dispensations of heaven the essential features of sacrifice have been the same. These radical and common features are—1. That the life of an innocent victim is substituted for the life of the sinner. 2. That the transgressor is transferred, as it were, into the victim, which pays the penalty demanded by the law, thus satisfying the law, and at the same time releasing the sinner. The sinner merges into the victim for the time being, and in that victim gives up his life, which was forfeited by his transgression.

But in the very nature of things, the substitution should be voluntary on the part of the victim. For, were the substitution arbitrary, that is, if the victim were taken by God, and made the substitute in the absence of all consent, the substitution would be no more than a mere subterfuge. It would be a confession of weakness or fear. If a government were to allow a criminal to be set at liberty in consideration, for instance, of his position and influence in society, it would confess its weakness and fear in not daring to mete out to him a just and merited punishment, or, if it should allow any consideration instead thereof, which was manifest to every one as no proper consideration, it would show that it was either too weak or too timid to execute its laws. So with the government of God. If he should make an arbitrary substitution for the life of the sinner, it could not be a substitute at all. Voluntary consent is absolutely essential on the part of a proper substitute. An arbitrary substitution would be an act as much against the justice and holiness of his character, as the pardon of sin would be without any consideration whatever. He had as well pardon without any respect or consideration for his own attributes as to pardon on account of a substitute arbitrarily made. As animals could not for this reason become proper substitutes, they could only fore-

* Heb. x: 4. † Heb. ix: 15. ‡ Heb. x: 1.

shadow in the purposes of God, a true and perfect sacrifice, which should be voluntarily offered for the sins of the world.

The nature, propriety and necessity of sacrifice are deeply laid in the fundamental principles of the organic kingdom. It is only in a world like this, where living beings are created by law, and maintained by processes which are common to the whole system, that such an institution, as sacrifice is, can be ordained. Here, a kingdom of life emerges from a world of death, where no signs of life are to be seen. It comes from the deep abyss of death, and spreads itself over this broad realm, and rests itself on this foundation, living and flourishing on death. The simplest forms of the living kingdom spring immediately from the kingdom of dead matter, and are sustained by material which exhibits no traces of an organized structure. They live alone on unorganized matter, the dead elements of the material world. No organized body becomes food for these until it has lost all traces of its organic structure, and passed completely into the world for dead matter. The living plant lives on death.

The same principle lies at the foundation of animal being. The animal lives on the vegetable. The death of the plant sustains the life of the animal. And the death of one animal becomes the means of sustaining the life of another. The life of one is given up that the life of another may be prolonged. In this we see the substitution of one life for the life of another. This one must perish if that does not yield up its life. Thus all organized beings live on death. The principle of sacrifice is seen running all through the kingdom of organized beings. It is a necessity inherent in the system, permeating and infusing itself into every department of the system. The principle is deeply laid in the nature of organized beings, and is as firmly established as the system itself. We may thus see that sacrifice is no anomaly in the universe; that it is not an arbitrary arrangement on the part of God that he may be able to preserve the honor and dignity of his character,

while executing a purpose dear to his heart, the release of the sinner from the consequences of his transgression; but that it is a principle pervading and inherent in a system by which organized beings are indefinitely created, and their lives maintained in a world of dead matter. Such a system once instituted, we have all the relations between individuals established and provided for, in harmony with the principles on which the system is founded. From these relations dependencies spring, which weave and lock the elements of the system into one intricate and united whole; so that the last member of the series shall rest, through the other and lower members of the series, on the broad kingdom of dead matter. Here its roots ramify and spread and take stronghold, in order that it may rear its head high in the glory and sunlight of heaven, where it can exhibit to an admiring world, the living forms which death is capable of supporting. Hence, man who crowns the long series of animated structures lives on the death of the living beings below him; his natural life is sustained and maintained by the flesh of animals whose life was sacrificed that their bodies might furnish him the necessary food by which alone his life can be prolonged on the earth. Hence, man lives not only spiritually, but naturally by death. The life of another is sacrificed that he may live on in this world, and in the world to come. His life is prolonged on the earth by the death of others. The same is true as regards his spiritual life. Sacrifice saves him from death on account of sin. It does more for his spiritual life than food does for his natural life. It gives him *eternal* life. Where there is a true and effectual sacrifice, the sin is fully and forever pardoned. There is no more remembrance of it. It is blotted out, and man lives eternally.

The natural life and death of the body are symbolical of the spiritual life and death of the soul; and that which preserves or loses the one, becomes the symbol of that which preserves or loses the other. So that, as man's spiritual nature becomes a part of the

great system of organized beings by union with an animal nature in man, so does the institution of sacrifice show itself in harmony with the fundamental principles of the organic world, and becomes linked to these as man's spiritual nature is united to the animal system.

In harmony with these views, Christ speaks of his own flesh and blood as symbolizing the words which he utters and which give to all who hear them, eternal life. This is the food which does not perish, but endures unto eternal life, and of which, if a man eat, he shall never die.*

H. C.

* John, chap. 6.

ROMANISM.

LECTURE VIII.

Dangers of Romanism and means of averting them.—Luke 14: 25-33

And there went great multitudes with him; and he turned, and he said unto them, If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple, and whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me cannot be my disciple. For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he hath sufficient to finish it? Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, this man began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is a great way off, he sendeth an

ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace. So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.

present, ou Catholicism I wish to distinctly disavow entertaining any bitterness of feeling for Catholics or Protestants. I love the men, but hate their errors. Indeed I have a high regard for the man who honestly thinks me wrong, and tries to show me my error. But I hold his conduct in contempt, who says I am in error, in private, and to my face is all smiles and conciliation. Such a course indicates a species of cowardice, having no sympathy for the truth. Error does not make a man bold, but on the contrary destroys his manhood, and in his conscious weakness fears nothing more than its manifestation. If such an one have the power he becomes oppressive and cruel to those that oppose him. This being true, the more erroneous any system is, the more tyrannical will its friends become. Romanism being the most erroneous system of religion, in what is called Christendom, and also the most potent in numbers, is more to be feared than all the parties of Protestantism combined. Catholics are men of like feelings and passions with the rest of us; and, influenced by their religion, are just what others would be if they were Catholics. If any thing I have said has been offensive, the cause is to be sought for in the false system more than in the offended ones. No man imitates the Savior or his apostles who is offended by a true statement of his sentiments. Some persons are so sensitive that one cannot repeat their sentiments, who differs from them, without regarding it as an offensive act. Such persons are in the bonds of a slavery more crushing than the manacled prisoner. Paul rejoiced that his enemies preached Christ of envy, thinking thereby to add affliction to his bonds.

Romanism has a history written with sufficient clearness to warn us of its danger in this country. With its leaders it is chiefly a grand system of political intrigue; to the people it is a religion. Kings have

In this, my concluding address for the

been compelled to bow before the pretended successor of the apostle Peter. He has levied taxes, raised armies, concluded treaties the same as any other political ruler.— This course of procedure arises from the errors of the system. Some of these I have briefly referred to this week. I will mention them again.

1. Romanism claims Peter as the rock on which the church is built. This assumption gives us a man instead of the Lord himself. There is danger to the religion of the Bible in every man's heart who believes this. No man can be a papist and not believe Peter to be the rock, the foundation of the church. He must also receive the statement, that about 260 men have succeeded Peter in authority since his death.

2. The Holy Scriptures are not an unerring guide. The reception of a fundamental truth leads us logically to the reception of every other truth related to it; so the reception of a fundamental error leads us logically (or illogically) to all related error. The belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, leads logically to obedience to all he has commanded. Belief that the Pope is the successor of Peter, leads to the conclusion that he, as well as Peter, may deliver authoritative oracles, possessed of equal power with those recorded in the Bible.

3. That priests have power to forgive sins. The man that believes this will be inclined to seek absolution from the priest rather than God; and to hold in undue reverence, a weak and fallible man, such as himself. We should remember, that Roman priests have no power to pardon sins, that every Christian does not possess.

4. That the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper are changed into the body that was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and arose from the dead. The danger growing out of this monstrous falsehood is, that it leads to the worship of "the deified bread." If the bread and wine were transformed into the body and blood of the Son of God by priestly consecration, a miracle is then performed. However monstrous

this may seem, our eyes and taste to the contrary, it is assumed.

5. The Pope assumes to have the care of the Lord's flock throughout the world as he declared in his letter to President Pierce and sent by the hands of the notorious Bedini. In that letter he tells our President that he hopes the President will protect the rights of Catholics in this country, in return for which he will pray for him. What rights have been denied the Catholics here, that the Pope should be in fear for their security? They enjoy such civil and religious privileges in this country, as they grant in no country, where they have control.

It should be carefully remembered, that shortly after a meeting of bishops in Baltimore, a few years since, several of whose sessions were held in secret, that a simultaneous attack was made on our free school system. Dayton was the theatre of a controversy, through one of the daily papers at that time, on the subject. The discussion was carried on, if I remember rightly, between Rev. Dr. Hall and father Yaunker. They asked a pro rota division of the common school fund to be given them, to educate their children apart from the children of Protestants. Had this been granted, a similar apportionment of funds, could with equal propriety have been demanded by each of the Protestant parties, and the result would have been a complete overthrow of our educational system.

I have looked on the increase of the Catholics in this country with some degree of alarm. They number perhaps between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000, and are in the Northern States chiefly. When two political parties nearly equally divide us, they hold the balance of power in their hands.— In an address, published in Cincinnati a few years since, by bishop Purcell, "to the Roman Catholics, and all whom it may concern" he said, "hereafter let it be remembered, that whoever seeks Catholic suffrage, must expect to subserve Catholic interests."

A Catholic, writing not long ago, to a

foreign Journal from Cincinnati, said, "this looks like a Catholic city." He then referred to its numerous schools and churches as proof of his assertion. In this city of Dayton, with the 12 years of my residence here, the meeting-house room of the Catholics has increased nearly six-fold. I cannot say that their membership has correspondingly increased, though I have been told, their houses are crowded at all their regular meetings. During the period above named, the aggregate increase of all the other churches, has not been more than about 30 per cent, though the population has increased more than one hundred per cent. If we look not beyond our own city, this state of things should arouse us to a sober consideration of the cause of the rapid increase of Catholics among us, and the slow advances the rest of us are making. They are making numerous converts all over the country, according to their own reports. Societies are organized by them for the dissemination of their doctrines; eloquent men are sent out to lecture, and the people hear them, and no one answering them, it is thought by many who hear them, that they cannot be answered. Is Protestant love for the Bible, and freedom to examine its claims, to be abandoned by us? For myself I answer, no. There is remedy for Romanism, untrue as it is, I think.

The means for averting the evils of Romanism are as I think :

1. To meet them whenever they come before the public to plead the claims of Catholicism, and show them, in the spirit of earnest truth and love, that the Bible, without tradition is adapted to our religious instruction and direction in every thing necessary for us to know or do. To meet their errors with the truth; their obstinacy with patience, and their misrepresentations with meekness and forbearance. To refuse to hear them and to reply to their pleadings is an indication of either fear that we cannot succeed, or unjustifiable indifference to their salvation. Have Protestants lost their confidence in the power of the truth? Or

shall apathy in its defence, be set down as cowardice? If Protestants have not confidence enough in the truth to meet Roman Catholic tradition that fact alone may increase justly an alarm.

2. Divisions among those calling themselves Protestants, must be healed; and *Christian Union* be substituted for Protestant Leagues, Evangelical Alliances, and Union Prayer-meetings. We may tell the people much as we will, that the union for which the Lord prayed, exists among evangelical denominations, and thousands will not believe it, because they see our party organizations still existing. It will not answer such men, to tell them that the union of Christians is invisible, while they can see so much done for mere partyism. "Union is strength." This is obvious to every one, but attention is specially directed to it by the Savior in his prayer, and the apostles in their teachings. Union among the professed followers of Christ makes faith in him possible to the world. John 17: 21. At this time, there are millions of our wretched race that know not that God has sent his son into the world. Neither can they know or believe in Jesus until He is made known to them by his people united in one as He and His Father are one.

Romanists justly and proudly boast of union in all the world. Their union certainly is not so close, nor is it of the kind that Christ prayed for, and yet is much more compact, and consequently more efficient in its operations, than divided and distracted Protestantism. I need not here to enter into an effort to show how Protestants may be united. This is a proven part, as witnessed in the union of hundreds of thousands of them from all the existing parties. As parties we never can unite.

With the demonstration of the practicability of Union on the Bible alone, of men of all parties, even Romanists, the way to success to stay the increase of Romanists, and to convert the world is plain. We must have as much confidence in the word spoken by the Lord, and confirmed by them that heard, as this primitive church had for three

centuries. Then, and never until then, may we see the nations receive the gospel. When the day comes that the present number of Protestants in the world shall be united, as Jesus and his Father are united, if they shall be possessed of present facilities for travel, and the printing of books, Romanism will be overthrown, Mahomedanism and Paganism destroyed, and the knowledge of the Lord be in all the earth; and in every place, incense and a pure offering be made to Him who is worthy to receive all honor and dominion forever. To labor for these ends is the duty of every one that loves God and his fellow men. Effort in any other direction may give promise of present success, but in the day of the Lord, will be complete and eternally ruinous failure. May He guide and preserve us all, by his unerring word, and comfort us by the Holy Spirit, unto the day of eternal redemption; and His name be praised evermore.

J. M. HENRY.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. IX.

MESSRS. EDITORS:

The first part of the 12th verse is thus translated by the Common Version: "AND WHEN ZACHARIAS SAW HIM, HE WAS TROUBLED."

The Bible Union's Revision says: "AND ZACHARIAH SEEING HIM, WAS TROUBLED."

The New Translation puts it: "AND ZACHARIAH WAS TROUBLED AT THE SIGHT."

No one would imagine, from the New Translation, that the word, which it here translates "AT THE SIGHT," is the participle "IDOOO," "SEEING." Yet such is the fact. The only cause for the change, which we can discover, appears to be a desire to make it different from the Revision. But

the change takes it equally away from the original. The Revision is literal, exact, simple and appropriate; and the New Translation leaves the Greek, and does not improve the English, by varying from a rendering in every respect so judicious.

In the 13th verse, the Common Version says: "THY PRAYER IS HEARD."

The Revision has it: "THY PRAYER WAS HEARD."

The New Translation puts it: "YOUR PRAYER HAS BEEN HEARD."

The original in this case is not doubtful. It is "EISEEKOUSTHEE," the second aorist, indicative; passive. The meaning is not left to the shadow of conjecture. It is "WAS HEARD," and not "IS HEARD," nor "HAS BEEN HEARD." Every person who has spent six months in the study of Greek, knows that the first aorist, indicative, passive, does not mean "IS" or "HAS BEEN," but "WAS." To argue the case might intimate a possibility for doubt, which does not exist.

"THY PRAYER WAS HEARD." The intimation here is, that Zachariah had at some former time prayed for a son. Perhaps he had offered the supplication when he was a young man, or in the prime of life. But time had passed, and the prayer did not appear to have been noticed, and Zachariah, in his old age, had ceased to pray for this blessing. But the Lord by his angel now assures the veteran saint, that the prayer which, so long ago, he offered in faith, was not neglected. It "WAS HEARD." It was heard when it was offered, although the answer was delayed till the fullness of time. The beautiful doctrine, here inculcated, so strengthening to faith, so consolatory to the believer, and so honoring to God, is utterly ignored by the New Translation, which has to violate the tense of the Greek, to prevent this example of Jehovah's hearing prayer at the time of its utterance, although postponing the reply, from appearing in the English version as it does in the original.

Errors of this character, arising from a want of accurate intelligence and of just discrimination in the distinctive functions of Greek

forms, will appear, when we come to examine the first chapter of the Gospel of John, to constitute a striking characteristic of the New Translation. If there is any peculiarity in the present case, it consists in the fact that the correction of the Common Version by the Revision had called attention to the Greek tense, so that the mistake in the New Translation cannot be regarded in any sense as an oversight. It is a clear, indisputable proof that the translator does not distinguish between an aorist and a perfect, but believes an aorist, when correctly translated, to be erroneously translated, and believes that the proper meaning of an aorist is that which properly and exclusively belongs to the perfect.

In the 17th verse, the Common Version and the Bible Union's Revision agree in using the phrase "TO THE WISDOM OF THE JUST."

The New Translation makes this: "BY THE WISDOM OF THE JUST."

Thus the whole passage is made to read by the New Translation:

"And he shall go before him, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient by the wisdom of the just."

The inconsistency of such phraseology is broadly apparent. "To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just," is consistent and symmetrical. The question in the case is, which is authorized by the Greek?

The difference depends upon the translation of the Greek preposition "EN." This preposition governs the dative case, and its proper meaning is "IN." It is sometimes with the dative, in quick speech or rapid narrative, substituted for "EIS" and "EPI" with the accusative. Instances of the kind are not uncommon in secular writers; and they are occasionally found in the New Testament. They result from the ease and rapidity with which the mind passes over the transition state to the result of that transition. "EIS" directs the attention to the transition; "EN" to its termination and the state consequent thereupon.

As examples of this usage, we may refer to such passages as the following:

Mark i: 16, "CASTING A NET INTO THE SEA."

Here one would naturally expect to find "EIS" with the accusative. But instead of this, "EN" is employed with the dative.

Of a somewhat similar character is Acts v: 18, "PUT THEM INTO THE COMMON PRISON."

Here, again, instead of "EIS" with the accusative, "EN" with the dative is employed.

In the case under consideration, "EPI" with the accusative is employed in the first clause, and "EN" with the dative, is substituted for it in the second clause. The construction in this respect is precisely similar to that in 1st Thess. iv: 7—

"FOR GOD HAS NOT CALLED US TO UNCLEANNES, BUT TO HOLINESS."

Here in the first clause, "EPI" is used with the accusative; and in the second clause, "EN" with the dative is substituted.

It would be simply preposterous to change the translation of the latter by substituting "BY" for "TO," and to make the passage read:

"GOD HAS NOT CALLED US TO UNCLEANNES, BUT BY HOLINESS."

Compare the two passages, and the usage to which I have referred will be found precisely the same in both. In each case the verb acts upon two clauses. The direct objects in these clauses are in the accusative. In each case, the object towards which the action is directed is expressed in the first clause by "EPI" governing the accusative, and in the second clause by "EN" governing the dative. By a similarity of translation, both are consistent and symmetrical, and both fully and accurately express the meaning.

"GOD HAS NOT CALLED US TO UNCLEANNES, BUT TO HOLINESS."

"TO TURN THE HEARTS OF THE FATHERS TO THE CHILDREN, AND THE DISOBEDIENT TO THE WISDOM OF THE JUST."

It is only necessary to add that the substitution of "BY" for "TO" in such a case,

is entirely unjustifiable on any principles of grammar or translation. The literal meaning of the original word is "IN." The only plausible plea for a change would be in favor of this original meaning. "BY" is not the original meaning, and it is far more remote from it than "To." "BY" is not in the first clause, and therefore is not rhetorically or grammatically suggested as the translation of the preposition associated with the same verb in the second clause.—Analogous construction, as we have seen, does not direct us to "BY." And, above all, the manifest sense of the passage in no way favors "By." If "By" is substituted for "To," the sense of the whole passage becomes perverted.

WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. V.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., May 25, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—

In my last reply to the Cor. Sec., I made this remark, that two things were wanting to the Revisors. 1. Knowledge of the Greek text. 2. Knowledge of the English language.

I find that they use the word *unto* throughout the Gospels. I know not for what class of readers they made their Gospels, unless for a class that has no knowledge of the English language. They tell us, indeed, that their work is intended for the common reader. But, let me ask: Has the common reader become acquainted with Webster's Dictionary? Again: Do they intend to force the common reader to use words which are obsolete? The New Testament, a book which is read, and to be read by every one, which moulds and fashions the language of

the people, should be written in the very best and purest style. But here is an obsolete word, used everywhere throughout these Gospels. The Revisors certainly, either did not consult Webster, or they disregard his authority. He says of the word *unto*, (compound of *un*, not, and *to*.) It is used instead of *to*, but it is not in our mother tongue, nor is it used in popular discourse, or in modern writings. It is therefore to be rejected, as obsolete and not legitimate.

Now when we consider the preparation that has been made for the revision of the New Testament, the expectations that have been raised, the large amount of means expended, and when we find, that, after the labors of some twelve years, the Revisors have not learned how to consult dictionaries, that they retain obsolete words, what shall we say of them? They make a book for the common reader, and yet know not what words are in use among the people. I may be told that this is a small matter: yes, surely; yet, "faithful in little, faithful in much," is the law. If these men know not these little matters, how can it be expected that they shall know the greater?

But they are not acquainted with the inflections of the verb, *Do*. They have the form *doeth*, for *doth*. "This verb, says Webster, when transitive, is formed in the indicative present; thus, I do, thou doest, he does or doth." But our Revisors have, "let not thy left hand know what that thy right hand doeth." Small matters, indeed. But remember, that dead *flies*, and not dead elephants, cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor.

These two witnesses must suffice for the present. They testify to the fact that the Revisors want a knowledge of the English language.

I had intended to change the subject of my remarks; but, on opening the Revised Gospels, my eye was met, accidentally, or providentially, by this expression; "But when the unclean spirit *is gone* out from the man," &c. Here is another instance of

negligence; to say the least of it. I again quote Webster:

"There is another fault very common among English writers, though it is less frequent in the United States; this is the conversion of an intransitive verb into a passive one. It is surprising that an error of this kind should have gained such an established use, in some foreign languages, as to be incurable. Barbarous nations may indeed form languages; but it should be the business of the civilized men to purify their language from barbarisms."

"Is gone" is then, in Webster's estimation, a barbarism; for it is an intransitive verb converted into a passive one. Archbishop Magee says: "Criticism is a thorny road." The Secretary may yet find that this remark is true, if he has not already found it so. Whether the Gothamites think themselves civilized men or not, we know not; but we of the State of Kentucky, and of the West generally, think ourselves, at least on the borders of civilization; and we, therefore, wish to purify our language from barbarisms; and, therefore, we reject a version of the New Testament which contains barbarisms, and obsolete words, and intend, by the grace of Him who has called us to this work, to supply our families with a translation that contains neither a barbarism, nor an obsolete word. We think that by proper attention, we shall be able to inflect the verb *Do*. *Do*, *doest*, *does* or *doth*. We think also, that we know what "since" means, and we are able too to add this much to our knowledge; that if A says, Brutus killed Cæsar, and B should say, that Cæsar was killed by Brutus, they both mean the same thing.

But I must confess I do not know the meaning of the following words taken from the Revised Gospels, Luke iii. 23. "And Jesus himself was, when he began, about thirty years of age; being the Son, &c." Will the reader look at those words again? Let us place them to themselves, so that they can be clearly seen.

"And Jesus himself was, when he began, about thirty years of age."

Here, the plea, that this is the literal meaning of the Greek text will not avail the Secretary. I deny that it is even literal. But what meaning is there in the words? I must again quote Paul: "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaks a barbarian, and he that speaks a barbarian to me." It is vain to use language that the people cannot understand, and then attempt to shelter themselves under the plea, that they give us a literal version of the Greek. We would prefer the Greek at once. That we understand; but their English is unintelligible. But again; in Luke iv: 33, we read:

"And in the synagogue there was a man having a spirit of an unclean devil."

The first thought that this sentence awakes in the mind is, that there are, at least, some clean devils. For, if there are unclean devils, there must be some that are clean. There are two objections to this sentence above quoted: 1. The word *having*. "There was a man *having* a spirit of an unclean devil." I do not understand why the participle *having* should have been used here. It is inelegant; it does not express the thought of the Greek. 2. The word *devil* is here improperly used. In this instance, Webster and Worcester would have given the Revisors instruction. But Webster is of no weight in the Bible Union. I remark:

1. That there is but one devil. The Greek *Diabolos* with the article, always means, "The Devil." He is one.

2. *Dæmonion*, and *Dæmon*, are names for a class of spirits, supposed to be either angels of the devil, or human spirits; some of which took possession of the bodies of men; others were the objects of Gentile worship. Paul says to the Corinthians: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *dæmons*, and not to God." Now that the word here cannot mean *devils* is manifest; for the Gentiles knew no such being as the New Testament *Diabolos*. The word in Luke iv. 33; and 1 Cor. x. 20, is *dæmonion*, not *diabolos*. The one is *dæmon*, the other *devil*, always. Here then the

Revisors have, throughout, erred grievously not knowing the difference between these most obviously different words. Webster says, under the word devil: "In the New Testament the word is frequently and erroneously used for *demon*."

Before I bring this to a close I will make a remark or two on the word *Thou*. Custom has confined its use to the language of devotion, and to poetry. We use *Thou* and *Thee* in prayer, as the language of reverence. But to make the scoffing Pharisee, Sadducee, and priest say *Thou* to the Savior is to make language utter a falsehood. For I say again, it is established law with us to use *Thou* and *Thee* when we feel reverence, and that for God; but if we should use these words in addressing one that we hate, we should violate the proprieties of speech; for by us they are never so used.

I will quote two passages of rough and inelegant English, and close the book for the present.

1. "For nothing is hidden, but it shall be manifested; nor was done in secret, but that it should come abroad." Mark iv: 22.

2. "With what measure you meet, it shall be measured to you, and there shall be added to you." Mark iv: 24.

I was made a life director of the Bible Revision Association some years past, when father Maclay was agent for the Revision. He promised us then that the New Testament would be finished in three years.—The aged man has passed away. He lived not to see what he so earnestly desired—a faithful version of the oracles. But had he lived, how his heart would have been pained at the reading of such English as is found in these Gospels of the Bible Union. He was taken from the evil to come. As a life director, I claim the right to criticize these Revised Gospels; and as the sweet Psalmist of Israel said, I will pray the Lord to "teach my hands to war and my fingers to fight" till I shall have accomplished this work, which, in his providence he has call me to do.

H. T. ANDERSON.

HE LEADETH ME.

"He leadeth me!" O! blessed thought,
O! words with heavenly comfort fraught,
Whate'er I do, whate'er I be,
Still 'tis God's hand that leadeth me!
He leadeth me! He leadeth me!
By his own hand he leadeth me!

Sometimes 'mid scenes of deepest gloom,
Sometimes where Eden's bowers bloom;
By waters still, o'er troubled sea—
Still 'tis his hand that leadeth me!
He leadeth me! He leadeth me!
By his own hand he leadeth me.

Lord, I would clasp thy hands in mine,
Nor ever murmur nor repine—
Content, whatever lot I see,
Since 'tis my God that leadeth me.
He leadeth me! He leadeth me!
By his own hand he leadeth me.

And when my task on earth is done,
When, by thy grace, the victory's won;
E'en death's cold wave I will not flee,
Since God through Jordan leadeth me.
He leadeth me! He leadeth me!
By his own hand he leadeth me.

EXAMPLE.

The best inheritance a parent can bequeath to a child is a virtuous example, a legacy of hallowed remembrance and associations. The beauty of holiness beaming through the life of a loved relative or friend, is more effectual to strengthen such as do stand in virtue's ways, and raise up those that are bowed down, than precept, command, entreaty, or warning. Christianity itself, I believe, owes by far the greater part of its moral power, not to the precepts or parables of Christ, but to his own character.

THE
 AMERICAN CHRISTIAN
 QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. II.

CINCINNATI, 1863.

No. 3.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. VI.

HARRODSBURG, KY., May 28, '63.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Criticism No. V. lies before me. In the latter part of this number V. the Secretary undertakes to criticise what does not exist. He answers before I speak. He says:

"If this be done, (he is speaking of the use of *you* for *thou*.) then every address to God must employ the plural form, and we must call Jehovah 'You.'"

I say, he has answered a matter before he heard it. He has not seen anything like this in my translations, and knows not what I have done in this instance. Let him hear the words of the wise man, and be on his guard for the future.

"He that answers a matter before he hears it, it is folly and shame to him."—Prov. xviii: 13.

I read the first sentence of Criticism No. V. with much pleasure. It stands thus:—"The first and greatest desideratum in a translation of inspired truth, is that it conveys the exact meaning of the original, in the clearest possible light."

To this I most heartily subscribe, and in this way I translate. But the Revisers are not able to act in accordance with their own words:

They see the right, and approve it too;
 Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.

The exact meaning of the original should

be conveyed in the clearest light. Then why envelop the truth in darkness, as in the following passage from Mark vi: 2, "And what is the wisdom which is given to him, and such miracles wrought by his hands?" These are English words it is true; but no man, or set of men, acquainted with English Grammar, would ever have penned such a sentence. Such is the product of twelve years of labor. Twelve, did I say? They are not yet in their teens. We must be merciful to the errors of youth. They have not come to their work, exercitati, but, exerecendi; that is, in plain English, they came to their work not prepared, but to be prepared; not practiced in language, but to be practiced. Their whole work proves the truth of this. But to the words *thou*, *thee*, and *you*. But the Secretary has furnished me with so many excellent sayings that I must, before I notice the pronouns, quote him again:

"Whatever adds to that meaning, (the meaning of Scripture,) interpolates human thoughts under the guise of divine revelations."

In this we agree. And we charge upon the Revisers this very thing—the interpolation of human thoughts under the guise of divine relations. This they have done in the great Commission given by the Christ to his apostles. They have it thus:

"Go therefore, and disciple all the nations, immersing them *in* the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

In this they have suppressed the truth, and in place of it they have given currency to a palpable error, which, in my next, I will thoroughly expose; and this I will do, not in my own strength, but in the grace and strength of him who gave that Commission, and of him who clothed the Lord Jesus with all authority in heaven and on earth. That truth in the Greek of Matthew shall be told in pure English. I now return to the words *thou* and *you*.

I will say that in Greek there is one word, the singular pronoun *su*, that is always used, whether God or man be addressed. The Greek has no form for solemnity, or for familiarity. There is no solemnity in forms, save so far as custom may establish a law. We, as has already been said, use *Thou* and *Thee* in prayer; in conversation, never. But the people have decided this matter, and vain is the effort to change the language of the people. We can purify the language from barbarisms, and obsolete words; but change an established custom we cannot. The great desideratum in a translation of the Scriptures is, that it shall utter the oracles of truth in the language of the people. I will further say that there is not in any passage of my translation a single instance of obscurity arising from the use of the pronoun *you*. I am not astonished at the Secretary for offering such a plea as he has done, for he must feel the obscurities of the Revised Version, and wishes to give as much light as possible from these grave and solemn words, *Thou* and *Thee*. When he makes men speak, he would, at least, have us understand whether one, or more than one, are addressed; but whether the persons addressed understand the speaker or not, is a matter of minor importance. I will now quote for the reader's benefit a passage from Trench:

"Once more—the entire dropping of the word 'thou,' except in poetry or in addresses to the Deity, and, as a necessary consequence, the dropping also of the second singular of the verb with its strongly

marked flexion, as *lovest*, *lovedst*, is another example of a force once existing in the language, which has been, or is being, allowed to expire. In the seventeenth century it was with *thou* in English as it is still with *du* in German, with *tu* in French; being, as it then was, the sign of familiarity, whether that familiarity were of love, or of contempt and scorn."

"It was not unfrequently the latter.— Thus, at Sir Walter Raleigh's trial, (1603,) Coke, when argument and evidence failed him, insulted the defendant by applying to him the term 'thou:—'All that Lord Cobham did was at *thy* instigation, *thou* viper! I THOU thee, *thou* traitor." And when Sir Toby Belch in, *Twelfth Night*, is urging Sir Andrew Aguecheek to send a sufficiently provocative challenge to Riola, he suggests to him that he taunt him with the license of ink; if thou *thou'st* him some thrice, it shall not be amiss." See Trench; English Past and Present.

I will now quote, for the reader's benefit, from Gould Brown:

"The history of *youyouing* and *thoutheeing* appears to be this. Persons in high stations, being usually surrounded by attendants, it became, many centuries ago, a species of court flattery to address individuals of this class in the plural number, as if a great man were something more than one person. In this way the notion of greatness was agreeably *multiplied*, and those who laid claim to such honors, soon began to think themselves insulted whenever they were addressed with any other than the plural pronoun. Humbler people yielded through fear of offense, and the practice extended, in time, to all ranks of society; so that at present the customary mode of familiar as well as complimentary address, is altogether plural; both the verb and the pronoun being used in that form." See Grammar of Grammars, p. 345. Again from the same author:

"The pronoun *you*, though originally and properly plural, is now generally applied to one person or more." Again—"For if *you* has literally become singular

by virtue of this substitution, *we*, also, is singular for the same reason, as often as it is substituted for *I*; else the authority of innumerable authors, editors, compilers, and crowned heads, is insufficient to make it so." p. 551.

We have now before us the history of these words, as it respects their use, and we can understand why the Quakers established the use of them. *Thou* and *thee*, in the mouth of a Quaker, meant that all men were equal. But in the mouth of a great man these words meant that the person addressed was an inferior. To an equal, they meant contempt and insult. But with us, *thou* and *thee* mean reverence to the Father in heaven and to the Christ. I therefore submit the matter to *the people*, who thus use these words, and who have decided that they will so use them. In this way they are used in my translation; and I am perfectly willing to put into the hands of the people, a translation of the oracles, in which not only these words, but every word I use, shall express the exact sense of the inspired Greek, and let them judge whether what I say is true or not. The Greek, and not the Revised Gospels, is the standard by which versions will be tried; and we have men among us who need not to be informed by the Secretary of any Society whether a version is correct or not. I have no objection to criticism, nor to a comparison of versions. The "Review" speaks on this subject; and the people will speak, so that their voice will be heard. If I seem to any one to boast, let such a one consult Paul on this subject. I will turn once more to the Gospels as revised by the Bible Union, remembering that the first and great desideratum in a translation of inspired truth is that it conveys the exact meaning of the original in the clearest possible light."—Take an example, Matt. xxviii: 1.

"And late in the Sabbath, as it was dawning into the first day of the week," &c.

Here is a most serious offense against Greek and law. They have not only offended against the Greek of Matthew, but they have offended (not to say sinned) against

the law of Moses. For, first,—"*Opse Sabbaton*" cannot be translated "late in the Sabbath." It has no such meaning. And, secondly, they have here given us such a translation as would lead us to suppose that the Sabbath lasted till the morning of the first day of the week. But the Sabbath ended at evening. This they did not know, perhaps; and as the law of Moses makes an allowance for those who are "ignorant and out of the way," we will show mercy and teach them. See Leviticus xxiii: 5. "In the fourteenth day of the first month *at even* is the Lord's passover." It began at even and ended at even. Then at verse 32, "From even to even shall you celebrate your Sabbath." Now, as two feasts are here mentioned, we take the two, 1. The Passover, 2. The Day of Atonement, and establish the fact that the Sabbath began at evening and ended at evening. And particularly is the passover mentioned as beginning at evening. And it was at the passover that the Savior was crucified. Therefore, as the Sabbath ended at evening, how could it be possible that a translation of this kind should see the light, unless the men who made it are, 1. unacquainted with Greek; and, 2. not at all versed in the law of Moses. They are then doubly offenders in this instance. Verily, criticism is a thorny road.

In my next I will attend to their version of the Commission.

H. T. ANDERSON.

MELANCTHON—THE LAMB OF THE REFORMATION.

The age of Luther was one of intense interest. Truth waged a fierce and fearless battle against time-honored error, supported by power and strengthened by superstition; and, in the end, gained a signal victory. Rome, hitherto, had been deemed invincible, but her strength had never before been put to so severe a trial; all her forces were marshalled, all her arts of force and flattery tried; but all in vain. In this contest she could not even cover her defeat by the claim of a drawn battle; for so decisive was the victory gained by the Reformers, that three hundred years have only served to confirm the claim of the victors and the disgrace of the vanquished.

Hence, we find that the names of the boldest defenders of Rome in those stirring times are but little known, only as they are linked with the names of their successful assailants, and have thus obtained an immortality of shame; but, on the other hand, how prominent on the page of history the names and deeds of the Reformers; and who, among earth's civilized millions, has not read there the name of Luther. Romanists themselves are silent concerning those who then stood forth in behalf of the Papacy with a zeal and devotion worthy of a better cause; but Protestants, even yet, regard the memory of the first Reformers with feelings somewhat akin to idolatry.

Most prominent among these, whose names, like those of David and Jonathan, Peter and John, Paul and Timothy, suggest each other, stand Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon; the first called with good reason the Lion of the Reformation, the other—shall we write it?—with less, the Lamb. "Speak nothing but good concerning the dead," says the ancient moralist; "but speak the truth," says Truth, and to her mandate we bow. The truth, then, is,

that Philip Melancthon, whom we have all been led to look upon as the impersonation of all human excellence, as the mildest and kindest spirit among the early Reformers, did approve of the counsel and deed of them who put to death Michael Servetus, for no other crime than that of daring to hold and express opinions different from those of John Calvin and the orthodox Genevese—his murderers. Melancthon was learned, far above the men of his own times, and gave an impulse to literature which has reached to our own days—and well did he earn and nobly wear the title of Preceptor of Germany; but in impartial history his name must ever be linked with one of the darkest deeds that ever saw the sun. That we have not spoken rashly, let the following account of the sad event bear witness:—"The executioner employed by the Genevese was not so well skilled in his work as others. The wood which had been piled up was fresh oak, still in leaf. There was a stake, and before it a block upon which Servetus was to seat himself. His feet hung to the ground, his body was fastened by an iron chain to the stake, and his neck by a strong rope twisted several times round it. On his head was a wreath, woven of straw and leaves, sprinkled with brimstone, through which suffocation might be speedily effected. The book which had occasioned all his misery was, according to the sentence, tied to his body, both the manuscript sent to Calvin, for his opinion, and the printed work. He now prayed the executioner to put an end to his sufferings as speedily as possible. The officer brought the fire and kindled the wood, so that he was surrounded by the circling flames. At this sight he cried out so terribly that the whole people shrunk back. As the pile continued to burn but slowly, a great many of the people ran and cast additional bundles of wood into the flames. Servetus cried continually to God for mercy. It is possible, as one report states, that a strong wind prevented, for a considerable time, the action of the fire. The torture to which the papal tribunals had so long doomed be-

lievers in the Gospel, was prolonged in the case of Servetus, if we may believe the account addressed to the Genevese, for half an hour. Farel says nothing on the subject. At last Servetus cried aloud, and this may be regarded as a sure sign that he persevered in his belief, 'Jesus, Thou Son of the eternal God, have mercy upon me!' protesting, in the midst of the flames, and in defiance of the whole Christian world, against the doctrine of the Trinity. When the sun stood at the highest in the autumnal sky, and the clock in St. Peter's tower struck twelve, Servetus had ended his sufferings and the people dispersed in silence."

If Melancthon justified and approved this foul deed, seems he still to you, kind reader, the Lamb of the Reformation; or hath not this lamb a tiger's heart; and are not the robes of this fair seeming saint stained with a martyr's blood. And oh that the evidence against him were slight or doubtful, that it were an unfathered rumor, or the whisper of a secret foe seeking thus to sully his fair fame; but, alas, if the deed was dark as midnight, the proof that he sanctioned it, is as clear as noon-day. The evidence consists of a letter from his own hand to John Calvin, the chief actor in the bloody scene described above; which reads as follows:—Honored man and most beloved brother: I have read your letter, in which you most excellently confute the horrible blasphemy of Servetus; and I thank the Son of God, who has been the umpire and director of your conflict. The church of Christ will also, both now and in all future times, own its gratitude to you. I am wholly of your opinion, and declare also that your magistrates, the entire proceedings having been conducted according to law, acted quite justly in condemning the blasphemer to death.

P. MELANCTHON.

Reader! let this foul blot on the character of Melancthon warn you against indulging in religious bigotry; against the employment of any other weapons against those who differ from you, save truth and reason.

B.

THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR.

Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached.—Luke vii : 22.

From statistics gathered by a committee appointed by the Ministerial Association of the city of Cincinnati, the following facts appear: As this city is, perhaps, about the same as other cities of the country, we are brought to the conclusion that the same state of facts exist not only in other cities, but also in smaller towns and the country at large.

First, In all the Protestant Churches in this city there can be seated about thirty thousand persons. On an average not more than one-third of these seats are occupied each Sabbath, leaving, thereby twenty thousand vacant seats.

Second, The entire membership of all the Protestant Churches, out of a population of 180,000, is less than fifteen thousand.—The Roman Catholics out number all the Protestant Churches put together. Supposing both Catholic and Protestant Churches to number thirty thousand, there are yet left, outside of the Christian churches one hundred and fifty thousand souls, including the Jews, who ignore Christianity.

Third, There are not as many members now in all the Protestant Churches, in proportion to the numbers, as there was ten or twenty years ago, showing that this city is gradually retrograding towards infidelity and religious indifference, or Catholicism, which, although in some respects is beneficial to society, is very little better for humanity. Assuming that the other cities of the country are about on a par with Cincinnati, as far as the above facts are concerned, it makes a very unfavorable showing for Christianity. These facts are fearful and astounding, yet they are facts.

Now arises the question—Why does this

state of things exist? Is Christianity a failure? Is the Gospel incapable of accomplishing what its Author intended, or have the professed teachers and preachers of the Gospel so far deviated from their path of duty, as to make their labors fruitless. Unless we follow the correct rule laid down for us to follow, we need never hope or expect to see the work well done. Let us notice how some and perhaps a large majority are working. They have overlooked the leading idea of the text, as well as the fundamental principles of the Gospel, that the poor are to have the Gospel preached to them. The poor as well as the rich have a divine right in the Gospel and should have it preached unto them. The majority of ministers backed up by their churches endeavor to secure the favor and influence of the rich, often at the exclusion of the poor, thereby losing all hold upon the masses.—The greater portion of the human family are the subjects of misfortune and poverty, and for this alone are excluded from the so called Christian churches of the land. Now we propose to examine a few witnesses touching the supposition that the fault may be attributed to an inefficient ministry as well as a proud and selfish church. The minister alone does not deserve all the censure, for it is the duty of the church to prompt him to a better discharge of his duties, when he is found neglecting the poor, and if he will not perform that which christianity requires of a faithful minister, it is the place of the Church to discard him and secure the services of one that will.—Let us first notice the sermons that have or may be written and read. Do you see that minister in his studio preparing and elaborating his subject for next Sabbath.—His mind is contemplating not only his subject but his eye is fixed also upon some intellectual man, or some rich and influential family. The subject is a sublime one. It is ably written. The style is clear, classical and elegant. Perhaps it may be read in a forcible manner. The emphasis, pauses, tones, and gestures of its author may be most happy. — He may succeed in gain-

ing his point, and he may not. The Sabbath rolls around, the sermon is read. A few, for a little while, are pleased with the mellifluous words that fall upon their ears. The effects of the sermon soon pass away, like a gentle exhalation, and the minister, by and by, is chagrined to behold that his labors have been almost fruitless. The Sermon was not calculated for the poor and illiterate had they been there. But they were not at the church for several reasons. First, the church, the house itself, with its fine carpets, its velvet cushioned pews, its splendid organ, all seemed to admonish them to stay away. The theme itself is too high and elevated for you to understand and appreciate with your ignorant and uncultivated mind. The sermon is the production of a learned and highly refined Doctor of Divinity. Its sublimity is far beyond your comprehension. The fine carpet says, "don't touch me with your dirty, poverty-stricken feet." The pew says, "away with your rags, you must not defile me." The organ says, "come not within my presence, my notes are too soft, too sweet and inspiring for your uncultivated ear." But had all these said, "come let us worship and give thanks unto the Lord," what would the Doctor and his nervous congregation have said? We have a pretty good idea what the most of them would have said. Doubtless there would have been a little opposition exhibited against some of the leading injunctions of the Gospel. The Master has said, the poor have the Gospel preached to them. How many of our so-called Christian churches to-day can say, "we admit the poor into our churches that they may have the Gospel preached unto them."

There is another class of intelligent men and women, who are to a great extent, close observers. Though they are now in comfortable circumstances, they know not how soon misfortune may overtake them and, they themselves be reduced to poverty, and as they stand looking on at the treatment the poorer classes are receiving at the hands of the rich churches, they shrink from becoming church members, fearing to risk a

religion that cares so little for the poor.— They judge of christianity by the influence it exerts over its present professors, and as they appear to them to be selfish, they turn from the religion lest they become more so themselves.

We are constitutionally religious beings. Every one must and will have some kind of a religion, a kind of binding process, (for that is the meaning of the term,) that which binds us to something greater than ourselves.

It is a prevailing opinion that religion is calculated to bless its possessor. It seems to be the determination of all to have some religion. If we are driven from the Protestant, we go to the Catholic. If we cannot embrace either of these, we seek the Jewish, Mahometan, or some religion calculated to satisfy our own minds. If we are out of reach of all of these, we then fall back upon some natural religion, common to those living in some unenlightened country. Again we notice that the system of religion which takes hold of the masses is always the most powerful. When we lose that, we are like Samson shorn of his locks. As that system of religion which cares for the poor or the common people, is necessarily the most powerful, the reason why the Catholics in this and other cities, are increasing more rapidly than the Protestants, at once becomes apparant. They minister to the wants of the poor, and in this consists their strength. In this one respect they are a worthy example for Protestant Christian Churches to emulate. No Catholic church is too fine for the reception of its poorest members. No sermon too sublime for them to listen to. No music too sweet and melodious as not to cheer the heart and enliven the spirits of the poorest members. Why are Catholic churches always filled to overflowing? because there is a spirit of equality, of love and sympathy existing among the members. Why are the principles advanced in Catholic sermons adhered to with such constancy by the members? merely because they have been addressed

to all classes alike. Why does the music of Catholic churches possess a richer charm for its members, than that of the aristocratic Protestant churches? because its harmony is intended to fall upon the ears of the rich and poor alike. In the Catholic churches, all are on a common level. In the majority of the Protestant churches, wealth makes distinctions. The poor are seldom seen worshiping in the churches of the rich. They are sometimes admitted, but are not always acceptable. Here is a haughty and ostentatious spirit of worship, a pride of feeling, a sort of *noli me tangere* characterizing many of the so-called Christian churches, which tends to repel the poverty-stricken, the meek, the poor in spirit, and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. It is no unusual thing in a city to see wealthy families seated in their pews on a Sabbath, listening to flowery sermons prepared expressly for their benefit, while the coachman or hack-driver is seated upon a thousand dollar carriage in front of the church, reading the New York Mercury, or meditating upon the folly of religious worship. In such churches a storm of contempt is seen to gather over the countenances of numerous professed Christians, when any poor worshipper is seen among them clothed in the garb of poverty, and whole congregations of such have been thrown into a state of tumult and confusion, because some poor colored brother chanced to enter their door. It matters not how many fine sermons may be written and read, innumerable theories upon metaphysical subjects may be advanced and listened to by some with delight, but one little word or deed of Christian kindness will accomplish more for the cause of religion than all the selfish sermons of an age. Show the poor that you care for them and are willing to labor for them, and a higher and purer spirit of Christianity will at once be infused into the hearts of the people. The advocates of natural religion when brought into civilized countries prefer their own form of religion to that of Christianity. For they who profess to

be governed by the former, always have a word of comfort for the poor, while they say the Christian neglects them and avoids their society. The common people, they say, will not embrace your religion, because you fail to assist them to do so, yet you set in your fine churches with folded arms, and say, unless all men become Christians like us, they will be eternally damned. Before dealing out threats of punishment to others, we should be sure that the position we occupy is such as to make us secure from similar punishment. These, and many others are the obstacles thrown in the way to hinder the success of the cause of Christianity. Protestants are not doing as well as they intend or wish to do. Perhaps the trouble is, they are not working by the Gospel rule. They have cisterns, but they are too small. They hold some water, but not enough.— They have a Gospel, but it is too limited. It is not broad enough to accommodate all. Suppose we throw away our little vessels and come to the deep and broad well of salvation, come to that river the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God. Let us all adhere to the simple yet glorious principles of the Gospel. Let us grasp the old Jerusalem blade that was instrumental in one day, of converting three thousand souls, in the hands of the first preachers, who were always successful.— Let us follow in the steps of those who all preached alike, who went about telling the simple story of the cross, carrying to the poor, words of cheer and comfort, and who were not ashamed to induct into the church, upon the Gospel plan, the Ethiopian or colored man, when he would say that he believed with all his heart that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. The sermons of the first preachers were sublime enough for the admiration and contemplation of angels. They contained force and wisdom enough to attract the attention of the Jewish lords, the wisest statesmen, and the intelligent and learned of all classes. Yet they preached with such plainness and simplicity that the common masses all understood as soon as heard. Having heard and asked

what they should do to be saved, the preacher told them, and they did that which he commanded and were blessed and saved.— When Peter preached, he simply made reference to his own experience, he referred to the Prophets and the Psalms, proving that Jesus Christ was the son of God.— He told them that they had wickedly murdered Him, that He had arisen again, and what they saw was a fulfillment of the sayings of the Prophets and of the Savior's own words.

Let us have more pentecostal preaching, and our prayers will be more speedily answered when we pray for pentecostal showers. This is the old Gospel arrangement. When God wants it changed to something different He will do it, and the change will be right, having done it himself. Every effort men make to change for something new will be for the worse. Go tell John the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. It is for us, of to-day, to do all in our power, that the poor may enjoy with us equal religious privileges. The Bible should be our platform. Faith, repentance and baptism, the old apostolic plan of induction into the church, should still be adhered to. These three requirements were all that was necessary to gain an admittance into the church. In order to remain in the church, it was incumbent upon each member that he should love God with all his heart, which will be shown by doing His commandments. God commands us to do what his Son tells us to do, and He tells us to love God with all our hearts, and to love man as well as God, also to keep in memory the death of the Savior by observing the Lord's Supper. These are the three fundamental and binding requirements laid down for Christians to follow. The observance of these will lead men up to a higher and a holier life, and the higher a Christian ascends in holiness the lower he will descend into the vale of poverty and distress, that he may mingle and sympathize with the sons and daughters of sorrow. As men become ennobled with the spirit of true Christianity they forsake

pride and arrogance for humility. Instead of wearing a contemptuous smile, they always carry with them a feeling of sympathy for the poor and the oppressed, and like their Savior, love to go about doing good. The soul of Howard became imbued with the religion of Christ and he descended into the "gloom of the prison, and the taint of the lazar-house" that he might carry to the poor and the outcast of the world, the hope and consolations of Christianity. Did this same spirit pervade the churches of to-day, the poor would not be seen as they are, shut out from church and from religion with no kind words to comfort them in their hour of sorrow and distress. In every pulpit an humble *Christian* minister would be found speaking to them words of cheer, and pointing them to that bright, eternal home where sorrows and afflictions never come. May the Great Head of the Church help his people to see eye to eye, and may His divine aid come to rescue the professed Church of Christ from the enemies that threaten its overthrow.

G. B. ROGERS.

THE NEW TRANSLATION.

NO. X.

MESSRS. EDITORS:

In the 19th verse, the New Translation says: "FOR I AM OLD, AND MY WIFE IS ADVANCED IN YEARS."

One might naturally ask the question,— "What is the difference between being 'OLD' and 'ADVANCED IN YEARS?'" Had the translator followed the Greek, he would not have made Zechariah express precisely the same idea in different form.

Our Revision has it in exact accordance with the original: "I AM AN OLD MAN, AND MY WIFE IS FAR ADVANCED IN YEARS."

We have before shown that the Greek

word, which is here translated "far advanced," as also in the 7th verse, means that, and not merely "advanced in years."

The Greek word translated "AN OLD MAN," is "PRESBUTES," properly a *noun*. The noun for "AN OLD WOMAN" is "PRESBUTIS." The Revision, then, is strictly in accordance with the Greek, and the New Translation, in varying from it, has departed from the original.

In the 19th verse, the Revision says: "I WAS SENT."

The New Translation has changed this to: "I AM SENT."

The Greek verb is "APESTALEEN," the Second Aorist; Indicative; Passive.

Every Greek scholar will admit without hesitation, that the Second Aorist is a historical tense, and that its meaning in narrative relates to the past, not to the present. It does not signify "AM," but "WAS."

By what right, then, is "AM" substituted for "WAS?" We know of no reason, no authority, no justification for such a change, but regard it as altogether unwarranted and improper. Indeed, if such liberties are permitted in translation, if the present may be substituted for the past at the option of the translator, there is no limit to the changes which can be made in statements of fact. The occurrences which transpired thousands of years ago, may be declared to be *now* taking place, and the parties then concerned with them, to be *now* living. By such a mode of translation, Jesus may be proved to be at this time in the wilderness, and John immersing in the Jordan.

In the same verse, the Bible Union's Revision has: "THESE GLAD TIDINGS."

The New Translation has: "THIS GOOD NEWS."

It is sufficient to remark upon the difference in this case, that the number indicated in the Greek is *plural*, and not singular.— The Greek word which determines this is "TAUTA," the Accusative; Neuter; Plural. Of this there cannot be room for doubt. Therefore, the New Translation, in substituting the singular for the plural, has again departed from the original.

In the latter part of the next verse (the 20th), the Bible Revision has: "MY WORDS, WHICH SHALL BE FULFILLED IN THEIR SEASON."

The New Translation has changed this to: "MY WORDS, WHICH SHALL BE FULFILLED IN THEIR PROPER TIME."

The Greek words which close the sentence are "KAIRON AUTOON," THEIR SEASON. It may, indeed, be said that "their season" is their reasonable time, or their proper time, or their opportune period. But the word "Season" so precisely corresponds with "Kairos" in various uses, and so completely expresses the idea in the present case, that there is no reason for a change. "EN KAIROO" is "IN SEASON," "APO KAIROO" is "OUT OF SEASON," "KAIROO" is "SEASONABLY."

"Words fulfilled in their season," are words fulfilled at the time appointed for them and appropriate for them, as fruit maturing in its season. It does not help the idea to say, that fruit maturing in its season matures at its proper time. No such change improves a translation. It is an awkward substitute of two words for one, where the original has only one, and where the one by which the original is translated in the Union's Revision, expresses its full and appropriate meaning.

In the next verse (the 21st), the Greek makes a marked distinction in the use of two forms of verbs. In the first, it joins the imperfect tense of the verb, EIMI, TO BE, with the present participle of the verb signifying, TO WAIT; thus making a form which is exactly represented by the English "WERE WAITING." In this the Revision and the New Translation perfectly agree. But in the next clause the Greek drops this form, and simply uses a single form of a verb: "ETHAUMAZON," THEY "WONDERED." The New Translation, however, still retains the compound form, and makes it: THEY "WERE WONDERING."

Aside from the awkwardness of the expression "Were wondering," there appears to be no reason for adopting a compound form in a case in which the original pur-

posely avoids it, after employing the compound form in the clause immediately preceding.

Respectfully,
WM. H. WYCKOFF, Cor. Sec.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. VII.

HARRODSBURG, KY., May 29, '63.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

I had promised to expose the error that is found in the translation of Matt. xxviii: 19, as found in the Revised Gospels. I will not, however, charge this error upon them directly, but I charge them with not correcting a palpable error of the Common Version, which version they propose to revise and correct. They have permitted this error to remain, and, therefore, they have given their sanction to error, and are guilty of suppressing the truth, and, in the words of the Secretary, their translation "interpolates human thoughts under the guise of divine revelations."

The error of which I speak is found in the preposition *in* which they use for *into*. Their version reads thus:

"Go therefore, and disciple all the nations, immersing them *in* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," &c.

The palpable error lies in the preposition *in*. But, before we show this error, let us look at the first part of this commission. There is a want of perspicuity; there is something obscure here. Let us read again. "Go, therefore, and disciple all the nations, immersing them," &c.

The pronoun *them* must stand for nations, as there is no other word for which it can stand. This being so, we have here an immersion of all the nations. All the nations

must be disciplined and immersed. Now, that such is the meaning and intent of the Savior, is obvious, if we have the exact thought of the original in these words of the Revisors. But that such was not his meaning, is obvious from the Greek text. The Bible Union has given to the pedobaptist world a fine argument for immersing infants. Disciple all nations immersing them—the nations. And the pedobaptist will say, that he dedicates the child to God in immersion, and thereby fits him for becoming a disciple. Further; he says the participle “immersing,” expresses the manner in which the nations become disciples; and all that is needed is, to immerse the nations, thereby making them disciples, and after this teach them to observe the commandments. The pedobaptist will thank the Union for this, no doubt.

But again: “Disciple all the nations, immersing them.” The obscurity in this English is palpable. In the Greek, there is no obscurity whatever. We confess our partiality to the word, “disciple;” but nothing must be done by partiality in translating the word of God. No human thoughts must take the place of the divine word. Let us see the Greek. The word *ethne* is neuter. The pronoun *autous*, which is translated by the word *them*, is masculine. It cannot, therefore, stand for the neuter noun *ethne*, nations. As *autous* cannot stand for *ethne*, the Revisors, by their version, have interpolated a human thought for a divine revelation. As this is done in the beginning of the commission, we need not wonder at the error in the latter part.

But this is an error that involves consequences of no ordinary magnitude. Here is a commission delivered by Him who was just clothed with all authority in heaven and on earth. Every word must be weighed with the most profound reverence, and with the utmost care. By this commission the Holy Twelve were guided in all their preaching and teaching; and by this same commission must all who preach, be guided to the end of time. An error here is fraught with danger to every one.

The Revisors have expressed the command of the Savior in obscure language, yet the command is given as if to be performed *in* the name, that is, by the authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Now, when a command or charge is given by one clothed with all authority in heaven and on earth; and when this command is to be performed *in* the name, that is, by the authority of the Father, Son and Spirit, surely, the words of the command should be given in the most perspicuous language. But the Revisors, with characteristic obscurity, give us the words: “Go, therefore, and disciple all the nations, immersing them.” All the nations must then be immersed. Every one feels, I say, *feels* that there is something wrong here. I use the word *feels* deliberately. For there is in the human spirit something, be it what may, that recognizes that which is true, when the truth is plainly spoken. And this same, something, be it what it may, condemns error, when it sees it. To the reader of God’s word truth brings satisfaction, contentment, peace; error awakens dissatisfaction, discontent, trouble. But, to the preposition *in*.

I deny that the preposition *eis* ever has the signification of *en*. To assume that it has would be to destroy the foundations of knowledge. Words are given to us as the means of conveying to others our thoughts. The meaning of words must therefore be fixed and certain; or we can convey no thought, gain no knowledge. “If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaks a barbarian; and he that speaks a barbarian to me.” Thus Paul thought.

Then *eis to onoma* cannot equal *ento onomati*, or *epi to onomati*. We have, for example, these words, John v: 43, “I have come *in* my Father’s name, and you receive me not; if another should come *in* his own name, him you would receive.” Here the sense is obvious; “in my Father’s name” means, by the authority of my Father. In this place *eis* would be impossible. Again; Blessed is he that comes in the name of

the Lord. Matt. xxi: 9. Here, the preposition *en* occurs again, and the meaning of *en to onomati* is, as is obvious, by the authority of the Lord.

I will now quote a passage, Matt vi: 22, in which the dative is used without a preposition; *to so onomati* with a meaning somewhat different from the dative with *en*. "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name." Here, the dative is one of means. Have we not prophesied by means of thy name; making use of thy name. And again; Matt. xxiv: 5, the dative with *epi*, in nearly the same sense, many will come in my name: here, it is not, by the authority of Christ, but, depending on my name, making use of my name as a means to deceive.

En and *epi* have in some places the same or nearly the same signification. In Acts iv: 7, "By what power, or by, (or in,) what name have you done this?" *en* is used here, as we say; In the name of the Commonwealth, or by the authority of the Commonwealth. Thus *en* may be used for the Hebrew *be*. Again, in verse 18; "And they called them and commanded them to speak no more at all, nor to teach in the name of Jesus." Here *epi* is used. The sense of the two places is obvious. 1. "In or by what name." 2. "To teach in or by, or relying on the name of Jesus."

With these places before us let us now turn to Acts ii: 38. "Be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ." Here we find *epi*. Taking the foregoing meanings of *epi* in the places quoted, we can now see how full of meaning this word is. Be immersed in the name of Jesus; that is, we immerse you according to his commandment. We act in his name; by his authority; relying upon his name; he commanded us to immerse those who believe. You are immersed by his authority; in his name; relying on him; depending on him; for, in order to, the remission of sins. In Acts x: 48 *en* occurs. He commanded them to be immersed, *en*, in the name of the Lord; that is, simply by his authority.

Observe, reader, that the command of

Peter is given in the name of Jesus, not of God the Father, nor of the Holy Spirit.

Here, then, we come in conflict with Papists, Protestants and Baptists, and fearlessly, so far as they are concerned, but with profound reverence in the sight of God the Father, we say, that no one was ever immersed in the days of the apostles, by the authority of God the Father, or by the authority of the Holy Spirit, but in the name, or by the authority of the Lord Jesus. The two passages, Acts ii: 38, and x: 48, show this. The reason is plain. We turn again to the words of Jesus:

"All authority is given to me in heaven, and on earth, go, therefore."

"Therefore," means "for this reason."—And the reason is—because all authority is given to *me*. By whose authority, then, did the apostles act in preaching and immersing? Children and the people generally will say, at once;—by the authority of Jesus. God the Father had just clothed him with all authority, and yet, with this truth most perspicuously stated they make the Savior command the apostles to immerse *in* the name of God and the Spirit. Yes, the Savior is made to say that he has all authority in heaven and on earth, and, in the very same sentence, he is made to deny this. And this error has become hoary with age, and claims the veneration of millions. Before it the Bible Union delight to bow and offer homage. Fearless of the millions that are against me, I assert the rights, the authority of Him to whom God the Father has given all authority, and I hold up this error to the light that it may be seen and avoided by all who love the truth.

The Revisors have not only suppressed the truth, they have given their sanction to an error, by which the people are deprived of the knowledge of their relationship to God the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. The right translation of this part of the commission is: Immersing them *in* to the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Here the expression, "name of the Father" is a periphrase

for "Father" just as, in many instances in the New Testament, "Name of Christ" is a periphrase for Christ, and the passage stripped of this periphrastic style, would read—"Immersing them into the Father, the Son, and the Spirit." But as this would sound badly, and seem irreverential, we have the beautiful, and reverential words—name of the Father, &c.

From this formula, "immersing into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit," come those oft-repeated expressions in the apostolic letters, "in God the Father, in Christ, in the Son, in the Spirit." When we are immersed into the name of the Father, we become his children; immersed into the name of the Son, we are saved from our sins, and he becomes our Savior, Priest, Teacher, Guide. Immersed into the Spirit, we are made partakers of the Spirit; we are strengthened by it; it dwells in us; it sanctifies us; it helps our infirmities. All this knowledge is lost by means of the version given to us by the Bible Union. Yes, they fear to translate God's truth lest the light of the truth should shine to their people. If I am wrong in saying, "they fear;" I will retract, and say, they know not the truth of God; and if they circulate their version among their own people, then they will only add darkness to darkness; and we can only conclude that God has smitten them with blindness, because they have disregarded the voice of his Son.

I am here reminded of the many conversations that I had with Dr. John L. Waller, during his stay in Louisville. He was a most ardent friend of Revision, and sincerely desired to see a pure version of the oracles of God. He has gone, like the aged Maclay, to the world of Spirits. But had he lived, he would have vexed his righteous soul with the unlawful English of this Bible Revision.

NOTE. The Cor. Sec. of the Bible Union will remember that we hold him accountable for his charge, that we have departed from the words of inspiration. He must "stick to his text," if I may use a common

saying, and do nothing else but prove his assertion.
H. T. ANDERSON.

P. S. As the expression, "in the name," means, "by the authority of," let us turn to Math. x: 41, of the Bible Union version, and read: "He that receives a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receives a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward."

Now what can we understand by receiving a prophet *in the name of a prophet*?—As, "in the name" means, "by the authority of" we understand, that, he that receives a prophet by the authority of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward. This is like the rest of the work done by the Union. They are determined that no one shall understand the New Testament, as far as it is in their power to prevent it. But "eis onoma" is here in this place, and the Revisors had their eyes turned, perhaps, to the commission. In this, as usual, they have displayed their want of knowledge of Greek. "Eis onoma" cannot be translated "in the name." It has no such meaning. They may see a version of it, at some future time. To what honor were these Revisors exalted! But alas, how have they fallen! Upon the Society, let the name henceforth be written—ICHABOD.

H. T. A.

THE BLESSED NAME.—The name Jesus is not only light, but also food; it is likewise oil, without which all the food of the soul is dry; it is salt, unseasoned by which, whatever is presented to us is insipid; it is honey in the mouth, melody in the ear, joy in the heart, medicine to the soul; and there are no charms in any discourse in which his name is not heard.—Bernard.

POPULAR CHRISTIANITY.

It is not my design, Mr. Editor, in penning these few lines, to ridicule, vilify, or malign true, genuine *Christianity*, or religion. I do not wish to detract aught from the fair name and fame which it has so justly acquired, and which it condignly merits. God forbid it! I profess to be a friend to true, *Bible Christianity*. I have openly volunteered, and pledged myself before men and angels—before heaven and earth—ever to be loyal to King Jesus, to fight under the ample folds of his blood-stained banner, and “strike till the last armed foe expires!” Yet, I do most solemnly protest against the *popular Christianity* of the present day. But by the phrase, “popular Christianity,” I do not, at this time, have reference so much to errors in *doctrine* as in *practice*.

It is positively humiliating to contemplate how poorly the pure and unsullied principles of Christianity flourish, even in our own country (to say nothing of England)—a country which is emphatically a *land of Bibles*—a land which professes to shed more gospel light upon its inhabitants than any other country; a land which sets up high claims for the vigor and purity of its Christianity; a land of “Sabbath and sanctuary privileges;” a land where you can scarcely get out of sight of church-steeple, or out of hearing of church-bells!

It is no part of popular Christianity to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.—Wealthy Christianity and squalid poverty exist side by side for year after year. There is more strife in the church (falsely so called) to see who shall build the most costly church edifice, erect the highest spire, and adorn the inside with all that can excite the pride, flatter the vanity, than there is to see who shall look faithfully and efficiently after the wants of the poor and perishing within her borders. There is money enough

lavished upon churches unnecessarily, to feed all the hungry, and clothe all the naked! And what does it all amount to in the way of producing Christian character? How is selfishness and avarice—evils that are deep-seated in the bosom of fallen humanity—to be overcome by converting the world to the popular type of Christianity? What has *modern Christianity* accomplished, or what is it likely to accomplish in that direction? Go into the busy, bustling mart, and you will find those who have just arisen from their knees; and those, too, who prate loudest about “Holy Ghost religion,” and “heart-felt religion,” as busily engaged in driving a sharp bargain, trying to circumvent and overreach their neighbor in a trade, as those who make no pretensions to Christianity. Is this the religion that is going to convert the world—that shall disseminate true philanthropy, benevolence, charity, fidelity, and disinterested and self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of Christ far and wide? Great God, what hypocrisy?

Let *revivals* sweep over the land, prostrating everything that opposes their progress, and when thousands have been “scared through,” or gathered into the churches, what has society or the cause of Christ gained? Is the converted miser any less a miser? Is the ambitious seeker after fame, or wealth, or power, any less such? In short, is the animal selfishness in any degree removed? I grant, you may have given him a long, sanctimonious *dough-face*; you may have given a religious *cant* or *drawl* to his *voice*; you may have robbed him of his reason and made him a fanatic or a bigot; (I mean generally speaking—of course, there are many illustrious exceptions,) but his animal feelings have not been uprooted, and pure, disinterested love and benevolence implanted in its place; he is as greedy as ever to drive a sharp bargain; he clings with as much tenacity as ever to his earthly treasures; and the hand of poverty is still stretched out to him in vain for relief.

Do the popular churches of our large

cities, as a general thing, look after the poor, even among their own brethren and sisters? I challenge them to answer!—While the members of our *orthodox* churches are wallowing in wealth and luxury, clothing themselves in “purple and fine linen,” and faring “sumptuously every day;” and while the church has (perhaps) a large poor fund on hand, there are poor widows and orphans, members of their own churches, pining in want and destitution!

What has the world to expect from such a Christianity? In what respect are the poor to be benefitted by such a religion?—What effect has it upon the proud, selfish and worldly minded?

Go from the bustling mart to the fashionable church, and what do you find there? Look in upon them! listen to the rustling silks! witness the gorgeous display of wealth and fashion, and snuff the odors of the fashionable perfume shop, and tell me, where else on the face of God’s footstool can you find such an exhibition of vanity, pride and superciliousness? And yet, these churches claim to be the embodiment of true religion, and represent what is to be the effect of Christianity upon the world! that when all are converted like themselves, then the millennium will come!

How do people who belong to the popular sects, and give their example and substance to the support of false Christianity, while the true is trampled under foot, expect to answer to their consciences for their dishonesty and hypocrisy? Not one in ten of them believes there is any more connection between the popular religion of this age, than there is between Belial and Christ; yet, for the sake of being with the popular multitude, or because their worldly interests are thereby subserved and promoted, they stifle conscience, trample truth and honesty under foot, and crucify Christ without repenting! Is this faith in God, or infidelity? Deliver me from such Christianity as this! The following Scriptural *excerpta* is an epitome of the teachings

of the Bible touching the sins treated of above:

1. *Covetousness.* “Thou shalt not covet;” Ex. xix: 17. “He coveteth greedily all the day long, but the righteous giveth and spareth not;” Prov. xxi: 26. “Incline my heart unto thy testimonies, and not to covetousness;” Psa. cxix: 36. “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and thieves break through and steal;” Matt. vi: 19. “I have coveted no man’s silver, or gold, or apparel;” Acts xx: 33. “For to be carnally minded is death;” Rom. viii: 6. “The love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some coveted after, they erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows;” 1 Tim. vi: 10. “Lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy;” 2 Tim. iii: 2.

2. *Riches.* “There is that maketh himself rich, yet hath nothing; there is that maketh himself poor, yet hath great riches;” Prov. xiii: 7. “Let not the rich man glory in his riches;” Jer. ix: 23. “Verily, I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven;” Matt. xix: 27. “He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away;” Luke i: 53. “Wo unto you that are rich, for you have received your consolation;” Luke vi: 24. “And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments;” Luke xvi: 22, 23. “But ye have despised the poor; do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats?” Jas. ii: 6.

3. *Uncharitableness.* “They cause the naked to lodge without clothing that they have no covering in cold;” Job. xxiv: 6.—“Pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father, is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world;” Jas. i: 27. “If a brother or sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of

you say unto him, depart in peace—be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" Jas. ii: 15, 16.

4. *Pride*. "Let not the foot of pride come against me;" Psa. xxxvi: 11. "Him that hath an high look and a proud heart will not I suffer;" Psa. ci: 5. "Pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate;" Prov. viii: 13. "The Lord will destroy the house of the proud; but he will establish the borders of the widow;" Prov. xv: 25. "Every one that is proud in heart, is an abomination to the Lord;" Prov. xvi: 5. "A man's pride shall bring him low, but honor shall uphold the meek in spirit;" Prov. xxix: 23. "Lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall unto the condemnation of the devil;" 1 Tim. iii: 6. "Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven;" Matt. xviii: 4.

5. *Vanity*. "Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity;" Psa. cxix: 37. "Wealth gotten by vanity shall be diminished;" Prov. xiii: 11. "Turn from these vanities to the living God;" Prov. xiii: 11. "Behold they are all vanity—their works are nothing;" Isa. xli: 11. "They speak great swelling words of vanity;" 2 Pet. ii: 18.

6. *Fashion*. "If there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, or in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect for him that weareth the gay clothing, and say to him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool, are you not then partial in yourselves?" Jas. ii: 1-7. "I will also that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with the broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but which becometh women professing godliness;" 1 Tim. ii: 9. "Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, of wearing of gold, and of putting on of apparel;" 1 Pet. iii: 3.

I must lay down my pen. My sheet is full. I own I have written plainly, but I prefer disclosing the truth in a plain manner to making use of honeyed phrases, which signify just nothing at all. And is it not every word truth? Reader, decide for yourself. C. J. KIMBALL.

BEREAVEMENT.

BY JOHN P. MITCHELL.

The earth is fresh upon a grave
The loved one has departed;
The Lord has claimed the gift he gave,
And thou art broken-hearted.

Thy home is sad, its light has fled,
A shadow has descended,
And rested on thy darling's head;
Her infant days are ended.

Gaze where thou wilt, some token there
Calls up again thy weeping,
And drives thy heart, in dark despair,
To where thy child is sleeping.

The dress she wore, in childish pride,
Is lying folded neatly;
The flow'rs she tended, ere she died,
Are blooming just as sweetly.

When midnight's gloom is over all,
Thy infant's face is beaming;
Thou hearest, then, her childish call,
But thou art only dreaming.

For, reaching forth to grasp thy dead,
In happiness elysian,
In darkness has the shadow fled,
And all is but a vision.

All through the long and lonely day,
The weary heart is turning,
And for the dear one gone away,
Thy soul is ever yearning.

But cease thy grief, and humbly pray,
The Lord can soothe thy sorrow;
For he who called thy child away
May call on thee to-morrow.

On earth thy child thou canst not see,
This thought thy heart has blighted;
But all who love the Lord will be
In Heaven re-united.

One thought should still thy spirit bless,
Although thy heart is riven:
On earth there is a being less—
An angel more in heaven.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

ELDER M. N. LORD:

Dear Sir—Your reply in the "Review" of June the 30th, requesting a change in the phraseology of our proposition for discussion, has been received. If the change will benefit the mass of common readers, I have no objection to the change you mention, as it does not change the essence of the proposition. I think the following phraseology will be free from ambiguity, and will be comprehended by all classes of readers, and will embrace all the argument necessary on both sides: HAVE WE SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE IN NATURE AND THE BIBLE TO PROVE THAT ETERNAL HAPPINESS WILL BE THE DESTINY OF THE WHOLE HUMAN FAMILY.

The reader by comparing this with the former phraseology, will perceive that the essence of both is the same,—for instance, the "evidence presented in the case," embraces all the facts in nature and the Bible, in affirmation of the proposition. Outside of these, there is no evidence. We cannot "believe" a thing, unless we have sufficient "reason" or "evidence" to *prove* it. The *proof* of anything is nothing more than bringing forth the "evidence" to establish it, or convince our mind of its truth.

The reader will, therefore, perceive that the above phraseology, which is in accordance with your own suggestions, will not limit my arguments in the least. Nature in its general sense, as given by Webster, is, "Whatever is made or produced; a word that comprehends all the works of God; the universe," and in which sense I shall use it, and the Bible *embraces all that exists*. But I had intended from the first to leave out all irrelevant matter, and limit the argument as much as possible to do the subject entire justice. The subject is an important one; and anything calculated to throw any light upon it, should be educed.

In a discussion of this kind, and one involving such momentous consequences, nothing should be taken for granted, but each position taken by either party, should be established by sufficient proof or evidence, to establish it as a valid position.—Mere assertions should not be received.

I shall endeavor to perform my part thoroughly and faithfully.

In each article I shall endeavor to not exceed one and a half columns, or two columns at most. I shall endeavor to observe the utmost candor and gentlemanly courtesy throughout, and *believe* that I shall receive the same in return. We, Elder Lord—for I cannot call you brother, but by common brotherhood of the whole human family,—can discuss this matter of difference in a proper spirit.

It will not be out of place, if it is not necessary, before commencing the general argument upon the proposition we have agreed to discuss, to make a few general remarks upon the great difference of our views upon man's condition here, and also beyond the grave, and the different characters these views give us of our one and common God.

The doctrine of partial salvation or endless woe to the great mass of the human family, is the most sad and dreadful in its nature, and awful fearful in its results, of any doctrine ever promulgated to man. No other evil so great as this could possibly be conceived by the imagination of man, or could fall upon the human family.

Yet, as revolting as this doctrine is to all the faculties of human nature and our conceptions of the character of an all-wise, powerful, good, and merciful God, it has been zealously advocated since about A. D. 500, to the present time, by the great body of the church, as an essential doctrine of the Bible, and one of the most efficient means for the prevention of crime, and the promotion of virtue. But a day of better things is fast dawning upon us, and we are forming nobler conceptions of the character of God and the relation which we sustain towards Him as His dependent child-

ren, and we are fast learning that this Father will not be more unjust toward us than an earthly father would be.

There always have been many persons who have denied the correctness, and doubted the beneficial tendency of the doctrine of endless woe, and the number of these have been rapidly increasing since the dawn of the reformation. But within the last half century, a most astonishing change has been produced in the opinions of the Christian world.

The doctrine of endless punishment has almost been driven from the church in Germany. In England and France, some have ceased to preach it, while others have come out boldly against it. Nor, is the rejection of this doctrine confined wholly to those denominated Universalists. The Unitarians, Moravians, Shakers, and Dunkers, do not preach it; and among the clergy and members of the orthodox churches, are many who secretly believe with us. A great change has taken place in regard to the preaching of endless misery within the last century. A century ago, we were treated, in almost every sermon, to such words as, "burned in a lake of fire and brimstone," "burning hell," "endless damnation," &c., and which were as common as the words, "God," "Jesus Christ," "Gospel," &c.—But now there are replaced by milder terms, such as, "the stings of conscience," "unhappiness of the future state," "banished from the presence of God," &c., &c.

I, as a member of the great human family, and as a child of the Great Jehovah, and an heir of the eternal world, and a representative of His last, greatest, and noblest work, feel grateful for this opportunity, to vindicate, in my weak manner, His great and glorious character—a character, perfect in all its attributes. I wish to bring before the reader and endeavor to delineate the attributes of the great Deity, in all their perfection and beauty. As such, the Deity stands as the cause, creator, and ruler of universal nature, and in whose realms there exists no rival, or dictator. Knowing all things from the beginning, He has crea-

ted them as he designed them to be,—for he holdeth all power in his own hand, and there never has existed a being, whether he be man, angel, archangel, or devil, who has had the power to change, or to thwart any of His plans and operations. There is nothing that now exists, that God did not foresee and provide for; and from the characteristic attributes of God, there is nothing that now exist, that was not for the best, SIN, *not excepted*. It is such a God in whom I believe,—such a God I honor and revere. In such a God I rest my final destiny, and in whose hand I know it is safe and reserved for me,—not placed in my own hand, perchance, my vascillating nature might barter it away. This is the perfect character given to God by the deductions of Universalism. On the other hand, all the various systems of partial salvation deduced from the character of God, make it an imperfect one. They all agree that God is perfect in His attributes,—that he made all things as he designed them to be, *except man*. His last and best work, whom He pronounced *very good*, instead of *simply good*, as He had pronounced every thing else. But, here, according to these systems, some superior agency, comes in and thwarts God's designs towards man, causing him to become a different creature from what God designed him to be. That this is so, none of them will deny that God created man to be happy, that is, God's first design toward man was, that he should be a happy creature. Now they all claim that man is not as happy as he was created to be. There is something wrong in the premises, and it will be the object in my affirmation of the proposition to find out, if possible, what it is.

When the issue involved is summed up, it will reveal God in the following light:—He either designed Adam to sin, or He did not so design him. If God did design Adam to sin, it was in accordance to His will, and was for the best interests of the human race, and therefore fully provided for, leaving God still a perfect being. If God did not design Adam to sin, then Adam

sinned contrary to the will of God, and therefore, was superior to God, thus making God imperfect,—for He has created a being which He cannot control, limiting His power in this respect. With this introductory, I will proceed regularly with my arguments. Yours truly,

G. L. PURDY.

REVIEW OF "THE UNION DOCTRINAL BASIS."

Article 1. The Inspiration, Authority, and Sufficiency of the Bible.

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are given by inspiration of God, possessed of supreme authority, and the only infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice.

This article in language sufficiently clear, reaffirms a declaration found in the creeds of all Evangelical Churches, as they are styled, and does not indicate any nearer approach to unity in this respect than previously existed. No ground therefore is gained; unless, indeed, the ministers composing the Association have to a man abandoned their respective creeds, and thus given full proof of their hearty belief in the supreme authority of the Bible; as the only infallible, and sufficient rule of faith and practice. We have not been informed that they have thus acted, and confess ourselves unable to perceive the use of an article of faith; which though commending itself to all who believe the Bible to be the word of God, has been attended with no practical results. Nay; we have reason to believe that while the article in question admits fully the sufficiency of the word of God, the practice of the framers of that article, proves that Disciplines, Creeds, Confessions and Articles of Faith, are necessary and desirable. If the Scriptures are sufficient, what need of these? If the Scriptures are

infallible, what need to express our faith in other language than that of the Bible—that is, in language which is fallible. The Association, therefore, and the churches which its members represent, while they profess to believe in the sufficiency and infallibility of the word of God, act as if they thought it both insufficient and fallible. While the writer happens to know of a people, whose claim to be deemed Evangelical, would probably be disputed; who though having no creed; not even as much as embraced in the first article of the "Basis," afford the fullest demonstration, by their practice, that they believe in the sufficiency, and infallibility of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice, by adopting them as their rule—their *only* rule. Moreover, if the first article were adopted in its fullest extent, the necessity for the remaining twenty would not be very apparent—unless, indeed, they were expressed in the language of Scripture; which is by no means the case. But even the first article is unnecessary, for the same thought is quite as well expressed in the following words of an inspired Apostle, 2d. Tim. iii. 16, 17. Our devoting so much time to the first article, will enable us to deal briefly with the rest, as much that we have said with reference to this will apply to those that remain.

Art. 2. Private Judgment in the Interpretation of the Scriptures.

It is the right and the duty of every man to search the Scriptures, and in humble dependence upon the Holy Spirit to form his own judgment concerning their true meaning.

This in the main must be regarded as a protest against the Church of Rome; and yet I am not certain that all Protestants are permitted to enjoy, unmolested, any views which result from their own Bible readings; when those views are at variance with the standards of the Church. Some years since the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge urged upon the Presbyterian Church the necessity of having a new Commentary on the Bible prepared; which should better conform to the Church Standard, and it was moreover insisted upon, that King James' Version,

should be the text on which such Commentary should be based.

We agree, then, with the framers of this article, that it is the right, and duty of every man to search the Scriptures; this is enjoined upon us by the Scriptures themselves, and is greatly strengthened by the fact, that the Bible was not given to any class of men, but to all men. We would fain hope then, that this article is intended to teach, that men in reading the Bible, are under no obligation to make their interpretations agree with any of the Church Standards, but simply to be consistent with other portions of the word of God—if such be the meaning it is an improvement; a step in the right direction.

Art. 3. The Unity and Attributes of God; Creation and Providence.

The Lord our God is one Lord, and there is no other God. God is a spirit, eternal, everywhere present, all-wise, and almighty, infinite in holiness, justice, goodness, and truth; and God is love. He is the creator and preserver of all things, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

This article, is mainly the language of the Bible, setting forth the nature and attributes of God, and might be passed by without remark; were it not that there is at least a seeming difference between one of its declarations, "there is no other God" and the language of some of the articles which follow, which will be noted in the proper place.

Art. 4. The Trinity.

In the unity of the Godhead there are three persons—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

While the doctrine announced in this article has convulsed the Church for centuries, and given rise to fierce and unrelenting persecution, and been the occasion of books and sermons without number, most of which have only served to render the subject more mysterious, is it not a matter of wonder to every reflecting mind, that the word "Trinity" is not found in the Bible? and stranger still, in the judgment of thousands of honest Bible readers, its equivalent is also wanting. This article is free, it is true, from the contradictions, real, or apparent,

which abound in many of the theological standards upon this vexed question, and also from the obscurity of the terms used in its discussion, would it not then be safer, as well as wiser, to let our faith in regard to this matter consist in a hearty reception of all that the Bible declares concerning the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. These declarations all can comprehend; while the most profound writers upon the "Trinity" have frequently contradicted themselves, confused their readers, and confessed their subject to be a most mysterious one.

Art. 5. Jesus Christ God and Man.

Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Savior of the world, is in one person very God and very man.

The meaning of this article, could have been better expressed in the language of the New Testament writers, as, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," "God was manifest in the flesh," and the first chapter of Heb. with respect to Christ's divine nature; the second chapter with respect to his humanity.

Art. 6. Christ's Incarnation, Death, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession, and Reign, and his Coming to Judge the World.

Jesus Christ the Son of God, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilot, was crucified, dead, and buried, and the third day he rose again; he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God the Father, where he ever lives to make intercession for us. All power is given unto him in heaven and in earth, and he will come to judge the world at the last day.

A summary of New Testament facts.

Art. 7. The Atonement.

Jesus Christ took upon him our nature, yet without sin; he honored the divine law by his obedience; he died the just for the unjust; and made a full atonement for our sins, and uniting in his person the tenderest human sympathies with divine perfections, he is a suitable, compassionate, and all-sufficient Savior.

As no theory of atonement is assumed, the New Testament view is presumed to be meant.

Art. 8. The Work and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit, who, for Christ's sake, enlightens, reproveth, regenerates, comforts, and sanctifies the soul, is very God.

The Holy Spirit is said to perform its work for Christ's sake, what this may mean we are unable to say, as we cannot recall anything in the Scriptures which conveys that idea to the mind. It does occur to us however, that the work attributed to the Holy Spirit in this article, is not regarded in the Bible as being exclusively the work of the Spirit. It is said of the word of God: "The entrance of thy word giveth light," the Scriptures are profitable for reproof; Peter says, "Being born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." The word of God is represented as a source of comfort, and has ever been resorted to for that purpose, and never in vain; and the Savior prayed for his disciples in these words: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Thus we see that all which in this article is attributed to the Holy Spirit, is in the Scriptures also attributed to the word of God. It may be that the framers of this article regard the Holy Spirit, as effecting all that is there mentioned, through the word of God as a means, which it unquestionably does; but it is liable to great misapprehension, as if evident from the fact, that many do suppose that all this is accomplished by the Holy Spirit directly, and not through the instrumentality of the word of God. The declaration, that the Holy Spirit, is very God savors more of the schools, than of the Bible.

Art. 9. Free Will.

The human will is free in choosing and refusing good or evil, and this freedom is essential to man's responsibility.

The only wonder is, that the truth of the above should ever have been doubted, and the adoption of it by many of those whose creeds and practice seemed to indicate the opposite of that statement looks like an advance in the right direction. It would be most strange if God were to enjoin certain things upon us, and forbid certain other

things, knowing that we could not obey the former or refrain from the latter. Much Calvinism was yielded, and much truth gained, when the above article was adopted.

Art. 10. Man's Disobedience and Sinfulness.

Man was made upright, but disobeyed God's law, and became a sinner, and brought death upon himself and his posterity, and in consequence of this disobedience all his descendants, by natural generation, are at enmity with God, and have deceitful and wicked hearts, and are inclined to evil continually, till they are born of the Spirit.

That man by disobeying God's law became a sinner, and brought death upon himself and posterity by his disobedience, does not, we think, admit of doubt; but when the Bible teaches, that sin is the transgression of the law, we are not able to see very clearly, how the law is transgressed by little children, whom the Savior seemed to regard as innocent, when he said in the days of his flesh: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." And again, when addressing the sinful, he said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven"—in both of these cases, children instead of being regarded as sinners, seem to be the types of sinlessness.

Art. 11. The Sufficiency and Freeness of Salvation.

The atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ is sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and in the Gospel salvation is sincerely offered to all men.

Coming from the source which it does, we are truly glad to see the announcement made; "That in the Gospel, salvation is sincerely offered to all men." To us we must confess, that an offer of salvation through the Gospel, to all men, with the explanation that, a certain limited, and definite number only could accept it—savored of insincerity, nor could we see clearly the guilt of those who failed, to accept the Gospel which was really never intended for them, and which was consequently impossible to obey. We understand from the article above, then, that God means what he says, and that ir-

respective of all the conclusions of theologians to the contrary. Whosoever will, may take of the water of life freely.

Art. 12. Of Regeneration.

Except a man be born of the Spirit, he can not see the kingdom of God; and every man who is in Christ is a new creature.

To this article we have serious objections—the first of these is, the term Regeneration is not used in the sense intended by the inspired writers; it is used only twice in the New Testament, once by the Savior.—Matt. xix: 28, in which it does not mean a process, as it evidently does in the article above; but a new state or kingdom; not the means by which man enters that state or kingdom—to thus confound the kingdom of Christ with the means of entering that kingdom is an error of no ordinary magnitude. The next instance in which it is used is by Paul in his letter to Titus, 3 chap. and 5th verse, in which place it evidently means Baptism. Thus the term Regeneration in this article has not the meaning of the same word in the New Testament. The second objection is, that half truths are sometimes whole falsehoods—that is; they convey an impression far different from that which was designed, and that impression a false one. The article declares that, “Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God,” a declaration neither found in, nor warranted by, the Bible. There are two passages in the New Testament which have some resemblance to the language just quoted from the 12th article of the Basis, the first, John iii:3—“Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” The second is John iii: 5—“Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Some of the words of both of these passages are quoted in the article without giving the sense of either. The first passage has the word “again” omitted, and the words, “of the Spirit” substituted. The second passage, has the words, “of water and” omitted, and nothing substituted, and the words, “enter into” omitted, and the word “see” substituted. The effect of these

apparently slight changes is to give an idea foreign to the word of God, and involves, moreover, an adding to, and a taking from, the word of God; against both of which there is a terrible denunciation in the 18th and 19th verses of the 22d chapter of Revelation. Were the “Basis” the production of a single mind, dashed off in an hour or two, we could readily attribute this error to haste, or confounding two similar passages—but what shall we say when those articles have been under consideration two years, and have been unanimously adopted by thirty-five ministers, representing ten different denominations?

True, it may be urged, that the words of the article are found in the Scriptures, this is not denied, and from this very circumstance arises the danger: for which the words may be called from different passages, the thought is not Scriptural.

Paul said, Rom. i: 16. For I am ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one. Again Heb. 5:9, he says, And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all. Was Paul here teaching the doctrine of universal salvation? By no means; for we find on examination of this strictly Scriptural language, that Paul says, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it; and that, “He became the author of an eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. To say that Judas went out and wept bitterly, and that Peter went out and hanged himself, would not be Scriptural truth, although in Scripture language.

Art. 13. Justification by Faith only.

Sinners are justified freely by God's grace, not for works of righteousness which they have done, but through faith only in the atoning merits of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Any doctrine which cannot be stated in the words of inspiration, should, to say the least, be looked upon with suspicion. Such a doctrine is that of justification by faith only. Luther termed this doctrine, the test of a standing, or falling Church, and is said to have for a season rejected the epistle

by James because he taught differently, and hence, in the esteem of Luther could not be an inspired man. Certain it is, however, that whoever would believe that doctrine, must in some way get rid of the words of James, who in language must unmistakable declares, in the 2d chap. and 24th verse, "that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Now it doubtless is true that a man is not justified by works only, any more than by faith only; and yet it may be true that he may be justified by both conjointly.

We need no reasoning, however, in regard to the matter, since none presume to state the doctrine without adding "only" to the words of the Bible; and the effect of a single word, as we all know, is often to cause the passage to have an entirely different, and even an opposite meaning.

No believer in the Bible doubts that men are justified by faith; that justification is impossible without it; yet he who professes to believe in justification by faith *only*, does so in the face of a direct declaration of the word of God to the contrary, and fails to see, that it was by the addition of a single word to the command of God, that Satan wrought the overthrow of our first parents; for while God's word, was, "ye shall surely die," Satan's was, "ye shall *not*, surely die." We think, therefore, that the 13th article is one of very dangerous tendency.

Art. 14. Sanctification.

The fruit of the Spirit in the believer is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth, and every Christian is prepared for the perfect holiness of heaven only through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.

The language of this article is a piece of Scriptural Mosaic, while the words are of New Testament use, the phrases are not found together, and of course do not present a clear and consistent thought; indeed, it seems to us studiously indefinite, and may mean "perfection" to some, and a degree of holiness far below it to others; "of the Spirit" seems to refer to the agency of the Holy Spirit in effecting sanctification; but it may also mean, the human Spirit, which

is the object of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.

Art. 15. The Church.

The Church is divinely instituted, and Jesus Christ is its builder and head, and he loves it, and gave himself for it. In the Church, God's praises should be sung, and his Word read, prayer offered, the Gospel preached, and Baptism and the Lord's Supper administered. Every Christian should be a member of the visible Church, and endeavor to promote her purity, peace, unity, and prosperity, and to extend her influence. And the Church should exclude from her communion every one who denies the faith or walks disorderly.

This opens up a wider field for remark than we feel at liberty to occupy. The final clause is as follows: "And the church should exclude from her communion every one who denies the faith, or walks disorderly." That which constitutes a denial of the faith in one church, is really, "the faith" in another; to walk orderly in one church would seem most disorderly in another; indeed, cases are not wanting in which persons have been excluded from one church for conforming to the worship and order of another. This article, then, should have clearly defined, "the faith" and disorder.

Art. 16. Baptism.

The Sacrament of Baptism was instituted by Jesus Christ in his Church, is of perpetual obligation, and is to be administered in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

We object to the term "Sacrament," as applied to the ordinance of Baptism, as unscriptural. It is no where used in the Bible, and is one of the peculiarities of the Papacy, and was borrowed from Pagan Rome.—With regard to Baptism, while there is seemingly unity, there is really great diversity; and while the language is calculated to make the impression, that the ministers who unanimously adopted this article entertain similar views with regard to Baptism—they in reality differ widely. They simply cover up under the same term, a thing which they regard as essentially different; and while their words are the same, their thoughts are as wide as the poles asunder.

It amounts simply to an agreement to shut their eyes to a radical difference, the existence of which it is impossible to ignore.

Let a Presbyterian Minister, a member of the Association, whose views this article assays to set forth, present himself at the Communion of his Baptist brother, who has also adopted this article as the expression of his views, and what will be the result.—The Presbyterian will be gravely informed that he has not been baptized, and consequently he has no claim to a place at the Lord's Table. But did we not frame an article expressing our agreement upon the subject of Baptism? he will reply. Certainly; but what you regard as Baptism, with me has no claims whatever to be the ordinance instituted by the Savior; to be frank with you, Immersion only is Baptism. A third member of the Association may come in, and endeavor to reconcile matters, by taking the ground that any of the modes in use are Baptism; but the Baptist will not be convinced; and the nature of the unity which exists would be admirably set forth, were a fourth party to enter and assume the ground, not wholly new, that immersion is not baptism. The unity in this case at least is merely verbal, and of the value of such unity we care not to inquire.

Art. 17. The Lord's Supper.

The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed instituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is to be observed till he comes. The elements to be used in this ordinance are bread and wine; and it is the duty of Christians often to eat this bread and drink this cup in remembrance of their crucified Redeemer.

Here the word "Sacrament" meets us again used even more inappropriately than in the preceding article. For while there may be some analogy between the "Sacramentum" (soldier's oath,) and the pledge made in Baptism—there is none between it and the design of the Lord's Supper; which is purely commemorative, as is evident from the words "this do in remembrance of me." But, "it is the duty of Christians often to eat this bread, and drink this cup." How

often? Annually? Quarterly? Monthly? Weekly? Have the Scriptures no light on this subject?

Art. 18. The Sabbath.

The Sabbath was made for man throughout all generations, and all men should remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, not doing their own ways, nor finding their own pleasure, nor speaking their own words, but devoting its sacred hours to reading, meditation, and prayer, to the worship of God in his sanctuary, and to works of necessity and mercy.

The Sabbath was peculiar to the dispensations which preceded that under which we live. The Lord's Day or the first Day of the week; being under a better Covenant should be observed, to say the very least, as well as the Jewish Sabbath, or the Seventh Day.

Art. 19. The Christian Ministry.

Christ has appointed ministers in his Church to preach the Gospel, administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and to take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers to feed the Church of God. Christian ministers must be blameless as the stewards of God, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, not given to filthy lucre, but lovers of hospitality, lovers of good men, sober, just, temperate, vigilant, apt to teach, holding fast the faithful word.

This article is too vague, it creates the impression that there is but one class of ministers, or servants in the Church of God; it would have been equally as easy to have enumerated Bishops or Elders, Deacons and Evangelists, as to have left the impression that the duties of these classes were to be performed by one class.

Art. 20. Christian Duties.

It is the duty of every man to repent of his sins; to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation; to confess Christ before men; to be baptized; to observe the Lord's Supper; to pray in the name of Christ, and read the Scriptures daily; to endeavor by his life, and words, and prayers, to bring the unconverted to Christ; to obey the Ten Commandments; to love God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength; to do to all men whatsoever he would that they should do to him; to minister to Christ's cause of his substance as God has prospered him; to be meek, humble, and forgiving; to take up his cross

daily, and follow Christ; to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; to set his affections on things above, not on things on the earth; to love his neighbors as himself; to love the brotherhood; and in all things to obey and adorn the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Quite a good summary of Christian duties; and while we might object to the order in which they stand, and incline to the opinion that a better summary might be framed, consisting entirely of Scripture language, we forbear with the remark, that as Article 16 is silent upon the subject of Infant Baptism, and as this article makes Baptism a personal and not also a relative duty, we may reasonably conclude that Infant Baptism is not recognized in the "Basis," and thus one of the obstacles to Christian Union is removed out of the way.

Art. 21. Death, Resurrection, Judgment, and Eternity of Rewards and Punishments.

After death the bodies of men return to dust, and their spirits to God who gave them, and at the last day there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust, when all men must appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad; and the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

No remarks.

Our task is done; and in sober sadness, we give it as our conviction, that much valuable time and talent has been spent in vain. What Christian mind has been enlightened by a clearer presentation of the truth? What Christian heart cheered by a prospect of the union of the people of God? No practical result has followed, no real union has taken place, and the "Basis" is one upon which those who framed and adopted it, do not stand; they severally stand upon their individual interpretations of it, which are as different as the various religious parties, which they represent.

TIMOTHY.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. VIII.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., June 5th, '63.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Your last Review contains criticism No. vi. I must notice, first, that I have used the word *for*, and the Union *to* in the third verse. "To write to thee," says the Union. But my version, "To write them *for* you." It seems that the Secretary takes this testimony of Luke for a letter; for he says: "All the Epistles are addressed to certain parties," &c. It had never occurred to me that the testimony of Luke was an Epistle. But this is the Secretary's reason for saying, "To write *to* thee." In all the epistles, I translate as the Common Version; Paul to the saints, &c. But the dative *soi* in this instance is what grammarians call the dative "commodi," which means, that the dative is used in connection with many verbs to denote that any thing is done *for* one's benefit or advantage. That such is the case here is obvious; for Luke wrote the things of which he had obtained exact information *for* his friend Theophilus—that is, for his benefit. But the Secretary has discovered that the testimony of Luke and the Acts of the apostles are letters, and for this reason he would say *to*.

The next point is, whether we should use the words "may know" or "might know" in the fourth verse. I quote my version—but from memory, for it is not by me. "It seemed good to me also, having obtained exact information of all things from the very first, to write them in order for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may know," &c. Now, the words "may know," depend not on "seemed," but on "to write" which is a present tense. "To write" expresses what Luke was then doing, and is equivalent to "I write." The words "it seemed" point to a previous intention, which

Luke was then executing. The words, "might know" would really antedate the time of writing. If I should say, "It seemed good to me to write this reply, that the brethren might know," &c., it is evident that "might know" being past time, would antedate the time of my writing. But, it seemed good to me to write this reply that the brethren *may know* that the Secretary is mistaken. Here, "may know" is subsequent in time to the writing. And I think that the brethren will all see that the very laborious Secretary lies under a mistake. His perseverance is worthy of a better cause than that in which he is engaged. I turn now to the Revised Gospels of the Bible Union.

In Luke iii: 2, we find an instance of most unintelligible English. The words are: "When Annas was high-priest and Caiaphas."

The meaning of this clause, when parsed, (for we tried to parse it,) is, that Annas was both high-priest and Caiaphas. We had always supposed that there were two men, Annas a name for one, Caiaphas a name for the other. Now Annas is evidently the subject of the verb was; priest and Caiaphas are predicates; and a predicate is that which is affirmed of the subject. Then Annas was both priest and Caiaphas. There is no escape from this. The language is not to be misunderstood. Now it seemed good to me to notice as I now do, this and other instances, that the reader *may know* that there is much want of scholarship in these Revised Gospels.

The Secretary informed us, in one of his criticisms, that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the English word "concerning" in a certain instance. I suppose that the same Spirit would direct in all instances. If in one, why not in all? There is significance in this hint of the Secretary's. I have firm faith in the inspiration of the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures, but none whatever in the inspiration of the Revised Gospels. On the contrary, it is my firm conviction that the Lord intends to make a full end of all parties and partizans; and

that he has given the party that made this Revision, over to an undiscerning mind, in order that they may accomplish the end which he has in view. There were men among them that could have guided them to that which is good, but they are taken from the end to come. I am now examining these gospels, that it may be evident to every reader that the hand of the Lord is against the Bible Union. Each passage that is quoted from their gospels is proof of their non-acquaintance with Greek and English.

Let us examine the passage found, Luke viii: 31, in which these words are found: "And he besought him that he would not command them to go away into the deep."

What are we to understand by the word *deep* in this place? The English reader can never know. Turn to chapter v: 4. The Savior had entered Peter's ship, and after having finished his speech to the people, he said to Peter, as the Revision has it, "Put out into the deep." Here the reader concludes rightly, that *deep* means deep water. Will he come to the same conclusion when he reads the passage quoted, viii: 31. The "devils," as the Revision has it, besought Jesus not to send them into the *deep*. We suppose that the English reader will conclude that *deep* means deep water, and that the devils were carried, against their will, down into deep water, after they had entered the swine. To what other conclusion the reader could come, I know not. But I will expose this ignorance of Greek, so that he that runs may read.

The demons had said to Jesus, "I beseech thee, torment me not." The torment would have been inflicted by sending them into what the Revision calls the *deep*.—How? says the English reader. Would it be a torment to send them into deep water? Hear then, while we make this matter plain.

The Greek word, used by Luke in this place, is *abussos*; and it occurs Romans x: 7, which I translate thus—"Who shall

descend into the abyss? that is, to bring Christ up from the dead." Here it is equivalent to hades, and means the abode of the dead.

It is found also, Rev. ix : 1, 2, translated in our Common Version by the word *bottomless*—"To him was given the key of the bottomless pit; and he opened the bottomless pit." Evidently, "pit, the abyss;" though here used as an adjective. See Isaiah xiv : 15, "Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, (Hebrew, sheol; Greek, hades;) to the sides of the pit." There is, then, in hades, or the abyss, a *pit*; a place lower still than the general region of the dead, in which pit the souls of wicked men and angels are confined.—But again, Rev. xi : 7, "The beast that ascends out of the bottomless pit." In this place, *abussos* occurs without the word *phrear*, pit. Again, Rev. xvii : 8, "The beast shall ascend out of the abyss."—Again, Rev. xx : 1, 3, "I saw another angel come down from heaven, having the key of the *abyss* and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold of the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut him up," &c.

The abyss, here mentioned, is the same abyss mentioned in the eighth of Luke, and is the pit, or lowest deep in hades, in which evil angels and wicked spirits are thrown. See II. Peter ii : 4, "If God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus," &c. Then, while the term abyss, like hades, is the general name for the place of the dead, it signifies also the lowest pit in the spirit world, into which wicked spirits are thrown; into this Satan, himself, will be cast and enclosed for a thousand years. The demons spoken of, Luke 8, besought the Savior not to torment them by sending them into the abyss.

Now I will suppose that the Revisers knew this, as they ought to have known it, before attempting to revise the Common Version. If they did know it, then they have not been faithful to the Greek; and,

consequently, are unfaithful servants, and must be dealt with as such. If they did not know it, then they are incompetent for the work of revising, and must be rejected as incompetent. I again ask the reader—What confidence is due to such men, as critics? Their criticisms are to be judged of by their translations.

In Luke iv : 1 we have a statement made, which is, to say the least of it, in opposition to truth. We are told that Jesus "was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted by the Devil." If any one should ask a scholar whether Jesus was tempted during those forty days, or at the conclusion of the forty days, he would answer, at the conclusion of the days. But the Revision has—"being forty days tempted by the Devil." Indeed, any reader, whether scholar or not, can see that the temptation did not begin till the forty days had ended. Why then should the words of Luke be so translated, as not to express a truth? We answer this question by saying that the Revisers do not understand the power of participles. They have offended the ear with the repetition of the present participle; not only is the ear offended, but the sense of the writer is not expressed.

Matt. xx : 17, "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart, and in the way he said to them: Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem." Every one sees that there is want of accuracy here, as well as want of correct taste. The sense is not expressed so that the reader may see it.

In Luke i : 9, speaking of Zachariah, Luke is made to say, "it fell to his lot to burn incense, *going* into the temple of the Lord."

This is most unfortunate, and is an indubitable proof of want of knowledge.

In Luke x : 25, "And behold a certain lawyer stood up, tempting him, saying."

Here are four instances of the translation of participles, each of which is, to the scholar, a proof that the Revisers have not become acquainted with the law by which

participles are translated. This law was observed with far greater faithfulness by the King's translators than by our Revisers. I will give this law for the benefit of the readers of the "Review." The Revisers will never observe it, I am sure.

4. The principle, as described under 2 and 3, is used to denote:

(a.) A specification of time, where the English uses subordinate clauses, with the conjunctions *when, while, during, after, since*, or a substantive with a preposition.

(b.) A cause or reason, where the English often uses subordinate clauses with *since, because, as, inasmuch as*, or a substantive with a preposition.

(c.) A motive, purpose, or object where the English uses the infinitive with *to, in order to*, or a finite verb with *that, in order that, so that*.

(d.) A *condition*, where the English often uses a subordinate clause with *if*; or a *concession*, where the English uses a subordinate clause with *although, though*.

(e.) The *manner* and *means*, where the English sometimes uses a participial noun with a preposition. — Kuhner's College Grammar, pp. 481–2–3.

Had the Revisers been acquainted with this law, or, if they please, these laws of the participle, they could not have translated as they have done. Indeed, translation of the Greek or Latin language is impossible without the knowledge of these laws. If then they have not a knowledge of participles, what can be thought of their knowledge of other parts of speech? The participle is but one part of speech. They have erred in this; they err in others. To reply to the Secretary would be to teach again the principles of the grammar of the Greek language. I would be glad to meet a critic who understands the grammar of the Greek and English languages. We could then confer together with pleasure.

I shall not say, in this place, how the passages above quoted should be translated. But I will say, that a translation has already been made by one well known to myself; and this translation, made accord-

ing to the well known laws of the Greek and English language, will be published ere long.

I must conclude this reply with an apology for my style of writing. Having studied the oracles of God for many years, I have learned to speak directly to the point, and to speak of things as they appear to me. The Savior and the Apostles thus speak. They speak truth, whenever it is necessary to be spoken, plainly and without concealment. Having Christ's example, and being engaged in translating his truth, I speak as that truth requires me to speak.

H. T. ANDERSON.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. VI.

JESUS' IMMERSION AND TEMPTATION.

Mathew, Mark, and Luke—all mention the immersion of Jesus. The words of Luke have already been quoted. Mark's account is very brief. Mathew records a circumstance not mentioned by either of the others,—a conversation between the Savior and the Immerser, before the act of immersion was performed.

"Then Jesus comes from Galilee to the Jordan, to John, to be immersed by him.— But John tried to prevent him, saying: 'I need to be immersed by thee, and dost thou come to me?' And Jesus, answering, said to him: 'Suffer it now; for in this way it becomes us to observe every righteous ordinance.' Then John consented. And Jesus, when he was immersed, went up immediately out of the water; and see! the heavens were opened to him, and he (that is, John, it is supposed.) 'saw the Spirit of God descending, like a dove, and coming

upon him. And see! a voice from Heaven said: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

What an interesting scene was this! A crowd of John's disciples were standing on the banks of the Jordan. The Son of God, in the form of a man, draws near. He desires the Prophet of Hebron to immerse him:—he who was to immerse the people in the Holy Spirit, demands immersion in water;—not for the remission of sins, for he was "without sin;"—not into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,—but that he might show by example the propriety of attending to all the ordinances of God. He is plunged beneath the waves, and, rising out of the water, he raised his eyes and voice to heaven and prays. While praying to his Father, the Holy Spirit comes down, in the likeness of a dove, and settles upon him. A voice from above proclaims him to be the Father's Son, in whom he delights.

Here observe: the Father is in Heaven, the Son on earth, and the Spirit between Heaven and Earth, descending! Glorious spectacle! It is difficult for us to realize the grandeur and sublimity of this heavenly scene. But we must turn from it; for, immediately afterwards, "Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness"—the uncultivated portions of Judea—"to be tempted by the Devil. And after fasting forty days and forty nights, he became hungry."

We may pause here long enough to remark,—for it is indeed remarkable,—that Moses fasted forty days on Mount Sinai, before receiving the Law; that Elijah fasted forty days in the wilderness, while on his journey to Mount Horeb; and that Jesus, before entering upon his Heavenly mission to the world, fasted forty days in the wilderness of Judea. And it may be further remarked, that the Adversary of God and man, the Being who tried the patience of Job, and who was "a liar from the beginning," knew that while Jesus was hungry, it was the most favorable time to approach him with some enticement, that he might

induce him to speak or act unworthily of his Divine character, or inconsistently with his Divine mission.

"Then the teacher came, and said to him: 'If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' But he, answering, said: 'It is written, man shall not live by bread only, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.'"

Then the Devil takes him up into the Holy City,—that is, Jerusalem,—and places him on a pinnacle of the Temple, and and says to him: 'If thou art the Son of God, throw thyself down; for it is written: "He shall give his angels command concerning thee; and they shall bear thee upon their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone."' Jesus said to him:—'Again it is written: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'"

Again the Devil takes him up into a very high mountain, and shows him all the kingdoms of the world, and says to him: 'I will give thee all this power, and the glory of these things; for it has been all delivered to me, and I will give it to whom ever I will. If, therefore, thou wilt worship me, all shall be thine.' What a lie! "*The Earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*" But Jesus, answering, said to him: 'Adversary, be gone from here; for it is written: Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

Here the Devil, having been met at every point, and having failed to accomplish his object, "leaves him, and angels came and ministered to him."

How successfully Jesus put the cunning Adversary to silence—how easily he vanquished the Arch-enemy of God and men—simply by quoting the Scriptures! And could not Christians as easily and successfully combat "the world, the flesh, and the Devil," by arming themselves with the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God?" Would it not be well to have the laws of God, the teachings of Christ, and the admonitions of the Apostles,—all plainly written upon the tablets of the memory, that when temptations present themselves,

they may rise up in opposition to the promptings of the Evil One?

JESUS OBTAINS SEVERAL DISCIPLES.

While John was immersing the people at Bethany—not that Bethany where Lazarus lived, near Jerusalem, but that upon the Jordan river, at the ford, where the Jews probably crossed under Joshua, (called Bethabara in the common Version,) he bore important testimony concerning the Christ. This testimony has already been given in the preceding article, as though the interview of John with the priests and Levites had taken place before Jesus' temptation. That it occurred afterwards, appears evident, from the reading of the following narrative of John the Apostle, who records a chain of events, extending from the time of the above mentioned interview to the time of the wedding at Cana, where Jesus changed water to wine. This writer, after recording the interview as occurring on a certain day, proceeds to say:

"On the morrow, John sees Jesus coming to him, and says: 'See the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said: "There is a man coming after me, who is preferred to me;" for he was before me. And I did not know him; but that he might be made known to Israel,—for this I came immersing in water.'" * * * *

"Again on the morrow, John was standing with two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he was walking, he says:—'See the Lamb of God!' And the two disciples, hearing him speak, followed Jesus. And Jesus, turning, and seeing them following, says to them: 'What are you seeking?' They said to him: 'Rabbi, (which, being translated, means Teacher,) where dost thou dwell?' He says to them: 'Come and see.' They came, and saw where he lived; and they staid with him that day, as it was about the tenth hour"—about 4 P. M., according to our time.

"Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard it from John, and fol-

lowed him,"—that is, Jesus. "He"—Andrew—"first finds his brother Simon, and says to him: 'We have found the Messiah'—which [word] is translated Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. Jesus, looking on him, said: 'Thou art Simon, the Son of Jonah; thou shalt be called CEPHAS,'—which [word] is translated Peter.'" (*Peter* and *Cephas*, translated into English, both signify *Rock*.) "The next day Jesus resolved to go over into Galilee. And he finds Philip, and says to him: 'Follow me.' Now Philip was of Bethsaida"—situated at the north end of Lake Tiberias, east of where the Jordan enters it, on its way southward,—“the city of Andrew and Peter.—Philip finds Nathaniel, and says to him:—'We have found him of whom Moses, in the Law, and the Prophets, wrote,—Jesus, the son of Joseph, from Nazareth.' And Nathaniel says to him: 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' Philip says to him: 'Come and see.'

Jesus saw Nathaniel coming to him, and says of him: 'See an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile!' Nathaniel says to him: 'How dost thou know me?' Jesus, answering, said to him: 'Before Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee.' Nathaniel replied:—'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God,—thou art the King of Israel.' Jesus, answering, said to him: 'Because I said to thee, "I saw thee under the figtree," dost thou believe?—Thou shalt see greater things than these.' And he says to him: 'Truly, truly, I say to you, hereafter you shall see Heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending, and [then] descending upon the Son of Man.'

WM. PINKERTON.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. IX.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., June 12th, '63.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Criticism No. 7 lies before me. Our Critic has discovered one error in the introduction to the testimony of Luke. But it is an error of the types, not of my pen. It is not in my translation. The types have *on* for *in*, "on which" for "in which" before the words "you have been instructed." As my last reply contains a notice of all that is found in No. 7 with the exception of an error made by the Revisers in the last clause of Luke's introduction, I will analyze this introduction, that the contents may be clearly seen, and that the mistakes of the Secretary and the Revisers may be read and known by all. I shall use the version of the Revision in my quotations, so that no confusion may arise in the mind of the reader, with respect to the words of the Secretary and those of the introduction to Luke.

Luke intends to give a reason for writing his testimony, and this reason is found in the concluding words of his introduction—"That thou mightest know the certainty concerning those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

The word "certainty" has a meaning in it. It implies that the narrations, made by the "many" that are mentioned in the first part of the introduction, could give no certainty as it respects the things of which they were made. They had not been written *kathexes*, "in order" or consecutively, so as to present the facts in a proper point of view. Further, these narrations composed by the many, were not only deficient in "order:" they were deficient in accuracy. The persons who set them forth "in order" had not accurately traced all from the very first. The "many" who had set forth these narrations in order, were, in Luke's estimation,

incompetent to write, so as to impart any certain knowledge. Lastly, the "many" who had set forth in order these narrations, were not eye-witnesses of the things of which they wrote, but had received them from the eye-witnesses. It is therefore evident that the testimonies of Matthew and John were not alluded to by Luke. Mark was as yet unknown to Luke. At least, Mark, being one man, could not be called "many." It is therefore, further evident, that these "narrations of the many" have never reached our times. Now, in the face of these facts found in Luke's introduction, the Secretary has this following words:

"The fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning" in connection with them."

The Secretary supposes that the narrations set forth by "many" in Luke's day—narrations so set forth as to impart no certain information,—narrations that have not come down to us at all—The Secretary, I say, supposes that these narrations are the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. See his Criticism No. III.

Now, that a child may not mistake, let us repeat what we have said. Luke gives us a reason for writing, (I quote the Revision of the Union,) "That thou mightest know the certainty concerning those things wherein thou hast been instructed. Evident it is, then, that the "many" had so written, that Theophilus could not, from their writings, know the certainty of the facts which they had taken in hand to record. And this arose from their want of "order" and their not having accurately traced all from the very first. But Luke, by writing these things in order, and after having accurately traced all from the very first, proposes to give certain knowledge of the things to his friend Theophilus.

Now what shall be thought of the critical acumen of the man, who, in the face of these facts, supposes the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, to be the narrations of the "many?" He would place

Luke's testimony among narrations which Luke himself regards as incapable of giving certain information.

The reader will probably think that I am mistaken in what the Secretary says. Then let me quote his words:

"But the books which the Evangelists have left us are not properly described by such terms." (Here the Secretary objects to the term "history.") "They are, as Luke properly describes them, "narrations concerning the things," frequently stating only isolated facts, and sometimes omitting both cause and effect, as well as historical comment. The fact must be manifest to any one who reads these narrations with care, that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the word "concerning" in connection with them."

Here, the Secretary says, that Luke properly describes the books of the Evangelists as "Narrations concerning the things." But where does Luke use the words "Narrations concerning the things?" The words are found in the first verse of Luke's introduction, and read, in the Revised Gospels, thus: "For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration concerning the things." Now no one can doubt that Luke applied the word, "Narration concerning the things" to the works of the "many," Yet the Secretary tells us, that Luke properly describes the books of the Evangelists as "narrations concerning the things." Thus it is evident that our Brother, W. H. Wyckoff, Corresponding Secretary of the Bible Union, thinks that Mathew, Mark, Luke and John are the "Many" who took in hand to set forth in order narrations concerning the things which were delivered by the eye-witnesses!!! But if so, then, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John had not obtained exact information, and had not written the facts in *order*, and therefore no certain knowledge could be gained from their writings! And, therefore, Luke, after obtaining exact information, thought it well for himself to write out in *order*, or consecutively, that certain

knowledge might be gained by Theophilus!!

Now, in the presence of the readers of the Review, I must say that I feel grieved for our critic. What spirit bewitched him, and urged him to this discussion? He has rushed into battle without his armor.

But let us continue to analyze Luke's introduction as given to us by the Revisers. They say:—"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration" &c. and again;—"It seemed good to me also, having accurately traced all from the very first, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou hast been instructed."

The reader will see that Luke uses certain expressions, which, rightly understood, distinguish him and his testimony from the "many" and their narrations. He has, say the Revisers, accurately traced all from the very first. The "many" had not done this. He intends to write these things in *order*, or consecutively. They had not done this. He intends that what he writes shall give certainty. The writings of the "many" gave no certainty.

But let the readers notice that Luke says, that it seemed good to him to write these things *in order*. If Luke did write these things *in order*, it is as evident as demonstration that the "many" did not set them forth in order. For why should Luke propose to do what had already been well done? But as Luke proposes to write these things *in order*, then the "many" had not done it; and hence, the translation given by the Revisers—"Set forth in order"—is a mistranslation. But they did not comprehend Luke, nor the meaning of the Greek. I have translated thus:—"Since many have undertaken to compose a history of the things," &c. I have expressed the exact thought of Luke. For these "many" did undertake to compose histories, yet their works were a failure. Their undertaking being a failure, as it respects orderly consecution, exact information, and certainty, Luke, after having obtained exact

information, thought it good to write these things in order, or consecutively, that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things in which he had been instructed.

But the Secretary classes Matthew, Mark, Luke and John with the "many," and even makes Luke call the testimonies of himself, Matthew, Mark, and John, "narrations concerning the things," when it was Luke's purpose to show that these narrations were deficient in three points; 1. Orderly consecution. 2. Exact information. 3. In imparting knowledge.

I intended to notice the error of the Revisers in translating the last clause of Luke's introduction. That preposition "peri" occurs again in that clause. Suffice it to say, that they have erred in this last clause as in many others. I shall continue my review of the Gospels, and a notice of this may come up in due time. The errors already noticed in the introduction to Luke, and the notice of the Secretary's remarkable discoveries with respect to these "narrations," with the fact that the Holy Spirit had special reasons for using the English word "concerning" will suffice for the present. I hope the reader will not think it out of place if I now give my translation of this introduction. With all the facts above noted he can, perhaps, better judge of its merits.

"Since many have undertaken to compose a history of the things that are fully believed among us, even as they were delivered to us by those who were, from the beginning, eyewitnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having obtained exact information of all things from the very first, to write them in order for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may know the certainty of the things in which you have been instructed."

As the Corresponding Secretary of the Bible Union has spent all his power on this introduction, and as not one of his missiles has left even a mark upon it, I do now respectfully and affectionately invite any one of whatever name, Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, or gentleman of

the world, to examine this introduction; and if he can point out any error, he will confer a favor on me by so doing. We give this invitation, not for the sake of controverting any point, but because we know that there is learning among the Catholics, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and we desire to profit by their suggestions. I do not confine any one named in this invitation to the introduction to Luke's testimony, but he will make suggestions on any chapter that has been, or may be published.

Very truly,
H. T. ANDERSON.

—
RIPLEY, O., June 20th, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—Permit me to introduce myself as a reader of your excellent paper, "The American Christian Review," a favor bestowed upon me by some unknown friend, or friends, for which I feel truly grateful. I have had the honor of being a member in the Christian Church, (sometimes called "the old Christian Order,") for about twenty years, the last thirteen of which, I have been trying, in much weakness and trembling, to preach the Gospel to a dying world. How successful I have been, I leave to the judgment of others, and for the decision of the great day. I have formed an agreeable acquaintance with many of the Christian (Disciple) brethren, most or whom I esteem with the highest Christian regard. I have long felt an anxious desire to see a union of the *two* bodies into *one*. It would certainly wrest from the hands of the sectarian and the skeptic a weapon, which is now being used too successfully against the simplicity of the Bible, and Christianity in general, I had, however, almost despaired of by such a union until recently, when on becoming more fully acquainted with your sentiments,

a faint hope arose in my mind that possibly such a good thing may yet be accomplished. But if such a work is ever done, it must have a *beginning* as well as a consummation. Therefore, in order to contribute, though it may be but a single "mite" in that direction, I propose for your consideration the following questions, (not for the sake of controversy, but as an honest enquirer after truth); the answering of which may do much to remove obstacles, and bring us all "into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God." I shall endeavor to shape my questions so as to embrace the principal objections to your system as I understand it. I hope you will receive them with favorable regard, as from one who loves the truth, and is willing to be led by the same. If in any case I shall improperly anticipate your sentiments, I will most cheerfully stand corrected.

Yours for the sake of truth,

J. P. DAUGHERTY.

REMARKS.

We are thankful to receive the foregoing, believing, as we certainly do, that it comes with pure motives, from a mind capable of understanding the truth, accompanied also with a disposition to receive it. Not desiring to print the questions twice, and desiring each question to be before the mind when reading the answer, we shall print one question at a time and follow each question immediately with the answer:

QUESTION I.

Was not our Lord anointed with the Holy Spirit, immediately after his baptism, to be a Prophet, Priest and King? Matt. iii: 16, 17; Acts x: 38.

ANSWER.

I. The first thing in order, is to determine the meaning of the question. What is intended by the words "to be a Prophet, Priest, and King?" These words are not clear. They are liable to be taken to mean in two different ways. They might be understood to mean, to be a Prophet, Priest and King commencing at some future period of time, and not to be a Prophet,

Priest and King immediately, or from the anointing forward. We think the intention of the question is better expressed omitting the words, "to be." Was not our Lord anointed with the Holy Spirit, a Prophet, Priest and King, immediately after his immersion? The intention, we take it, is to ascertain whether the Lord did not commence acting and officiating fully in his offices as Prophet, Priest and King, at the time of the descent of the Holy Spirit on him. If we are not correct in this, our worthy brother will correct us. So much for the definition of the question. With this definition, we answer, No.

II. The idea that the Savior was anointed Prophet, Priest and King, with the Holy Spirit, immediately after his immersion, is plausible, and has been received thousands of times for no other reason than its mere beauty and plausibility. Still, we know of no Scripture that teaches anything of the kind. That he was "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power," we are clearly taught in Scripture. See Acts x: 31. That he received the Holy Spirit—that the Holy Spirit descended on him immediately after his immersion, is equally certain, but that this was intended to anoint him a Prophet, Priest and King, is not proved by any Scripture known to us. We have one clear intimation of the object of the descent of the Holy Spirit on him. John the immerser said, "I knew him not, but he who sent me to immerse said, On whomsoever you shall see the Holy Spirit descending and remaining, he is he." The intimation is clear from this, that the object of this wonderful descent of the Spirit, accompanied by the words of the Almighty Father, "This is my Son the beloved in whom I am well pleased," immediately after his emerging from his immersion in Jordan, was to manifest him, as the Son of God to Israel. Hence John the immerser exclaims, "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world," and not "Behold your Prophet, Priest and King." The intention was to make him known to Israel, as their long-promised Me-

siah. We must take the divine intention and not the human intention of some modern theorist.

III. He was certainly a prophet, and more than a prophet. He was the Prophet of all the prophets—the one of whom Moses spoke, whom the Lord should raise up, and he was a Prophet while on earth, but we know of no evidence that he was ever anointed prophet immediately after his immersion by the Holy Spirit.

IV. He was prospectively Priest, not merely a priest, but the great High Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec; but he did not enter into his priestly office, act, or officiate, as High Priest, while on earth; nor is there any evidence of his being anointed Priest immediately after his immersion, by the Holy Spirit, or by anything else. Paul says, Heb. viii: 4, "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." He was the victim himself, the great sin—offering, in the end of the two ages, offered without blemish to God. He died without the gate. He entered not into the most holy place on earth, with the blood of bulls and of goats, but into heaven itself, into the true holy place, which the Lord pitched and not man, with his own blood to appear in the presence of God for us and purge us forever from our sins. Here is where he officiates, or acts as Priest for us, and not on earth. No man can find an instance of his claiming to be a priest while on earth, or acting as priest.—He waited till the law was ended, dead and taken out of the way, till the old priesthood was removed, when he entered his office as a priest forever; to officiate in the true holy place, in the presence of God.

V. He was prospectively, not only a King, but "*the King of kings and Lord of lords,*" but not acting in his office, as King, while on earth, nor when put to death. He explained when on trial before Pilot, saying: My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom

not from hence." See John xviii: 36.—When he died, and his disciples were dispersed, his reign had not commenced, but was only in prospect, and he was put to death to prevent the inauguration of his reign. But he ascended no throne, had no crown on his head but a crown of thorns, and inaugurated no reign while on earth. All done during the period of his lifetime, was preparatory; all the steps taken were incipient, and his own disciples did not understand the nature of the reign at hand, believe or understand the foundation facts of the Institution. They did not believe the Lord when he told them that he would be put to death, nor when he told them that he would rise from the dead. They never preached that Jesus would die, that he would shed his blood, or that he would rise from the dead, or even understood these things, during the Lord's personal ministry. During this whole period, they were expecting an earthly kingdom, and even after he rose from the dead and appeared to them, they said, "Lord, wilt thou restore the kingdom to Israel?" All they said and thought of his being King, was not in view of his being anointed King by the Holy Spirit immediately after his immersion, or any other time while he was on earth, but *prospectively*. They believed and preached as he taught them to do, while he was on earth, and as he also preached himself, that *the kingdom was at hand*. Consistently with this, he taught them to pray, "Thy kingdom come." This they never prayed after the kingdom *had come*. Many preachers are maintaining that the kingdom *did come* early in the lifetime of the Lord, and are praying for it to *come to this day!*

QUESTION II.

—If the Messiah was not inaugurated King before his ascension, how was the prophecy, "Behold thy King cometh unto thee," (Zech. ix: 9.) fulfilled, as recorded in Matt. xxi: 1-4, and John xii: 13-15?

ANSWER.

He was their anticipated King, or their King *prospectively*, or *to be*; but certainly

not yet inaugurated, reigning and acting in the office of King. Where had he been inaugurated? When? Let him who says, he had been inaugurated previous to this time, point to the *time* and *place*. Where is the account of any inauguration previous to this time! It is not sufficient to imagine an inauguration and claim it, when we have no account of it, but let it be pointed out.

QUESTION III.

If the kingdom was not set up before Pentecost, how could it be preached and men press into it before Christ was crucified? Luke xiii: 16.

ANSWER.

I. It could be preached precisely as Christ commanded, and as the apostle did preach, that it approached, was at hand, and thus prepare the public mind for it when it should come, and not as he did not command them to preach, and as they never did preach, that the kingdom *had already come*. Certainly the Lord did not say, as he does, Mark ix: 1, "There be some of them that stand here, who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," knowing that they had already seen it, entered it, and introduced others into it.

II. The "pressing into it," only means *inquiring* into it, and not entering into it, for surely "every man" did not enter into it. Had "every man" entered into the kingdom at this period, we know not where Peter found his three thousand on Pentecost, five thousand in Solomon's portico, and the numerous other thousands still not *in the kingdom!*

QUESTION IV.

How could a woe be pronounced on the Pharisees for shutting up the kingdom, in the days of Christ, if it did not exist?—Matt. xxiii: 13.

ANSWER.

By objecting to the preaching of Jesus, the Twelve and the Seventy, who were preaching that the kingdom was at hand, opening it up to the public mind. It did, however, *exist* in its incipency, embryo,

or preparatory state, and they opposed the preaching, cavilled, quibbled and confused the public mind, and thus obstructed the way into the kingdom. This was all the way in which they could have shut it after it even was fully inaugurated.

QUESTION V.

If Christ had not a kingdom while on earth, to what kingdom or order did those belong, who believed in and followed him?

ANSWER.

Their church relation had not been changed. The Jewish Church was still in existence, its ritual, temple, altars, priests and all stood in full force, not abrogated till Jesus died, and they all remained in the old Church. All the steps taken were preparatory to the change from the Old Institution to the New, from the old church to the new. They were all under the law till Jesus died. The preaching and immersing was all preparing among the Jews, and in the Jewish Church, a people for the nucleus for the new body, or church; but it never took distinct, separate and independent form till Pentecost. A people in the old Church, under the law, adhering to all its rites and ceremonies, were prepared for the Lord; but they never existed in the new, separate and distinct body till Pentecost.

QUESTION VI.

If Christ had not kingly authority, by what authority did he teach? Matt. xxvii: 29.

ANSWER.

As the great Prophet sent from God, the Son of God and the Savior of the world, the sent of the Father, or the apostle from God, he had authority from his Father and by his authority he taught, doing nothing in his *own name*. The beginning of repentance and remission of sins *in his name* was after he rose from the dead. See Luke xxiv: 47.

QUESTION VII.

If Christ was not inaugurated King till after his ascension into heaven, how far, or in what sense, are the precepts of his personal ministry obligatory on mankind since that time?

ANSWER.

He taught as the great Prophet from God, the apostle of God, the sent of the Father, the Son of God, and the circumstance of his not being inaugurated King till Pentecost would detract nothing from the authority of his precepts. His moral precepts are all binding, and will be till the end of time.— We find in his life some *special* enactments for *special* cases, as anointing a blind man's eyes, the enactment for the thief on the cross, etc., never intended as *general law*, and not applicable to any other cases.

QUESTION VIII.

Upon the hypothesis that Peter preached the first gospel sermon on the day of Pentecost, how do you explain Matt. xxiv: 14; Mark i: 14; Heb. ii: 3?

ANSWER.

The gospel was preached to Abraham, in promise, saying, "In thee and thy seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed." The good news of the kingdom, in a mystery, secret or promise, was preached to Abraham, but not made known to the sons of men till they were revealed to the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. The gospel, or the good news, that the kingdom was at hand, was preached by the Lord, the apostles, the seventy, *prospectively*, or good news shortly to be realized, but never preached in all its fullness, in fact, and the way opened for the people to enter into the real enjoyment in full of the kingdom of God till Pentecost. They never could preach that Christ died for our sins, shed his blood, was buried, and that he rose from the dead, till he did die, shed his blood, was buried, and did rise from the dead, and without the fundamental facts, the gospel, in all its fullness, was not and cannot be preached.

QUESTION IX.

When Christ commanded repentance and remission of sins to be preached in his name among all nations, "beginning at Jerusalem," was it the beginning of the gospel, or the beginning of its *proclamation to all nations*, that he meant?

ANSWER.

It was not precisely either. It was the beginning of repentance and remission of sins in his name to be preached among all nations. It was the beginning of the proclamation to *all nations*, and the beginning of repentance and remission of sins *in his name*. Previous to this time, they had not preached to *all nations*, nor been authorized so to do, nor had they preached repentance and remission of sins *in his name*, or been authorized so to do.

B. F.

DR. LILLIE ON VERBAL INSPIRATION.

BRO. FRANKLIN: Enclosed, I send you Art. No. 1, of Bro. Lillie's Essays on Verbal Inspiration. I think your readers will be pleased and instructed by the perusal of this, the first part, and perhaps demand the second.

Yours truly,

D. S. BURNET.

June 17, 1863.

THE WORDS OF SCRIPTURE THE WORDS OF GOD.

Efficient work implies competent knowledge; and God, in requiring work from His children, has not left them without light. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? Mic. vi. 8. "But do thou abide in the things which thou didst learn, and with which thou wast entrusted, knowing from whom thou didst learn them, and that from a child thou knewest the Holy Scriptures, that are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-inspired, and is profitable for teaching, for argument, for setting right, for training, that is in righteousness, that

the man of God may be complete for every good work fitted out." Tim. iii. 15, 16.—We are here infallibly taught how we are to become complete men, trained for all the works of God. It is by knowing and applying the "*God-inspired*" writings.

The Greek compound *theopneuste* occurs but once in Holy Writ, and literally means *God-breathed*. We may be sure if the Holy Spirit uses a peculiar word to express the character of Scripture, it must be an infinitely important matter, that we interpret it properly. It is illustrated in Ps. xxxiii. 6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth." Here we are taught that the heavens are "*God-breathed*." The heavens, then, and the Scriptures are alike in this. They are equally the glorious effects of the wisdom and power of the Eternal. Every word therefore of the one is as divine as every star of the other. It is a palpable contradiction of the Apostolic statement to deny that the words of the Scripture (of which words the Scriptures are made up) are God's breathings or God's word. This is what is meant by verbal inspiration; and were there no other passage than the one before us, no Christian can consistently deny, that the words of the Bible are divine. A truth of such infinite importance, however, has not been left to be proved by this one decisive text. There are very few truths for which such a mass of Scripture evidence can be marshaled as this. One or two of the more obvious points are all that can be mentioned now; after which, I will invite your attention to the more prominent objections, which two popular religious teachers are urging against this divine and all-important truth.

I. THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE WORDS OF GOD.—Heb. i. 1: "God who, in many parts and in many ways, spoke of old to the fathers by the prophets, did, on the last of these days, speak to us by his Son." Here is a clear declaration, that God is the Author of the Bible, in both the Testaments. The prophets in the Old, Jesus in the New, were the conveyers of the words of God.

Every reference made by Christ to the words of Scripture, demonstrates the light in which he looked at them as the words of his Father. Whether he is repelling the assaults of Satan, silencing the Pharisees and the Saducees, or teaching his disciples, he appeals to the Scriptures as the infallible words of God. Does Satan tempt him to infidelity, when he is hungry, after the forty-days fast? He answers: "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God shall man live.'" Is he tempted to presume on his Sonship, he replies: "It is written, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'" Is he offered the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if he will fall down and worship Satan? he answers: "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

In each of these texts we have the words of Moses to the Israelites. The use, however, to which Christ puts them, stamps them as the living word of his Father, which Satan could not resist, and which Jesus, as made under the law, came to vindicate and obey. With all the precision and power of him whose name is Counsellor, he appeals to the divine statute in his arguments with his enemies: "Yea, did we never read?"—"What saith the Scripture?" "How doth David inspiritecall him Lord?" John x. 34: Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods. If the law called those gods, to whom the word of God came, (and the Scripture can not be broken,) say ye to him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world: Thou blasphemest, because I said I am God's Son?" Here the argument hinges on the word *gods*. If your law gives this title to your magistrates, why may not I, without blasphemy, call myself God's Son, when God is evidently marking me as his messenger by all the miracles that I am performing? The question was unanswerable, simply because the word "*gods*" could not be set aside. "The Scripture can not be broken," (more properly annulled or

set aside) *i. e.* This word "gods" is Scripture, *i. e.* God's writing, and must stand. Even the gainsaying Jews could say nothing again. Our modern Christians, who ridicule *verbal* inspiration, would have retorted at once: The *word* proves nothing. Moses made a bad selection, or: It is a blunder of some ignorant transcribers. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." Why should they do this, unless the words were all divine? Had some words been divine, and others human, a new revelation was indispensable to make the distinction between the two; and if the Scriptures were the prophetic witnesses of Christ, from what mouth could they have come, if not from the mouth of Him who knoweth the end from the beginning?

It is an unparalleled manifestation of the glory of the words of the Old Testament, that the Son of God himself, in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, should have so habitually appealed to the words of the Old Testament, of Moses, David and the prophets, as the oracles of Heaven, thus veiling his own peerless majesty, while, as made under the law, he bowed in meek submission to its very least command, and taught us, by his example, how to drive Satan before us, to silence if not convince the teachers of error, and savingly to instruct the people of God.

The divine authority of the words of the Old Testament, therefore, is guaranteed to us by the express authority and habitual use of God our Savior.

The question now comes up concerning the New Testament. Is it the will of God, that his children should regard the New Testament, as on the same heavenly level with the Old?

In the first place it will be admitted gladly by every Christian, that the Gospels, so far as they are the words of Christ, are the words of God. But what security have we that the words are correctly reported? Two of the Gospels are by the Apostles Matthew and John. On these, before leav-

ing the world, Christ breathed, and said: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." To them he had formerly promised his Spirit "to lead them into all the truth," "to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said to them," and "to shew them things to come," and that he would be with them "to the end of the world." He told them they were his witnesses to the nations, that they were to be brought before Governors and Kings, and commanded them not to be anxious beforehand what they should say, inasmuch as words were to be given them in that hour, expressly assuring them it was not they who should speak, but the Holy Spirit. Their official words, therefore, were to be the words of God.

Now the point which we have to consider is this: If the Apostles always spoke the words of the Holy Spirit, in those innumerable discourses delivered to their cotemporaries, and which have perished, so far as writing is concerned, shall we believe that in their testimony which has been embodied in which, and which has been revolutionizing and reforming the world for 18 centuries, they were left entirely to themselves, that their words were merely their own, and not the Holy Spirit's? Did they always speak inspiration when they preached but never write it? Was Christ and his Spirit so careful of the generation then living, and so careless of all the generations that were to follow? That is impossible; for Christ expressly told his disciples: "Lo! I am with you always even to the end of the world." The only way in which the disciples have been in the world, since they left it, has been by their written testimony; and therefore we are sure, that in that testimony we have not merely the disciples speaking, but Christ speaking, and the Holy Spirit speaking, even to the end of the world.

Mark and Luke were not Apostles, but they were the disciples and attendants of Peter and Paul, and their Gospels have always been regarded by Christians as of equal authority with those of Matthew and

John. On this point I shall have occasion to speak again.

Paul is a divine witness of the verbal inspiration of both parts of the Bible. In 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, we have an unanswerable text, in which he pronounces an eulogium on the Old Testament, by calling it the Holy Scriptures, and declaring them to possess a saving power as the word of Christ—they “are able to make thee wise unto salvation, by faith which is in Christ Jesus;” and then by immediately adding: “All Scripture is God-inspired”—he stamps the New Testament *isotime of equal* that is of infinite *value*. Paul took every opportunity of magnifying his office, as that of a witness whose words were all divine. 1 Cor. ii. 4: “My speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith might not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.” 13: “Which things we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but in those which the Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

Peter is a witness of the same character. 1 Peter i. 23: “Being born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the living and eternally abiding word of God.” 2 Peter i. 21: “For not by will of man was prophecy ever brought, but the holy men of God spake, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” iii. 2: “That ye may be mindful of the words that were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Savior.” Vs. 15, 16: “And the long-suffering of our Lord account salvation; even as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote to you. As also in all the epistles, speaking in them of these things, among which are some hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.” Here we see the great Apostle setting his official seal to the words of the Old and New Testament, uttering his divine testi-

mony to the equal authority of his beloved Paul, endorsing all his epistles and his dark things, and denouncing perdition to those who wrested them. If Peter threatened perdition to those who offered violence to a few of the words of Paul, because difficult as they were, they were still the word of God, what would he have said to our modern deniers of the divine authority of large portions of the words of the Bible, or even of the whole, because they find it hard to understand how they can be divine?

The conclusions of the two Testaments are solemn, and should be weighed by all who read the Bible. Mal. iv. 4: “Remember ye the law of Moses my servant which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.

A SYNOPSIS OF THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,

Meeting at the corner of Jefferson avenue and Beaubien streets, Detroit. Together with the by-laws which regulate the order and business of the church.

Such is the title of a little work recently published by the congregation in the city of Detroit. It consists of *ten Articles*, or paragraphs, which we are to understand as constituting *the faith* of said Church. Then follow eighteen by-laws, which control the *order* and the *business* of the congregation; all of which are neatly expressed in the beautiful style of our gifted and accomplished brother, ISAAC ERRETT.—The congregation meeting on the corner of Jefferson avenue and Beaubien street, Detroit, are admirably *harnessed*, panoplied and equipped, for their spiritual warfare, with *ten* articles of faith, and *eighteen* by-laws; so that under these safeguards, it is to be presumed their religion, in the important elementary points of *faith, order*

and business, may be considered as entirely secure from the assaults of foes, both within and without. And if the Church, in the city of Detroit, do not move on with the utmost precision and mechanical harmony, as perfect as that of the spheres in their mystic dance, it will not be because of the absence of a human symbol of faith, and eighteen most exact by-laws,—for they have these—the coveted idol of every form of the Apostasy, in every age of its history. The truth is, the brethren in Detroit have made a creed, a confession and discipline, and published it to the world.

It matters not whether they intended to do so or not, they have done it in fact and in form; and as such it must be treated or regarded by every man who can discriminate and identify facts. The work before us is far more than an essay. It is an *authoritative* declaration and document. It professes to enunciate in regular systematic form, *the faith and the practice* of that particular congregation. True, it only professes to be a *synopsis* of their faith and practice. But we are to understand that it embraces the “essential” or the “fundamental” points or articles of the faith of that Church. So that this “synopsis” sustains the same relation to the Detroit Church, that the “Discipline” does to the Methodist Society, or the West Minster Confession, to the Presbyterian Church. The brethren in Detroit may not be so rigid in the application of their synopsis and by-laws, as the various protestant sects; they may not make their ten articles and eighteen by-laws a test of fellowship to the same extent as the Presbyterians; but this is another matter altogether. The use they may make of their creed cannot alter the nature and character of the document which lies before us. It is a human creed, whether they live by it or not.

1. We are to understand that the entire congregation indorse, that is, believe these ten articles of faith—have accepted them and hold them as the faith of Christ. We are also to understand that each member of said church has likewise accepted the

eighteen by-laws, and obliged himself or herself to obey them. I say we are to understand this as an implied *fact*. Any other supposition would involve an absurdity, and even *falsehood*, in the title of the document. The words are these: “A synopsis of the faith and practice of the church of Christ, meeting at the corner of Jefferson avenue and Beaubien street—together with the by-laws which regulate the order and business of the church.” We are not at liberty, therefore, to suppose that this document is a mere declaration designed to furnish information to the public alone. Before the public is reached, the church itself was reached—and its members subscribed both the articles of faith, and the by-laws. The entire church consent to hold these ten articles, and to obey these eighteen laws; *i. e.*, they agree to hold and advocate the one, and to obey the other. Now what is this but making and adopting a human creed, in every particular essential to such an act? If the church in the city of Detroit are not bound by this document, then it is not their faith and practice—but an imposition upon them, and the public too. If they are religiously bound by it—as in all good faith we must believe, then they have a human creed as much as any church in Christendom.

2. The information conveyed in the tenth paragraph is singular and extraordinary, in the superlative degree, to-wit: “*This declaration of our faith is not to be taken as a creed.*” How, then, is it to be taken? You tell me what you believe—what your faith is—in plain words—but in conclusion tell me that I am not to take it as your creed, or your faith. This appears to me to be inconsistent and self-contradictory. The church in Detroit writes and prints a “synopsis” of its faith, in systematic form—prints it for the information of the public, and then closes by assuring the public that this, the authentic creed or faith of the said church, is not to be taken as a creed or formula of faith!! Whose creed is it then, if it be not the creed of the church in the city of Detroit? That the

document is a creed in form, substance, and fact, no one can be so puerile as to deny. This is the nature of the document. It is a declaration of faith—the creed or symbol of the faith of the church in Detroit, and if it be not taken as a creed, it cannot be taken at all. The moment the mind ceases to regard it as a creed, it loses all importance, becomes insignificant and false, both in name and character. No, we must take every thing according to its nature or character. This document in its essential nature is the symbol of the faith of a religious congregation; and as such, it *must* be understood, or it cannot be understood at all. I confess my inability to comprehend the meaning of the admonition that this declaration of faith is not to be taken as a creed. It seems to me to be out of place; and suggestive too, that the work of these brethren had not been comprehended in its real nature. It appears that while the church in Detroit have nerved themselves up to the act of making a creed, they have not yet got the courage to openly avow it and employ it for the only purpose that instrument is adapted to—to control and fix the minds of its members. Hence the squeamishness as to how their little Synopsis shall be regarded. Though it is a creed, they do not wish it to be so regarded. They are not yet quite full grown men and women in the creed-doctrine. The initial lesson has been well studied—the work even has been done—the little creed-bantling, well dressed, is introduced upon the stage; but with some bashfulness and deep misgivings it is said: O! it is nothing—not to be taken as a creed—not it—but merely an innocent little angel to impart information to the public! Time, however, will show the effect and influence of this doubtful measure upon the authors of it.

3. It is said that this synopsis of the faith and practice of the church in Detroit is put forth, or published, for the information of the public. This is plain. But why was it conceived and subscribed by the church? It is not to be presumed that the church would write and publish her

faith and practice solely to give information to the public. There must have been first a personal sense of need in this respect. The congregation must have felt that a written formula was, in some sense, essential to its own well being. If it was merely to give information to the public, why adopt the form of a creed? Why dress the document in sectarian guise? Why use ribbons and gewgaws from the ancient shop of Mystery Babylon? A tract, or an essay, or a sermon from the pen of brother Errett would have given the requisite information to the public. Indeed, I am clearly convinced that this last method would have been much more effectual.—The fact that another method was adopted—that a creed, in fact and form, is produced, compels a thinking man to regard this movement as *radical in the extreme*; and, as designed chiefly for the well-being of the church, as supplying a felt deficiency in the structure, or the circumstances of the church, in the abstract. The carefully prepared discipline, in the shape of eighteen laws, meant to regulate the order, *and the business*, would seem to be a special devisement intended to meet a special want. Then these eighteen by-laws embrace the practice of the church! They are the second table of the law—the first table being filled with the faith. Surely this is sufficiently methodical. But what a meager practice of Christianity do these by-laws present. I have read them over several times, and I feel sure that I entirely comprehend them. But they are cold mechanical forms. I ask myself, Is this the practice of the church of Christ? Is this to be called the practice of Christianity?

I open my New Testament and read—
 “Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine—ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, for without me ye can do nothing. . . I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that

you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable and perfect will of God . . . Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in the tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice; and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. *Be not wise in your own conceits.*—Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written vengeance is mine. I will repay saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good . . . Let all bitterness, and wraths, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice, and be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Here is, in part, the practice of the apostles. It kindles the soul to read it. It unseals the deepest yearnings and aspirations of the heart. It points to the personal effort, conflict, prayerful endeavor, and manly purpose, to rise to the divine and heavenly, by surrendering the mind and heart to the life and law of Love and Righteousness. It opens at once another life within life, deep, pure, immortal, and Godlike. Like some sweet voice and hymn of nature it soothes,

and melts the heart, heals it of its sicknesses, and brings into it the thoughts, and the beauty, and the joys of heaven.

Now let the reader compare this specimen of the ancient apostolic practice of the saints, with the practice of the Church in Detroit, as enunciated in the eighteen by-laws of the newest human creed in christendom—and tell me what he thinks of the comparison. These eighteen by-laws are as cold and mechanical as those which regulate the Lowell mill in Massachusetts, in comparison with the soul-moving teachings of the Holy Spirit. Besides, what of Christianity is communicated to the public, in these eighteen by-laws? Not one particle. And yet they represent *the practice of the Church of Christ* in the City of Detroit! Obedience to every one of them would not weigh one feather in a true and Scriptural estimate of the christian life. Nay, a man may punctiliously obey each of those eighteen by-laws, and not even be any thing but a heartless formalist. And so it is, and ever will be, with every effort of man to mend or modify the Christian religion, and to render it more acceptable to the speculative spirit of the age. Human creeds are lifeless forms. They are trees without foliage, without blossoms, and without fruit. Their dry, knotted, and gnarled trunks, and storm-beaten and twisted boughs, only add fresh feelings of desolation in the mind of him who gazes upon them, in the barren wastes of dogmatic theology. The Bible alone contains the true faith and practice of Christ and the apostles. To circulate this—to interest men in it—to call attention publicly and privately to its teachings, and to exhort men to believe and obey it—is the great work of a preacher. Writing creeds or symbols of faith for the public; and publishing by-laws to enlighten men concerning the practice of the Gospel, will never do any good, but will ever do harm, no matter how well meant. Such is my deep conviction, and I cannot but weep at the fact that any of our brethren should so far go backward as to manufacture a creed and by-laws for the perfection of the

Church of Christ, and the conversion of the world.

The Church of Detroit has as good a right to make a creed as any other body of men living. But in doing it they have left the grand principle of Protestantism—and ignored the fundamental axioms of the current Reformation—that the Holy Scriptures alone contain and teach all that is necessary for salvation. Here is our creed and discipline. It is sufficient and perfect in every respect to the end had in view. If it be not, I am sure the wisdom of the world cannot supply the defect. So far as I am concerned, I can never consent to hold membership in any church which has any other creed than the Bible. But enough for the present.

J. W. Cox.



H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. X.

HARRODSBURG, KY., June 19, '63.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Criticism No. VIII. lies before me.—Like those that have preceded it, it has much of the freshman about it. This constant attempt at the display of Greek words proves the novice. Somebody says that *roots* are found to grow mostly in barren ground. *Fruit* is found on a different soil. But to the criticism.

Robinson and Webster are the highest authorities in the Greek and English. Robinson gives us the word "class" as the translation of the Greek term; and Webster gives in his sixth definition of the word "course" "order; turn; class; succession of one to another in office or duty. Solomon appointed the courses of the priests. 2d Chron. viii." Class is the word for these

times. We say, a course of medicine, a course of study, the course of nature, the course of a stream; but no sensible man ever talks of a "course of men" or course of priests. "Class of priests" is English.

Our critic is surely afflicted with the spirit of error. In his remarks on the participle of "probaino" he forgets all else but the Revision of the Union. The verb "probaino" is one of the most common of Greek verbs, and means "to go before; to advance." The simple verb "baino" cannot mean to "advance." For it requires the preposition "pro" to give it this meaning. Surely our critic did not think that a Greek could be guilty of such a blunder as to use a word that would be equal to the English words *advance before*. Yet such is his judgment in this case. Then he knows not that the verb *advance* is equal to the verb *to go before*. He tells us that "pro" is of the nature of an *intensive*. *Intensive!!* I suppose he means *intensive*. Let me say, that this is but a fiction of his imagination.—For there is nothing that would lead any one to think that Zachariah and Elizabeth were *very old*. The words *now* and *for*, as given by the Revision, are the merest fictions, and show to every scholar that the Revisers are in error. *Advanced in years* is the full meaning of the Greek words.—Bloomfield says, "the expression exactly corresponds to our word *elderly*." Our critic has lately made the discovery, that a perfect tense expresses past time continuing up to the present, and he is anxious to acquaint the readers of the Review with the fact. We will see who is fit to translate, ere we are done.

The Revision has the words, "Executed the priest's office." I have "officiated as priest." Webster is of no authority with the Bible Union. We execute plans and works, law or justice, deeds and bonds; but we do not *execute offices*. Our critic is so much occupied with Greek roots, that he has no time for the examination of an English Lexicon.

Lastly, the Revision has, "It fell to his

lot, according to the custom of the priest's office, to burn incense, going into the temple of the Lord."

The remarks made by our critic on this sentence convict the Union of want of knowledge, as respects the translation of participles. The obvious meaning of the sentence above quoted, is, that Zachariah burned incense in the act of going into the temple, and not after he had entered the temple. The language, as they have it, "to burn incense, going into the temple" can mean nothing else. They teach what is not true in this case. The sense of the original is lost to the English reader. But, "to burn incense when he went into the temple" is the exact thought as expressed by Luke's Greek.

I have noticed these points more particularly than was necessary for the readers of the "Review" generally. But our critic deserves some notice on account of his *freshman* style of treating Greek; and for his sake I have been more particular than heretofore. I will now resume the examination of the Gospels revised by the Union. First, we will take an example of rude collocation of words in a sentence; Mark x: 2.

"And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, if it is lawful for a man to put away his wife, tempting him."

Here is another abuse of the law for translating participles. Two defects are obvious in this sentence. 1. The position of the words. 2. The translation of the participle.

In Matt. ix: 19, 20, we find the following: "And Jesus arose and was following him, and his disciples. And behold, a woman, having a flow of blood twelve years" &c.

In this last clause, the participle "having" is most unfortunate. There is no excuse for it but want of knowledge. We well remember the words of the Savior: "The servant that knew not his master's will, and did things that were worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few." We have been merciful, and have spared the rod measura-

bly, knowing that the intent was good.—There are, however, somethings pardonable, and some things not. The first clause in this last quotation is a version that is not pardonable, and we will expose it fully, so that any one who has the least acquaintance with Greek, may see the error.

It not unfrequently happens that, in the same sentence, there are two or more nouns in the nominative case; one a singular noun, the other, or others, plural. The singular noun is called the principal subject; the verb takes the singular number, because the principal subject is singular. The other noun, or nouns, as the case may be, is called the subordinate subject, and has no verb expressed. Then, in translating, we couple both the subjects by the copulative *and*, and make them the subjects of the one verb. I will give two examples, first expressing them according to the Greek form, then according to the English.

1. "The King came, and his courtier." This is the Greek form. In English we say, "The King and his courtiers came."

2. "The President entered the room, and the professors," the Greek form. In English we say, "The President and the professors entered the room."

Now by applying this law, the Revisers could have said, "And Jesus and his disciples arose and followed him." But in their ignorance of Greek Grammar, and of English composition, they have committed this unpardonable error; "And Jesus arose and was following him, and his disciples." And further; as the pronoun "his," must grammatically stand for "him," the ruler; then Jesus follows the ruler and the disciples of the ruler.

Again; in Luke xxii: 36 we find this most noticeable attempt to improve upon the Common Version. "Therefore said he to them, But now, he that has a purse, let him take it, and likewise a bag; and he that has none, let him sell his garment and buy a sword."

We have tried to find out the meaning of this sentence, but our efforts are vain,

"He that has none," must mean "he that has no purse or bag;" and we must interpret thus: "he that has no purse or bag, let him sell his garment and buy a sword." Still we are altogether uncertain as to the meaning. The Common Version has, "He that has no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." This is intelligible.

Our critic is admirable on the meaning of the perfect tense. Let us hear the Revision on that wonderful tense. In Luke viii:46 we find the following:

"And Jesus said, Some one touched me, for I perceive that power has gone out from me."

According to the late discovery of our critic, this means, I perceived some time ago that power has *now* gone out from me.

In Matt. x:22 is the following: "And ye will be hated by all, for my name's sake; but he that has endured to the end, the same shall be saved."

According to the late wonderful discovery, we interpret thus: But he that has *now* endured to the end, that is, has *now* endured all the trials that shall hereafter come upon him, the same shall be saved." Well, we shall grow wise, if we are patient.

Once more; and for the present, we will lay down our pen. "Nor do they put new wine into old skins, else the skins burst, and the wine runs out, and the skins are destroyed." Matt. ix:17.

Our Revisers attempt to be ludicrous; *askos* and *derma* are surely different in meaning. Why did they not, for the sake of the Greek, and for the sake of dignity, use the word "bottle" in the text, and by means of a note, inform their brethren that, in ancient times, (as even now in the East,) bottles were made of skins?

Your's very truly,

H. T. ANDERSON.

TRUE AND FALSE EDUCATION.

Address before the Graduating Class of Eureka College for the session 1862-3; delivered on June 25th by the President, B. W. Johnson.

I presume that I address to-day only the friends of education. Your presence on occasions like the present, sacred to the cause of human progress and the attention you have given to the exercises, serve to show the deep interest you feel in this great work. We are all the friends of education, and indeed it has no enemies. *All men, wise and simple, virtuous and vicious, rich and poor are its friends.* The pick-pocket and the ruffian of the great city, the miser who will not vote a dollar for schools, the savage of the Western wild, all make common cause with the good and great in favor of education. Not only is this the case, that all men are the friends of education, but I will go a step farther and urge the paradoxical position *that all men are educated;* friends of that system in which they have been educated. We speak of the poor, ignorant and degraded of the earth; I have no issue to make with those who use such language, for they use it correctly, but still I must assert that all sane persons who have reached adult age are educated men and women. Yes, the degraded rag-picker of the Northern city gutter, who has never seen inside of a school and does not know one letter from another, the unlettered poor white of the slave states and the still more degraded African have all gone through the process of education. They may not have attended the best schools, enjoyed the best masters and pursued the best systems, but still they have had their schools, masters and systems.

What is the meaning of the term education? It evidently has an equivocal signification; for we may say correctly that a person has a *good* or a *bad* education. It

means to draw out, to develope, to cherish the powers we have within us. It matters not what these elements may be, wicked or righteous, passions or virtues, the fostering and strengthening of these elements in education. There may be a *physical* education of the body, the development of the muscular system, as seen in the litness and elasticity of the acrobat, in the great strength and symmetry of the gymnast, or in the mighty arm of the blacksmith; there may be an education of the appetites, as exemplified in those who develope an acquired taste until it gains a power to whose mandates they are compelled to cower like helpless slaves; as exemplified in the drunkard who sees in the red depths of the intoxicating bowl, destitution, starvation and wretchedness for his wife and little ones, and the gutter, the poor house, death and hell for himself;—shrinks back from its horrors, yet drinks, the powerless victim of the appetite that he was educated into such omnipotent strength. That fierce; all-devouring passion was feeble once, but grew under the tuition he gave as gradually as the slow dawns of the young school-boy's mind.

The savage of the western wild, delighting in deeds of blood, treacherous to friends, stealing at the midnight hour to murder and scalp the unsuspecting victim whose fears he has allayed by professions of friendship, fiendish to his captured enemies, this being who has never seen a book or a school house, can we call him educated? Who will lay it to the charge of the Great Author of existence that He created him a demon! that He made him the slave of cruel, relentless and debasing passions? Who is responsible for this, man or God? They have been *educated* to track the foe-man, to treacherously slay the unsuspecting victim, to torture the prisoner to death with fiendish atrocity, to revel with devilish pleasure in deeds of blood. We may not approve of their *system* of education, but nevertheless they have been educated.

The thief has the faculty of acquisitiveness, given by God for noble ends; this he

distorts and develope to a disproportionate extent, while the moral faculties lie dormant and ignored by the *system* that he has adopted, and the consequence is that he is gradually *schooled* into an adept at his unholy calling. So with all the children of vice and shame; they had noble spirits once; warm hearts throbbed in response to the high impulses that filled their bosoms, but they have been educated in the wrong schools, unholy influences have directed their footsteps into the ways of sin until, their manhood forever wrecked, they are only a fallen tower, or a dismantled ruin, amid whose walls reeking with poisonous damps, creeps the venomous serpent.

You are the friends of education, I dare say; you say that it is a great thing to be educated, better than rubies or the gems that sparkle in the mine, desirable above all things earthly. I am not ready to agree with you unless you suffer me to qualify your language. It depends on the *kind* of education whether it is a good thing. Men are educated to lie, cheat and steal, to blaspheme God, and to curse men, as well as to be noble, good, and wise. "Oh yes," responds some hearer, "I do not mean that the development of the basest passions and propensities is a thing to be desired, but I mean *education of the intellect*; I would develope that divine faculty into overpowering strength that would bless the subject and be a blessing to mankind." I admit much of what you say, my friend. It is a noble work to cultivate our intellectual being; I love to see it developed into a power that seems to belong to God rather than men; but I must urge that the education of the mind is not enough. That may give superhuman power to a friend who will use it for the destruction of mankind. Danton and Robespierre, Couthon and St. Just, the furies of the "Reign of Terror," who swam in seas of innocent blood; Cæsar and Bonaparte, each of whom immolated 2,000,000 human beings upon the shrine of his satanic ambition; these all were men of surpassing genius and high cultivation. They used the powers of a

developed intellect to erect temples to their own fame out of the ruins of the human race. Jeff. Davis, Toombs, Benjamin and Lee, are all men of education—too well educated by far.

I have presented the examples that you may look at the subject from its different stand-points and may see the need of developing some other faculties that will act as a restraint and guide to the intellect.—It must needs be controlled and directed.

Let no one conclude from what I have said that I am not the friend of education. I yield to no man in interest for this great cause, but while its friend, advocate and *servant*, I am an enemy to some kinds.—I am an enemy to that schooling which injures and debases men; I despise systems that make men lie, cheat and steal, torture, cut and slay; that make them fiends and scourges to the earth; but there is no warmer friend of that education which ennobles and blesses men, which holds the baser passions in check, which develops the intellect, but directs it to good and noble ends. I want the *man* developed, not the brute or "lurking devil" that is in the man. I want them to be exercised.

The problem of education is then one of the deepest interest. On the "*course*" pursued depends the course of life. On the influences brought to bear depends success or failure, virtue or vice, blessings or curses in this life and that to come. It need not be wondered then that this subject has excited the deepest interest among the friends of the human race. The wise and good of ancient and modern times have labored long and earnestly to devise the course and means by which society could be improved, enlightened, and elevated; the old philosophers have thought that they supplied the great want in their various systems, but their hopes were proved vain, and it has been left to our own age to still discuss doubtfully the educational problem. I shall allude briefly to three modern systems, which, though still in existence, have been tried enough to show their insufficiency and that ere long they

will be consigned to the tomb of the dead theories of the past.

1. The first system is practically as follows: The student is shut up in a sort of monastic life from the world; he is brought into converse with the dead of other ages; he is led into the mysterious mazes of theoretical philosophy, but kept away from all that is modern, living, and practical in the hope that he will be held aloof from the follies of the world. What is the consequence? The scholar knows too little of the actual wants of the race to become a benefactor of men; or he is unfitted to grapple with the strange foes that rise to assail in the *unknown* country in which he fights the battle of life. The scholar of this system might be fitted for the Roman forum, or the Athenian *agora*, but is totally disqualified for the *rushing, whizzing* life of this age of gunpowder, steam and harnessed lightning.

2. The second system is at the other pole—the first is the *negative*, this is the *positive*. It is called the *practical* system. According to its canons all that is useful in education is that which has an immediate bearing on the special calling chosen for life; there is nothing for *manhood*, but everything for *business*. Its corner stone is the Horatian precept, "In all thy gettings get money." The soul is sold to a trade or calling. Schools are springing up devoted to this system, and the prevalence of its dogmas among the patrons of other schools, exerts a most pernicious influence on the cause of sound education and human progress. Men and women haste to be rich; and boys and girls haste to be at the business of life. A year or two at most is all that can be devoted to the development of mind and soul. Pope was right when he said that

"A little *learning* is a dangerous thing."

These smatterers who think that they have bounded the domains of knowledge, when they have only peeped into her outer chambers, and never had the slightest glimpse of her inner glories, these men are blind leaders of the blind, wells without

water, clouds without rain, pretenders who steal away the key of knowledge, and will neither go within her sacred temples themselves nor permit others to enter. The smatterer is conceited and pedantic; the thoroughly educated man is modest from a sense of his own nothingness and of the boundless realms of the unknown before him, which his science will not enable him to explore.

3. The third system, I would call the *exquisite* system. The God of the first system is *antiquity*, of the second *mammon*, and of the third *fashion*. The seat of its power is in the fashionable boarding schools of the country. Its votaries are the vain and foolish of the earth, those who prefer gilding to real gold; the exterior polish to the all-pervading beauty of the spirit; who are satisfied if the outside of the platter is clean, though all is filthy within. In this system, forms are of more value than power or substance; to *shine* preferred to goodness or usefulness; this world, with its few fleeting years, of more importance than heaven and eternity. In this system, the soul is left a dreary waste; the mind is cultivated only under the inspiration of vanity, and the desire of human approbation. No great and ennobling motives are held up as incentives to exertion. Its subjects are educated for the parlor or ball-room, and their ears are so filled with the notes of revelry that the sad agonizing cry that comes from a despairing world, is unheard. Is that your system, my friends? I know that it is not.

What then should be our system? It is evident, when we glance at the human constitution. We have a body, a mind, and a spirit. If one is cultivated to the exclusion of the other, it gains an unnatural power, and no system is worthy of adoption that does not address itself to each of these three elements. The body must be developed, for a sound mind can only be found in a sound body; the mind must be developed, for in the exact ratio of its cultivation, will be our power; and our moral nature must be developed in order that we may be good as well as great; otherwise,

with the mind of an angel, we may be staid with the sins of a demon. The intellect, ever increasing in power until it assumes a gigantic strength, must be controlled and directed by a heart that beats in response to the sufferings of man. We must not ignore the great fact that we are destined to an immortal existence; we must recognize our Judge in heaven; we must realize that we shall be held to account for the manner in which we perform the work of life. While we sit at the feet of Plato and Newton, we must not forget to learn the lesson of the Great Teacher, upon which eternity hangs, and which this earth could never teach. A correct system should turn out its subjects accomplished ladies and gentlemen, thorough scholars and pious Christians.

I should like to develop at greater length, the excellence of this, the only true system, the *Christian* system; but the time I have spoken, admonishes me that I must close; and besides, we prefer judging by the Savior's rule, by the *fruits* of the tree. We have the *fruits* to exhibit to-day.

The ladies and gentlemen who sit before me, have been educated according to this system. They have been taught that they must not be "cumberers upon the earth;" that the business of life is to work, and that they must "work while it is called to-day, knowing that the night of death cometh when no man can work." You will probably expect that I would give them some advice on this occasion—the last that we shall be associated in this capacity. I have nothing to say, for what I would say, is already in their hearts. They have been educated in the true system—*our* system. Their hearts are warm, and their hands are ready. They hear the Macedonian cry, and go forth "about their Father's business." They are our "*epistles*," living epistles of the work in which we are engaged.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. XI.

HARRODSBURG, Ky.

BRO. FRANKLIN :

The ninth criticism on the first chapter of Luke lies before me. I must call the attention of the reader to the meaning of the word *Translate*. Webster gives it thus:—"To interpret; to render into another language; to express the sense of one language in the words of another." Unless the sense of the one is expressed in the words of the other, then there is no translation. I must also say, that no one can express the sense of one language in the words of another, by imitating the forms of that language which he proposes to translate. Our critic fancies that every one departs from the words of inspiration, when he does not imitate the exact forms of the Greek. I have already given many instances, in which the Bible Union have closely followed the Greek forms, and, by doing so, have not given the sense. We will now attend to criticism No. IX. Here is, in the Revised Gospels, an instance of exact imitation of a Greek form:

"And Zachariah seeing him, was troubled." This is not translation, but imitation. Such is the custom of the Bible Union. I have translated this passage thus; "And Zachariah was troubled at the sight." I have already said that this book published by the Union exhibits, throughout, ignorance of the use of participles. The participle in the above passage denotes cause; but the Revision does not express its sense. They merely *imitate* the Greek form, because they do not know for what purpose the participle is used. I have expressed its real sense by the words "at the sight," which give the reader the cause of Zachariah's being troubled.

Now, if our critic thinks that a rigid imitation of Greek forms is an adherence to the

words of inspiration, he will find, when it is too late to amend, that the labor of the Bible Union has been in vain.

2. I am pleased that our critic has at last undertaken to give us some information on the Aorist tense. In the words of the Revision, we have an aorist thus: "Thy prayer was heard." It will be a cause of amusement to the reader to see how sorely the Secretary lashes the authors of the Revised Gospels. See:

"Every person who has spent six months in the study of Greek, knows that the first aorist indicative passive, does not mean 'Is' or 'Has Been,' but Was. To argue the case might intimate a possibility for doubt, which does not exist."

Such is the lash which our critic applies to those men, who, for twelve years, have been trying to revise the Scriptures. I say he applies the lash to them, intending it for myself.

Let the reader open his Greek Testament and turn to the first chapter of Luke, and he will find in the 49th verse, the first aorist of the verb *poieo*. The Revision has translated it thus: "Has Done." "Because the Mighty One has done great things for me." The aorist is translated as a perfect by the Bible Union. Hear our critic again:

"It is a clear, indisputable proof that the translator does not distinguish between an aorist and a perfect, but believes an aorist, when correctly translated, to be erroneously translated, and believes that the proper meaning of an aorist is that which properly and exclusively belongs to the perfect."

I know not what these Revisers will think of such a castigation from the hands of their Secretary. But we are not done with this aorist tense as yet. The reader will now open his Greek Testament and turn to Matt. x: 22. There he will find a first aorist participle. The Revision has translated it as a perfect thus: "Has endured." "He that has endured to the end, the same shall be saved." Yes, reader, here is another aorist translated as a perfect. But again, in Luke viii: 46, another aorist is, by the Revision, translated as a perfect. "Has gone." "I

perceived that power *has gone* out from me."

In these three instances, an aorist is translated as a perfect by the Revisers. Now, what shall we think of our critic? He has not read the Revised Gospels. He knows not what is in them. He attempts to find fault with my translation; and in doing so, condemns severely his own Revisers. It is evident that he knows not what he is about; for surely he did not intend to lash his own brethren, whom he undertakes to defend.—But to the aorist tense.

The aorist is used to express the taking place of an event in time past, without reference to the particular time. This is its first sense. But secondarily; from the fact of its being thus indefinite, with respect to time, it is used to express an act that frequently takes place in past time—the continued recurrence of the act. Thirdly; it is used to express a thought, which is present indeed, but which is supposed to have been long and firmly conceived in the speaker's heart.

Now, to say, as the Revisers have said,—“Thy prayer was heard,” is to do injustice to the Greek, and to the ways of God. The imperfect tense, *was heard*, conveys to the mind of the reader the thought, that God did, in some time past and gone, hear the prayer, but no longer regarded it. For instance: “A man builded a house.” The man did, in some past time, build a house; but is no longer building. The prayer was heard in time past, but is no longer heard. I objected to the Common Version, because “is heard” limits the time to the then present moment. But what is the fact in the case? Zachariah had prayed some time before this; his prayer was not only heard, but remembered, and God intended to answer it. Now, a translation that will express this fact must be the true one. “Your prayer has been heard” exactly expresses the whole truth; for the perfect expresses time past and continuing up to the present. God heard, and continued to hear, and was then about to answer the prayer. And thus the Revisers have done well in the 49th verse of the first

chapter of Luke, by rendering the aorist by an English perfect. The Mighty One *has done* great things for me. But, strange to say, they have committed nine errors in ten verses, and have thus not only not expressed the sense, but have spoiled one of the finest songs in the Holy Oracles.

The next point is my translation of the preposition *en*. The remarks of the Secretary show that he has not studied the use of *en*. I will here say, that *en* is never used for *eis*. There are instances in which it is so used *apparently*; I say *apparently*, and this only to such as are not acquainted with Greek usage. The only way of interpreting this passage so as to preserve the original sense of *en*, is to supply *hosti einai*, and read thus: “To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient *so that they may be* in the wisdom of the just.” To avoid this rudeness in English, it is generally supposed that *en* is used for *eis*, and so it has been translated by *to*. This is but avoiding, not solving a difficulty. The preposition *en* is often used in the New Testament in the sense of *by* or *through*; Matt. xvii: 21, “This kind goes not out but, *en*, by prayer and fasting.” Here, prayer and fasting are the means by which such evil spirits were cast out. So also *en* in many other places. Now let the reader notice that John the Immerser went before the Lord to *turn* the hearts of the fathers *to* the children, and *to turn* the disobedient, *en*, not *to* the wisdom of the just; but he was *to* turn the hearts of the fathers *to* the children, and he was further *to* turn the disobedient *to* the Lord, by some means; and the means we find expressed by the words, *by the wisdom of the just*. On the use of *en* with verbs of motion, and *eis* with verbs of rest, see the Lexicons and Grammars. This is a point on which many errors are made by the uninitiated. I shall not follow the Secretary in his remarks on *en*. It is unnecessary.

I must remark that this is the third instance in which we have shown that the Revised Gospels are against our critic. Yet he goes boldly forward, fearless of consequences.

A word or two on his remarks on my Reply. He says that I virtually admit what he stated—"He has departed from the original in varying from the Bible Union's Revision." Now, I beg leave to say, that I have not admitted what he has stated. He is much mistaken in supposing such an admission. I have *translated* the passage in question; the Revision *imitated* the Greek form. This is the true issue. I *translate* the thought from the Greek into English. The Revisers merely *imitate* the Greek forms. And I must say to the reader, that the true issue between myself and the Secretary is found in the words *translate* and *imitate*. Every scholar knows that no one can express the sense of the Greek by *imitating* its forms.—*Translation* is a something widely different from this. The Secretary and his Revisers are entangled in inextricable difficulties, by attempting to give the sense of the Greek in an exact, literal version. They err in tenses, in participles, in prepositions, in articles; in a word, they err in all things. And they cannot avoid error; for they have chosen the course that leads to error. Our brother Wyckoff is a good man; but he is blind, and led by the blind. Take the following example from John xiii: 2, 3, 4. This I adduce as an example of the most incurable blindness. Reader, mark the example I now give.

"And supper being served, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him; knowing that his Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came out from God, and is going to God, he rises from supper, and lays aside his garments, and taking a towel, girded himself."

Reader, let us look at this sentence, and consider its grammar. The participle *knowing* must agree with some word in the sentence. It cannot agree with Judas Iscariot, nor with son, nor with any other word than devil. If the reviser says that it agrees with *he*, the following pronoun, then I ask, with what does *he* agree? or what does *he*, as a pronoun, represent? It can represent no other noun in the sentence but devil. Then, the devil is here made to do what our Com-

mon Version makes Jesus do. May we not now say, that incurable blindness has fallen on the Bible Union? I submit the above sentence to the examination of any scholar, and he will decide that the devil is the person *knowing* and *acting* throughout. The laws of grammar are inflexible, and know no mercy. The Revisers revise the Common Version, and make it far worse in many respects than it was before. These Revisers have removed the word *Jesus* from the text, and thereby made the Devil wait on Jesus' disciples and wash their feet!

Now, our amiable brother, the Secretary, instead of looking into the Revised Gospels, and amending the errors there, is vainly attempting to make out that I have "*substituted*" a passive for an active verb; that I have departed from the words of inspiration. He deals in things of no moment, while the vital question is left untouched. This vital question is—Shall we *translate* the thoughts, or *imitate* the forms of Greek? For myself, the decision has long since been made. I *translate* the thoughts that are in the inspired volume into pure and grammatical English. Let this be a full reply to his remarks on my reply.

I must make a remark or two on the passage quoted from John xiii. The word *Jesus* is left out by the Revisers; and this is done without authority. The sense of the passage is wholly lost, and another sense given. I have noticed other instances of omission by them—not of omission, but of removing words and changing them. If we are to judge of their acquaintance with those laws by which a word is removed from, or retained in, the text, by this instance of removal, then we must say that they are not to be depended on in that department at all. How far they have done justice to the Greek or the English, let every reader judge. We shall do the book that justice, which is its due, in exposing its errors to those who read the "Review." To the readers I will say, be not weary; we will make an end of this discussion in due time.

Very truly yours,

H. T. ANDERSON.

SECOND DIVISION.

QUESTIONS BY BRO. DAUGHERTY.

QUESTION I.

Has God more than one plan of remitting sins under the gospel?

ANSWER.

Only one plan for the alien, or the man of the world, who resolves to turn to God. The steps to be taken by all who would become Christians, or disciples of Christ, to come to the point where the Lord has promised remission of sins, according to the gospel, are the same to all. God has ordained but one process through which for men to pass to obtain pardon and become children of God.

QUESTION II.

If God has ordained that mankind, under the gospel, are to obtain the remission of sins through the *positive* act of immersion in water, will he not *invert* his order, or *contradict* his plan, if he ever saves one soul who is not immersed?

ANSWER.

Certainly not. If he should be pleased to save persons outside of the clearly revealed plan, as we find it in the gospel, it would not *invert* nor *contradict*, the revealed plan. But he has not said that he will save any outside, or independent of his revealed plan, and no man knows that he will. It is not, therefore, preaching the gospel to preach that he will save any who do not obey the gospel, as preached by the apostles; but preaching *another gospel*, of which he knows nothing, and for which God will condemn him. We know the Lord will save those who obey the gospel as preached by the apostles, and we are safe when we are preaching and enforcing that on mankind, and no man has any authority to preach and enforce anything else, or even express the opinion, that there is any other way. We must preach what we *know*, and not what we *do not know*. There

is nothing hard in immersion, any more than in faith, repentance, prayer, the communion or the attendance on the public and established worship, that men should be cavilling, quibbling and wrangling about it. It is manifestly a commandment of God, and right. It is not the part of any one who possesses loyalty to Christ, to try to get rid of it, round it, or by it, or to inquire whether he can be saved without it. Submit to it at once, and thus end all scruples about it, and you then know you have done right. The man who evades immersion, or excuses others in doing so, soon finds himself in a cavilling, quibbling and unsubmitive spirit, wholly incompatible with the Spirit of the Savior, and you will soon find him lacking fealty to Christ in other things. When we find what the law of Christ is, let us lay it down and enforce it; maintain it; advocate and perpetuate it, as the only truly benevolent, philanthropic and merciful system for poor, sinful, dying man. He is an enemy to the race, who is an enemy to the gospel, in any or all its parts, as the Lord gave it.

QUESTION III.

Is God's plan of remitting sins so contracted, as to require *positive* performance of any overt act before pardon is granted which may be beyond the power of thousands of individuals?

ANSWER.

By no means. The gospel, containing the faith, repentance and immersion, is for "all nations," for "every creature"—as free to all as to any one. Still, it is in a man's power to place himself where he cannot hear the gospel, and consequently, where he cannot believe; or where there is no water in which to be immersed, or no person to immerse him, and consequently, where he cannot be immersed; or he may defer his believing or repentance till he is in eternity, or so near it, overwhelmed in pain and indescribable sufferings, so that he cannot believe or repent; or he may be so far gone that he cannot be immersed; but who is responsible for all this failure? Certainly not the gospel, but the man him-

self. The gospel was made for him and adapted to him; but he kept himself out of the way of it, refused to regard it till it was too late. Is the gospel to be condemned for that? The light of the sun is made for all, but if a man puts out his eyes, or goes away into the caves of the earth, or closes his eyes, the light of the sun will do him no good, but this is no objection to the sun. The fault is in the foolish man, and he must suffer for it.

The faith, repentance and immersion are for the same persons, and for persons who can believe, repent and be immersed. There are infants and idiots who cannot believe or repent. These are not gospel subjects. They are not required to believe, repent or be immersed. The Lord will take care of them. If there are persons who cannot be immersed, they too are, in so far, not gospel subjects. We leave them with the Judge of all the earth who will do right with them. There are persons who cannot assemble themselves together as the gospel requires, but that is no excuse for those who can, but will not. The circumstance that there may be persons who cannot be immersed, forms no excuse for those who can but will not.

That immersion is in the same sentence, in the commission, with faith, and one of the things to be done in order to the same end, any man can see who will read and believe his Bible. That immersion is in the same sentence, in the language of Peter, Acts ii. 38, with repentance, and one of the things to be done in order to the same end, viz.: remission of sins, any man can see who will read and believe his Bible. It is useless to inquire whether it is so or not. If any man does not believe this, it is faith in the word of God he needs, and not immersion. It is no difference how many times men style immersion a "positive performance," an "overt act," or the plan "contracted," there it stands in God's own inspiration, for every gospel subject. He who runs may read.

QUESTION IV.

Ought the penitent sinner to pray for

pardon, or may he attain it through repentance and baptism, without prayer?

ANSWER.

Peter did not say, "Repent and be immersed every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *without prayer*, for the remission of sins," but Ananias did say to Saul, "Arise and be immersed and wash away thy sins, *calling on the name of the Lord*." It is safe to stick to the letter of Scripture. Follow the apostolic directions and no cavilling about them, and then we know we are safe.

QUESTION V.

Should the penitent sinner pray that God may pardon his sins now, or in the act of baptism, or after he is baptized?

ANSWER.

The best way is to come to the Lord humbly and submissively, and call on his name for salvation, for his mercy, and not *instruct him when he shall save, but be instructed by him what to do, how to do it, and what it is for*, and rely on his most holy, righteous and gracious promise, and you need have no fear but he will save in the right manner and at the right time.

QUESTION VI.

If none were turned from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive the forgiveness of sins, before baptism, how did Paul accomplish his mission (Acts xxvi. 18.) in harmony with the fact, that he was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel? 1 Cor. i. 17.

ANSWER.

When there was no other person to immerse, though not sent to immerse, *he did immerse*, as is stated, 1 Cor. i. 14-16: "I thank God that I immersed none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I immersed in my own name. And I immersed also the household of Stephanus." The reason he assigns why he was thankful that he had immersed only these few of those who said they were of Paul, was "lest any should say he had immersed into his own name," and not that he considered immersion an unimportant thing. The prob-

ability is, that he was *not sent to immerse*, as a favor on account of his being a small and feeble man, but the fact that *he did immerse*, though *not sent to immerse*, by virtue of *his right to do so*, shows that he considered it a matter of importance. Before he would omit it, slender and feeble as he was, or even defer it, though not sent to immerse, he would administer himself, by virtue of his common right to do so, as a disciple of the Lord. Give us an instance where he ever omitted or deferred it, and we will admit that there is something in the question under consideration. He did not defer the jailer's immersion long!

QUESTION VII.

Christ says, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings," John xiv. 24. Therefore, as love must precede acceptable obedience, if the candidate goes to the water without loving God, and is baptized in order to get his sins forgiven, will he not as certainly fail as did Simon the sorcerer? Acts viii. 13, 21-23.

ANSWER.

This question involves an absurdity. No one will come to Christ in immersion, or in any other appointment to obtain pardon of him, who does not love him. He certainly will pardon no one who does not love, in immersion, or in any appointment.

How did our worthy brother find out that Simon was not pardoned? Jesus says, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." Luke says, "Simon himself believed," and "was immersed." See Acts viii. 13. Did the promise of Jesus fail?

QUESTION VIII.

John says, "Every one that loveth is born of God," and "dwelleth in God and God in him." 1 John iv. 7-16. Hence if the candidate loves God before he is baptized, is he not born of God, and consequently pardoned before baptism?

ANSWER.

Instead of "born," in this passage, we should have *begotten*. "Every one who loves is *begotten* of God." Begotten of God, literally means, made a believer by our heavenly Father. Paul says, "I have

begotten you through the gospel." Literally it is, "I have made you believers through the gospel." We are begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," or we are made believers by the word of God.— "Every one," then, "who loves is begotten of God," or made a believer by our heavenly Father; but not pardoned till born of the Creator, or immersed *into* Christ. The penitent believer, who loves God, is a proper subject for immersion and pardon.

QUESTION IX.

Has God promised pardon to the immersed sinner on any other condition than to the unimmersed?

ANSWER.

We do not know that we understand this question. God has promised no pardon to an immersed or an unimmersed *sinner*, but he does promise pardon to a *penitent believer* who is immersed. To a man who is not immersed, and will not be immersed, he does not promise pardon at all, on any conditions. The promises are all to those who have entered into Christ, into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, into the kingdom, into one body, according to the gospel, and who are walking in the love and obedience of the gospel, and not to those who have taken a part of the steps required in order to admittance. If we were as small, weak and feeble, in body, as Paul was, we would consider it an infinitely easier task to immerse all whom we could ever turn to the Lord, than to prove by Scripture that God will pardon any one who is a gospel subject, who will not be immersed. No one doubts that those who believe, repent and are immersed, calling on the name of the Lord, are pardoned, and if they live Christian lives—are faithful till death, no one doubts that they will be saved. B. F.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSAL SALVATION

ELDER LORD :

Dear Sir—Presuming that you will have but few objections to my arguments until I begin to discuss "Man himself and his Relations to God," I thought it best to send and publish several articles without waiting for your reply. If you should present some objections, I will take an article to notice them in. This course, I think, will move the discussion along a little faster. Otherwise I would have to wait on your replies, and could publish but one article every three or four weeks.

You may think I am rather tedious, and much of the argument not necessary.—Were all minds as enlightened as your own, this might be the case; for many of my positions would be taken for granted—being self-evident to them. But this is not the case, and I must explain these things to them, and form a connected chain from beginning to end. I must show the connection, harmony and perfection of the great creative plan—for the more perfect this plan is shown to be, the less reasonable will appear the break at man, for which you will contend.

I will at the outset of my general argument, and as a guiding principle in its elucidation, lay down a proposition, or class of general principles for consideration, which I think you will receive as being true, and which will also be received as such, by all classes of readers who have examined with care the creative works of the great Jehovah. To those who have not so examined the Creator's works, it will devolve upon me, the affirmative upon this question, to explain and prove these principles, so they may be comprehended and understood by them.

The proposition I would lay down is this: The whole creation of God has been, and now is being, wrought out after a definite and well matured plan; that God com-

prehended and founded this plan in all its magnitude and minutia, and foreknew all things concerning it, from the beginning; that in this creation God had an eternal purpose to fulfill, and that this purpose, as far as man is able to learn, extending from the smallest atom of earth to the final destiny of man, was the Creator's glory, and the greatest good of man; and finally, as God's provisions have been for the greatest good of all the now existing classes, genera, and species of the brute creation, as it has also been of the long since extinct races of the same, and of whose prior existence we have only become acquainted by their fossilized remains being found locked up in the stony sepulchres of nature, where they have lain ages upon ages, awaiting the progress of man's development, when he, with the key of geology, would open their rocky tombs, and in their resurrection read wondrous pages in the history of earth and the progressive plan of creation's work, we can find no cause, either in nature or reason, why God's plans are not the same towards man, the greatest and the best of His works.

Now, my dear sir, as stated by yourself, and in which statement I fully coincide, that this discussion will be for the benefit of the "common mass of readers," more than for that of those versed in theology and the various sciences, it should be discussed in a plain and common sense manner.

In a controversy of the importance of this, nothing should be taken for granted which is not fully understood by the reader, therefore it will devolve upon us to establish such points by good and sufficient evidence.

In pursuance of the principles of the above proposition, I will commence this subject at its beginning, and deal with first principles throughout. I shall also contend for the perfect and inimitable character of God. This character I shall prove from His works, ascertain the nature of the cause by its effects. In the delineation of God's character and attributes, I shall be-

gin at the fountain head and come down the stream of time until it empties itself into the boundless ocean of eternity, noting upon its banks the "footprints" of its great creative Cause, and read the records placed there by the finger of the "Great I Am," and from their interpretation, to learn what they teach of God and of man—learn what position he occupies in the great creative plan, and to his Creator, his progress here, and his final destiny.

Of created things, all that was, now is, or ever will be, hath a beginning, but the Eternal God had none.

The Bible tells us God had no beginning—is self-existent—has always been, and forever will be. Nature can trace him up the stream of time to where He first manifests Himself in His works, but no further—all beyond this is dark, and the long eternity of time that has passed, and lies beyond the commencement of His works, the fertile imagination of man may in vain try to fathom. Man may conceive of the duration of a thing, though it may have existed for millions upon millions of years; but of an object or being that hath no beginning, he can form no adequate idea. Of the duration of time since the world began, man can form an idea, but of the infinity of time—without beginning or ending—he can form none. In admiration of such a Being as the Creator of all that exists, man may, in wonder and exalted adoration, say, Oh! infinity, infinity, where'er I look, the effects of infinity meet my ravished gaze! Infinite in power, wisdom, goodness and love, and in this infinity, "Thou hast made the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is."

To prove the character I have ascribed to the Deity, I must produce the evidence from His works. That these works are formed after a definite plan, a plan known in all its details to the great Architect, I believe none will deny. I would be regarded as a very unwise man, were I going to build a house, and knew not what kind of a house I wanted, or knew not whether it would answer my purpose when it was

done. An architect, when he builds a house, must have the plan first, and which he must understand in all its details—must know just how the house will be, the number and size of the rooms; whether it is a two story house, or no upper story at all; whether there is to be a cellar or not, &c., &c., before he can build the house upon correct principles, and without mistakes, tearings down and building up again. If men perform their work after a definite plan, how much more has the intricate and complicated machinery of nature, been formed after a plan without an error—a plan perfect in all respects, and executed in infinite wisdom and power.

After these preliminaries, which I thought necessary to fully open the subject, and prepare the way for my direct argument, I will at once proceed to the discussion of these works. I will, in the first place, confine my attention to the Creator's works as displayed in the formation and inhabiting of the earth. I will condense my remarks as soon as possible, and at the same time maintain an unbroken chain of argument.

There was a time in the long past ages of the eternity of time, when the earth was not—the place of its orbit around the sun was vacant. But the time came when it was to be—that time in the great creative plan, when the earth was to be commenced, had arrived, and the fiat of the Creator went forth, and the earth began to be.—The most probable theory of the earth's first State, and the theory having the most facts in its support, is, that the earth at that period was a ball of liquid fire, in substance the same as the fiery matter erupted from the volcanoes of the present day.—This ball of liquid fire contained all the elements to be used in the inorganic structure of the earth, that is, the rocks, soil, minerals, or what we call the ground or earth, has been formed from this mass, under the operation of certain physical laws established for the government matter.—The time of this *beginning*, neither nature or the Bible informs us of. But it began,

progressed from age, and still exists. Geology gives us an approximate answer as to how long the earth has existed. It tells us that what are called the fossiliferous strata—containing the remains of animals and vegetables—comprising seven and a half miles in depth of the earth's surface, were 52,000,000 of years in forming. How long the earth had existed before their formation began, we can of course but guess, as there is no evidence anywhere to tell us. But there came a time when this huge ball of fire began to cool, by its heat being thrown off into the surrounding air. This process was continued age after age—how long none can tell—until a crust, called the primitive rocks, was formed. This crust was frequently broken up, and floated as islands upon its surface—the interstices being again filled up. This process of cooling continued, and a solid wall of primary rocks was formed around the globe, imprisoning the liquid fire, where a great portion of it remains to this day, now and then breaking forth from various volcanoes. The earth is 8000 miles in diameter, and about 7,900 of this is yet liquid fire, for the crust of the earth is but about 50 miles thick. After the primary rocks were formed as above stated, the formation of water took place, in which the Silurian rocks were formed, and with them the lowest class of animal life, the Mollusk, which sported in all the enjoyment of life in the warm shallow waters of this far-distant Silurian age, when the earth could support no higher class of life. In my next article I will try and run up the geological chain to man.

Yours truly,

G. L. PURDY.

OVER THE RIVER.

BY HENRIETTA G. LEGGETT.

Over the river—Death's dark, rolling river—
 We shudder—we fear
 To launch on these waters—these turbulent waters,
 Chilly and drear.
 We come to the margin, but shrink from the billows,
 Fearing to lave
 Our feet in the dark rapid stream that sweeps onward,
 Cold as the grave.

Over the river—we all must pass over, -
 Seeking a home;
 From that far country, unfading, unchanging,
 Never to roam.
 On the cold banks, Mercy'll spread her fair pinions,
 Pleading no more;
 But soaring away, with her farewell dirge ringing,
 That we must pass o'er.

Over the river—are we thinking with pleasure
 Of the dark night,
 When the unseen, with its long-hidden treasures,
 Bursts on our sight?
 On the rough banks have we beacon lights gleaming,
 Lighthouse of love,
 Illumined by faith's torches, with halo rays beaming,
 Pointing above?

Over the river—have we a sure passport,
 That may not fail?
 Is hope, as an anchor, truthfully, steadfastly,
 Cast in the vale?
 Eternity, knowing no changing, no ending,
 For time will be o'er;
 Wisdom Divine, may we ever be tending
 To that heavenly shore.

Over the river—we'll seek a true Pilot;
 One who has passed
 Cross the dark stream while the greatest commotion
 Reign'd till the last.
 We'll lean on his bosom, he'll calm the wild billows,
 And light up the way,
 And bear us triumphant, where bowers are blooming,
 That never decay.

H. T. ANDERSON'S REPLY TO WM. H. WYCKOFF.

NO. XII.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., July 5, 1863.

BRO. FRANKLIN:

Criticism No. X. lies before me. Our critic objects to the translation of the Greek word *presbutes*. I have—"For I am old, and my wife is advanced in years." The Revision has—"I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years." Our critic asks, "What is the difference between being "old" and advanced in years?" I know not that there is any. Nor can I perceive that any truth is lost by my version. For as we all know that Zachariah was a *man*, and not a *woman*, I did not think it necessary to use the word *man*, thinking that when a man says, "I am old," he means the same as if he should say, "I am an old man." When, however, *old men* are distinguished from *old women*, then we think it due to Greek and English so to translate, as in Titus, ii: 2, 3, "That the aged men be sober." "The aged women likewise," etc. In Philemon, 9, we would say, as the Common Version, "Paul the aged," not "Paul an old man."

If I may express an opinion, I would say, that the above has more the appearance of fault-finding than criticism, and our critic could certainly find something more profitable in which to spend his time.

The next is the translation of an aorist tense. I have—"I am sent." The Revision has, "I was sent." In reply to the remarks of our critic, I have only to cite a passage from the Bible Union Gospels, in which an aorist is translated as a present. In Matt. iii: 17, we read thus:—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The word *eudokesa* is in the aorist tense, and yet translated as a present. If now, the Revisers are right in this translation, then our critic writes in vain. If they

are right, I am. He writes, however, without regard to consequences. He has not looked into his own book, so as to know what it contains. This is the fourth instance in which he has been condemned by his own book.

But really, our brother Wyckoff has not considered the fact, that in English we have no aorist tense. How, then, can he translate at all? He will give us in English an imperfect for an aorist in Greek. Our imperfect is not equal to a Greek aorist. Now, in the absence of an aorist tense in English, I lay down this as a truth undeniable, that no one, who would translate literally, can translate at all; because the English has no tense that exactly answers to, or is equal to an aorist. If our critic would translate literally, he must make a tense corresponding to the Greek aorist, or not translate at all. Here is a difficulty from which he can not escape. The Revisers and our critic are snared continually by the aorist tense, and they have made some of the most unhappy and unfortunate errors, all of which are obvious to every one who has studied the ways of God. I ask, then, what can be done, when our language has no tense that is equal to a Greek aorist? The literal translator violates the laws of both Greek and English. The student of the Oracles of God learns how to understand the ways of God, and he is governed by the known laws of the relation of thought, and translates accordingly. There is a meaning which words derive from their relation to other words, and from their contextual position. There is a sense which tenses express, known to the student by a diligent comparison of all the circumstances of time, and of the relation of one fact to another. Our Revisers have not studied the tenses, and consequently have erred in many instances. Let us for one moment consider the instance in hand:—"I am sent." Take the fact into consideration that our language has no aorist tense. Gabriel stood before Zachariah.—God had sent him. God did send him. These two forms of expression are different in tense. They both express the fact of

Gabriel's being sent; but whether we use the one or the other, depends on our particular view of the case. "I am sent," and "I was sent" are different forms; each expresses the fact of Gabriel's being sent.—But how shall we determine with certainty with respect to the two? Let it be thus—Gabriel certainly did not intend to say to Zachariah,—"I was sent," and thus state a fact that took place in the past. For he was then standing before Zachariah, and the fact in the past, that is, the particular time at which that fact took place, was a matter unnecessary to be expressed. The past fact of sending was known and certain, from the present fact of his standing before Zachariah. Hence, in English we say, "I am sent," or "I have been sent," to denote the present fact connected with one past. For this very reason, the aorist is often translated as a present or a perfect, because it expresses time *indefinitely*, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" is correct; because God was not, in some time past only, well pleased; but had always been, and was then, well pleased.

An aorist may then be translated by a perfect, a pluperfect, an imperfect, a present; and the translation will always depend on the relation of time and fact, the contextual relation.

This I write for the readers of the "Review" generally, that they may know how I deal with this tense. I do not write for our critic, or for his Revisers; for what they have written, they have written. There can be no change with them. Our critic speaks of substituting *am* for *was*. What can he mean by *substituting*? Surely he cannot refer to the Greek; for *am* and *was* are English words. His thoughts are bewildered. I have *substituted* no one word for another. I have translated the thought from Greek to English. I fear he is still troubled with the thought, that I have intended to improve the Bible Union Gospels. He must be at ease on this point. I knew nothing of those gospels when I was translating. I shall never try to improve upon them.

On the expression, "These glad tidings," I remark, that I have not used the word *tidings* in my version, because it is now not much used among the people. We do not say, "these news," but "this news."

Whether my translation of Gabriel's words to Zachariah is correct or not, let the following remarks determine. I am sorry that our critic compels me to say what I now say. It is true that fruits ripen in their *season*; but Gabriel's words were fulfilled in their *proper time*. There are *seasons* in which fruits ripen, but no particular seasons in which children are born. There is a *proper time*, however, in which, or at which birth takes place; and this happens to be the very thought of Luke. "My words, which shall be fulfilled in their proper time." Let the reader take the facts mentioned throughout the chapter, and he will see the truth of my rendering.

The words "were wondering," to which our critic objects, are sanctioned by our Revisers, in their translation of the imperfect *dieilogidzeto*, in verse 29 of this first of Luke, thus—"was considering." This is the progressive form, and shows that the action was continued. It is strange that our critic cannot see a little distance before him. He seems so intent on finding fault, that nothing can hinder his onward progress. He thinks he has found some small matter in which I am wrong, and he applies the lash, not knowing that it falls on his own Revisers. This is the fifth instance in which his own book condemns him. If I may express another opinion, I would say that he would do well to study his own book before he writes more. We have yet to notice several instances in which his book condemns his criticisms.

I had not intended to notice the present effusion of our critic further at present; but on opening the gospels of the Union, this passage met my eye: "Now the feast of unleavened bread *was drawing near*." I am condemned for making use of the progressive form, "were wondering," and yet here is a second instance from the book of the Union. Two instances are enough at pres-

ent. Our critic should read more closely than he does. If his book is right, so is my translation in this instance. And strange to tell, in the very next verse, Luke xxii: 2, there is another progressive form for the common imperfect: "The Scribes *were seeking* how they might kill him." I italicise the forms.

In the third verse of this chapter, the Revisers tell us that Satan was of the number of the twelve. Hear them. "And Satan entered into Judas Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve." The participle *being* must belong to the subject of the verb entered, and the subject of this verb is Satan. Again, in the 10th of the same chapter, we have this bad English: "Follow him into the house where he enters in." Well done, you men of the Revision! The house where he enters in!!! Again, in verse 17, "And having received a cup, he gave thanks and said." Again, in verse 20: "And the cup in like manner after supper." What will be the astonishment of the reader when I tell him that the word which our Revisers have here translated by the word "Supper" is an aorist infinitive! Now, let our critic take heed how he talks of translating aorists.

In the 52nd verse we find a barbarism—"were come;" and in verse 54 a singular expression—"And Peter followed afar off." Singular following indeed! In xxiii: 6, "When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked if the man is a Galilean." The Common Version has it thus—"Whether the man were a Galilean." Much better English; but even it may be made better. In verse 9, we find this—"And he questioned him in many words." I know not what this means. The Revisers will publish a book of notes to explain their bad English, or we shall be unable to understand them. In verse 12:—"For before they were at enmity between themselves." This is unintelligible English. We must have a guide-book—a key to these Revised Gospels of the Bible Union. In verse 34, we read thus:—"And they divided his garments, casting lots."—The sense is entirely lost to the reader in

this. They have translated a participle by a finite verb—"they divided;" and an aorist tense they have translated by a participle, "casting." "They parted his raiment and cast lots" is the Common Version, which can be made much better. But enough.

Yours truly, H. T. ANDERSON.

JOHN WESLEY.

John Wesley was born in the town of Epworth, Lincolnshire, England, June 17, 1703. His father was a clergyman of the National Church, and is represented by his biographer as having been a man of great piety, learning, and talents. His mother—the daughter of a clergyman of the same Church—was a highly accomplished lady, and is said to have been a most beautiful woman. She gave birth to nineteen children. Eight of them died in infancy—or at least while quite young. Of the remaining eleven there were three sons and eight daughters. A singular and awful fatality seemed to hang over the Wesley family—or the majority of them—as it respects the marital relation. Most of these daughters—all of them finely educated, virtuous, and good women—had the great misfortune to get brutes and scoundrels for husbands. One of them married a preacher by the name of Hall, and after living with her till she bore him ten children, and treating her with uniform unkindness, not to say cruelty, during a period of many years, he finally left her, and died a miserable wretch.

Hetty Wesley, another daughter, and the flower of the family, coerced by her *pious* father aforesaid, married a low, ignorant fellow named Wright, because he had money. He soon grew weary of her intellect

and beauty, and betook himself to the more congenial companionship of pimps and drunkards. It has been truly said of her married life that, "it began in despair, continued a living death, and ended with a broken heart."

Susanna, another sister, married a morose gouty tyrant named Ellison. After enduring with him for many years a purgatorial existence, human nature could hold out no longer, and she left him. So much for some of the daughters, and their conugal misfortunes; that of John, the subject of this sketch, will be noticed at the proper time. The three sons—named here according to seniority—were Samuel, John, and Charles—all clergymen of the Church of England. They were distinguished for poetical gifts and scholarly attainments: all graduates of England's famed University.

One night, while Wesley was a little child, the house in which they lived took fire. The flames spread so rapidly the family had barely time to escape. The father counted his children by the light of the conflagration. John was missing. Presently he appeared at an upper window, through which the smoke issued in thick volumes. The flames were ready to lick his cheeks. No one dared venture in. It was indeed a critical moment. What was to be done? One tall man stood on the shoulders of another tall man, and extended his arms. John threw himself into them, and was safely borne to his overjoyed mother. In after life his portrait was published with this text engraved under it: "Is not this a brand plucked from the burning?"

Their new house, built on the site of the one destroyed by fire, was haunted by ghosts. Horrid groans, loud knocks, doors opening and shutting without a visible hand—such were some of the *spiritual* exercises of these disembodied visitors. The old gentleman remained skeptical until one night loud knocks on the headboard of his bedstead converted him to the faith and at least quashed his doubts. After this he

was taken in invisible hands, used very roughly, and jammed up against the wall.—From this circumstance originated John Wesley's ideas of *mysterious influences!!!* He continued superstitious, if not *all* his life, at least many, many years, as we can abundantly show. While attending college at Oxford, a poor girl came to his room one day and asked alms. He had nothing to give; but afterward, his eye falling on a shilling picture which he had purchased, he tormented himself with the monstrous idea that it was the price of her blood!—He soon became the leading spirit of the Holy Club—a band of sanctified young men, so called by their irreverent companions.—Wesley, however, adopted the name. Afterwards they were, by the same wicked young collegians, called Methodists. Wesley readily adopted the name! Had they chanced to call them devils, it would to-day be called the Devil's Episcopal Church. A distinguished Methodist writer truly says: "To say nothing of good taste, it was the worst policy in the world to adopt it. It was a term of contempt, meant to disgrace the religious zeal of those to whom it was applied, and no one can deny that it has answered its purpose. Names have an influence for good or ill. If the Christians at Antioch had been called *Swaddlers*, as the Methodists were in Ireland, the odious term would hardly have a place in Luke's history." Yes it would; because it would have been the name given by the Holy Spirit, and if that *name* pleased God, I would as soon be called a Swaddler, or a Methodist, as a Christian. But God had just as much to with making Swaddlers as Methodists. He never had anything to do with either *as such*.

The author above quoted continues: *Methodist*, with all its outlandish derivatives, has been a drag on the Wesleyan reformation since the day it was given. It is conceding too much to the Devil to allow him to name a great religious movement."

Shortly after Wesley was admitted to clerical "orders," in the Established Church,

he sailed for Georgia, United States, as a missionary to the Indians.

True to his papal ideas of punishing the body for the good of the soul, during a voyage of one hundred and twelve days he ate nothing but sea-biscuit and rice. While in Georgia he lived a great portion of his time, from choice, on bread and water. As a matter of course, with such notions of penance as he had, taken together with the austerity of the life he led, the character of his preaching would be greatly influenced. Consequently his sermons were dry, morose, and sour. Said a gentleman to him one day: "Why, if this is Christianity, a Christian must have more courage than Alexander the Great."

The result of his well-meant missionary operations on this continent proved a total failure. He shook the dust from his feet as a testimony against them and determined to return to England. At this juncture he got into an unpleasant difficulty with a young lady. He repulsed her from the "sacrament," a lawsuit was entered against him, and damages were laid at one thousand pounds.

Six times he appeared in court to answer, and as often was the case deferred. Believing this was done to vex and hinder him, he posted a notice on the public square of Savannah setting forth that he would embark on a certain day. The day arrived, and Wesley was permitted to depart in peace. So ended his labors in Georgia. It is but fair to say, however, that the friends of this lady claimed that Wesley loved her, proposed marriage, was rejected, and vented his spite by excluding her from the Lord's Supper. As a faithful chronicler, we have given both sides, and our readers must form their own conclusions. The most astounding discovery that Wesley made by his voyage to America was, *that he himself was not a Christian!* Here are his identical words, faithfully copied from his published journal: "I went to America to convert the Indians; but oh! who shall convert me? who is he that will deliver me from this evil heart of unbelief?

I have a fair summer religion. I can talk well; nay, and believe myself while no danger is near; but let death look me in the face, and my spirit is troubled." We would like to transcribe the whole passage, but it is too long. The gist of it, however, amounts to this: He was on the ocean—a storm arose he became alarmed for his personal safety—and concluded himself no Christian! The closing paragraph reads thus: "This, then, have I learned in the ends of the earth—that I am fallen short of the glory of God; that my whole heart is corrupt and abominable, and consequently my whole life; that alienated as I am from the life of God, I am a child of wrath, an heir of hell."—We offer no comment on this—but *when* and *how* was he "converted?"—he means, pardoned. Let us condense from his writings. Shortly after he landed in England, he went one night to a house in Aldersgate street, London, where it appears there was some sort of social religious meeting. Some person was reading *Luther's Preface to the Galatians*, and *while listening to this* Wesley says: "God strangely warmed my heart."—Now, this was three months *after* he arrived in England; let us see how it corresponds with extracts from his diary during his voyage.

We have no difficulty in showing that he *never* understood the subject of regeneration, and in making out a clear case of Wesley *versus* Wesley.

He first states, the reader will remember, that his whole heart was corrupt and abominable; that he was a child of wrath and an heir of hell. Read the following, bearing in mind that it *antedates* the meeting in Aldersgate Street about *four months*:

"Dec. 14, 1737.—I read public prayers, and was *much refreshed* with the glorious promise in Psalm lxxii, and Isaiah xl."

"Dec. 28, 1837.—Finding my apprehensions increase, I cried earnestly for help; *and it pleased God in a moment to restore peace to my soul.*"

"Jan. 13, 1738.—We had a thorough storm. The sea broke over the ship con-

tinually. I was at first afraid; but I cried to God, and was strengthened. Before ten I lay down, *I bless God, without fear.*" If God will deal thus with a man whose "whole heart is corrupt and abominable; a child of wrath, an heir of hell," what would He not do with a *good* man—a Christian? But his mother, who had more sense, but not much better knowledge of the Living Oracles than himself, wrote thus concerning his *strange heart-warming*: "You say that till within a few months you had no spiritual life, nor any justifying faith. Now this is as if a man should affirm he was not alive in his infancy because when an infant he did not know he was alive. All, then, that I can gather from your letter is, that till a little while ago you were not so well satisfied of your *being a Christian as you are now*. I heartily rejoice that you have now attained to a strong and lively hope in God's mercy through Christ; not that I can think you were totally without saving faith before; *but it is one thing to have faith, and another to be sensible we have it.*" The italics are the present writer's. There's theology for you! Let our teachers and scribes attend!

Among other things, Wesley taught what he called the "Doctrine of Christian Perfection;" and verily, this has been a bone of contention among his followers. But that he has been greatly misunderstood on this question, the writer has no doubt; and, were he now living, he would repudiate with scorn and contempt the insane ravings of such persons as Ex-Bishop Hamline, Rev. James Caughey, Mrs. Palmer, and others, on the doctrine of "Sanctification."

Another of his dogmas was, "The abstract influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion." He held it to be such a testimony of the Holy Spirit as leaves an impression or consciousness that a man is pardoned and accepted of God. And this consciousness, he contended, is always *antecedent* to the religious affections of love, joy, peace, etc. While, on the other hand, the most distinguished of American Meth-

odist Bishops—the late Rev. Elijah Hedding, D. D.,—has left it on record that he was converted some weeks *before* he received the Spirit's witness!!!

Here the experience of the Bishop stands diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the founder! And yet, this very people have the hardihood—when speaking with reference to the Church of Christ—to talk about "all sorts of doctrines by all sorts of men!"

Suppose two *Christian* preachers should differ as widely as some of the "essentials;" when would we hear the last of it? But now comes the strangest part of this "eventful history." Wesley, after a while, *denied* the necessity of such evidence of the Spirit as he had before contended for? In the year of our Lord 1768—just thirty years after the *heart-warming* operation—in a letter to Dr. Rutherford, he says: "I have not, *for many years, thought a consciousness of acceptance to be essential to justifying faith.*" The italics only are the writer's.

Here's more work for the doctors of divinity! Now let them cry, havoc! and let slip the dogs of war!

Added to his unsettled opinions concerning the regeneration of the soul, he was very superstitious—as we have elsewhere intimated. Among many other foolish things, he was guilty of the great folly of opening the Bible and letting the first text of Scripture that met his eye decide the most important questions of duty! This is almost incredible, but still it is a fact.—Whitefield wrote him, urging him to come to Bristol. He submitted the question to the decision of the chance text.—The result is thus stated in his own writing: "I was not at all forward to go, and perhaps a little less the inclined to it because of the remarkable Scriptures which offered as often as I inquired, touching the consequence (probably permitted for the trial of our faith): 'Get thee up into this mountain, and die in the mount whither thou goest up, and be gathered to thy people.' Deut. xxxii: 49, 50. 'And the chil-

children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days.' Deut. xxxiv: 8. 'I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake,' Acts, ix: 16. 'And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him,' Acts viii: 2."

These oracles didn't talk to suit him; and not being quite ready to brave the broilings and roastings of inquisitorial fires, he resolved to lay the whole matter before the "society" in London. Charles Wesley was present at this game of holy dominoes, and vehemently objected to John's exposing himself to the unbridled fury of a Bristol mob. Recourse was had to the Bible, when Charles was squelched with this text: "Son of man, behold I take from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke." The rest of the persons present were divided in opinion, when finally they determined to settle the question by lot. The lot told John that he must go. Again the Scriptures were opened to ascertain whether or not the decision of the lot would be confirmed by the chance text. The result is thus recorded by John Wesley: "When wicked men have slain a righteous person in his own house upon his bed, shall I not now require his blood at your hands?" 2 Sam. iv: 11. "And Ahaz slept with his fathers, and they buried him in the city, even in Jerusalem." 2 Chron. xxviii: 27. Things looked far from favorable. A bloody death was clearly indicated. But Wesley's heroic soul was now fully aroused; he went to Bristol, and died—just fifty-one years, eleven months, and twenty-six days after!

Like many of his sisters, he was unfortunate in his selection of a life-partner.—To say nothing of the Georgia affair, after he returned to England he fell in love with a most charming and accomplished lady; but it seems Charles Wesley was opposed to the match, and it was therefore broken. At the age of forty-eight he married a buxom widow; they lived together twenty years, and then she left him.

Finding himself in the unenviable position of a "grass-widower," he went to his

inevitable Journal and made this entry in the Latin language: "*Non eam reliqui: Non dimissi: Non revocabo.*" Which being done into plain English reads thus: "I have not left her; I have not dismissed her; I will not recall her."

Cool, wasn't it? We pass no opinion, but simply present the facts. (N. B.—People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.)

Added to his many other traits of real genius, he was a keen satirist. We give two specimens from his diary: "I preached in the court house to the *elite* of the town. So I took the plainest text; but I found that I was still out of their depth. *How hard it is to be shallow enough for people of quality!*" Another: The famous Beau Nash once understook to blackguard him in the presence of a congregation at Bath. "How do you know these things whereof you accuse me?" queried Wesley. "I judge from common report," answered Nash. "I dare not," replied Wesley, "judge of you by common report."

He died in London, March 2, 1791, being at the time of his death over eighty-eight years of age. Had he made the same effort to restore primitive Christianity to the world that he did to reform a corrupt State-Church, who could measure the beneficial results of his life? With all his errors of faith, and some of practice, he was, according to his light, unquestionably a good man. The mummeries of papal superstition dimmed his intellectual vision; the scholasticism of his own age dwarfed his spiritual powers and blunted his spiritual perceptions. Considering when, where, and how he started, he made a tremendous advance upon the moral status of the times in which he lived.

DAVID WALK,

Greencastle, Ind., July, 1863.

SYNOPSIS OF THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH IN DETROIT.

In a former article, I offered such remarks on the creed of the Church in the City of Detroit, as seemed pertinent and proper. I resume the subject, not for the purpose of criticising the "Synopsis," but to elucidate the great principle on which the brotherhood stand, and which, after years of meditation and reflection, appears to me to be the same as that on which the apostles founded the church, in the beginning.

The necessity for recurring often to the first principles of the gospel is manifest in the history of the Christian religion, as well as in the teachings of the apostles. The tendency of the human mind to abandon the safe and certain truths and examples of Divine Revelation, and to follow the guidance of fable, myth, tradition, popular opinion, and the varying and false lights of the speculative reason and ecclesiastical authority, is demonstrated by incontrovertible facts, under every Divine dispensation. The general prevalence of idolatry at the Christian era originated in this cause. Men were not satisfied with God's revelation of his character and order of moral government.—"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 incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Here the origin of idolatry is given in a few pregnant words. But the mischief did not end in intellectual blindness alone. The poison affected other powers, and the fearful result was a universal corruption of social life. "Wherefore God also gave them up to 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 worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator."—"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, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection implacable, unmerciful."

The picture is complete. The understanding darkened and the heart ruined, are the fearful price of apostasy from the revelations that God gave to man. Here is the result of exchanging faith for ingenious speculation—for substituting the wisdom of this world for the wisdom which is of God. The history of the ancient religions, and of manners and morals under them, is the history of man, no longer under the guidance and moral power of faith, but under the guidance and power of speculative thought.

If the Jews be taken as an example, their numerous lapses can be traced positively to the same fountain—relinquishing faith for reason. And the same moral phenomena followed elpse upon the darkening of their understanding with the empty and insidious philosophy of the natural reason—the almost total corruption of their morals and piety. If they made fires to Molock, grim monster smeared with human blood, they caused their own innocent children to pass through the fires; and there was no disgusting form of heathen degradation and pollution which they did not readily adopt, when once the Divine truth had been dislodged from their minds. The difficulty with which they withstood the example of idolatry, and the almost incessant solicitations of the imagination to guide the soul, is seen in their frequent apostasies, and in the perpetual admonitions and warnings of the prophets.

The publication of the Gospel was the clear rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in his beams. Jesus of Naza-

reth was the brightest glory of God, and the express image of his person. The Creator united himself to humanity, and now, the Divinity of the heaven of heavens was revealed through the forms of human thought, human customs, and human sympathy. While fallen creatures could not gaze upon the unveiled Divinity, those gracious scintillations of our own untroubled spirit were employed as fitting splendors through which the unclouded Godhead might pour an effulgent stream of truth upon the world. God was in the world as a man, and men knew it not. But through the very principle on which the human family had become idolaters, the Jews crucified the Savior of the world. But the Gospel was announced by inspired men—a system as simple as love, and the impulses of a generous and pure heart. One would have thought that now surely man will be satisfied, being in possession of unmixed truth, and obliged only by the law of love. But not so.

In the days of the apostles, amid the awful splendors of miraculous gifts and powers, the "mystery of iniquity inwardly worked." The seeds of the great apostasy were sown. For twelve hundred years—dreary years—the light and the power of Christianity have been obscured and thwarted by the active operation of the same causes which changed the glory of the incorruptible God into idols. Idolatry is but a human creed substituted for the word of God, and the *apostasia* announced by the apostle Paul, is nothing but a human creed, put in place of the gospel of Christ. Thus a common principle and cause underlies every form of religious error—every form of the grand apostasy of man from God in every age of the world. The ancient superstitions or idolatries, together with every form of error under the Christian name, and under every form of speculative thought, rest upon the same principle—a human creed or form of religion, adopted in place of simple faith in Divine truth. Here is the common fountain of religious corruptions. Countless streams have issued from this one fountain

—and these streams are, at every moment, penetrating the world. Error reaches every human mind—and there is no remedy for it, or protection against it, except the word of truth.

True, these human creeds or forms of religion differ from one another. The two extreme points of observation are the first form or system of idolatry, and the last human creed, produced under the peculiar modifying influences of the Christian Scriptures. The difference between these two outgrowths of human wisdom is unquestionably vast; but no greater than might reasonably be expected, when the circumstances are taken into consideration. But whatever the difference between idolatry or the ancient superstitions, and human formulas of Christian faith, they are the offsprings of the same parents, and common family features reveal the close and intimate degree of relationship between them.

The corruption of morals and manners under the Christian apostasy is in harmony with like causes in every age of the world. The Middle Ages are distinguished for nothing more than the absence of moral purity, in a religious point of view. Popery—a form of religion growing out of, and resting upon, the wisdom and authority of a human creed, could not, and cannot, produce fruits of piety and moral excellence. When unchecked by opposing truths, when left in quiet authority over society, it seems even to hasten a general corruption of manners. Human nature, under the control of Popery, runs a riotous course of licentiousness and vice. The facts of history clearly and unequivocally demonstrated these remarks. The reason has been already stated. The darkening of the understanding—the intellectual apostasy from Divine truth—the substitution of human reason for faith in the word of God—the dislodgement of truth from the intellect—issues in the corruption of the heart and the ruin of the virtue of society. Hence, the demoralization of society is always in proportion to the ignorance of the people concerning the disclosures of the Bible, and of the dogmas of

the speculative reason, adopted as religious truth. The character of these dogmas, also, must be understood as a modifying influence. That Popery is a human creed or system of religion, is a fact sufficient to account for its bad fruits. But the peculiar nature or character of this creed alone accounts for the more than usual evil effects it has produced, in comparison with other Christian creeds.

Protestantism, or the Protestant movement, is, in principle, a repudiation of human creeds, however signally men have failed to apply the principle in fact. The soul of the movement was the grand homage it offered to the word of God. As the life of animals and of vegetables frequently maintains itself under evil conditions, and overcomes destructive influences, till they pass away, so it has happened in the case of Protestantism. Its inner life consisted in profound religious faith and reverence of the Bible as the only authoritative standard of Christianity. And though outward circumstances forced upon the Protestant communities creeds, made by uninspired men, yet the life—the spiritual life of the entire movement fixed the *character* of those creeds, and rendered them of such a moral tendency as forever precluded the same results from them as Popery had produced. The evil effects of human creeds among Protestants are, therefore, of another class altogether, and differ essentially from those produced by the same generic cause among Romanists, in a different age and condition of the world.

Protestant creeds consist of intellectual abstractions, and favor the development of metaphysical thought and theories. The evils arising from them are plain, and easy of comprehension. They nourish a spirit of dogmatism, in contradistinction to the spirit of authority, which is the grand attribute of Romanism. Hence Protestantism splits—divides into innumerable sects or parties. Rome consolidates into one vast despotism. The abstract nature of the Protestant dogmas—develops an intellectual system of religion, and fills the

mind with pure abstractions, as objects of faith. These mental identities occupy the place the gospel ought really to occupy, and produce formalism, ritualism, mechanical grimaces, ceremonial ostentation; yet they are held in check, and modified perpetually by the deeper conception and life-principle of the sole authority and sufficiency of the holy Scriptures. The protestant movement has, therefore, greatly stimulated thought and free-inquiry. It has searched heaven and earth, developed science, prosecuted discovery, adorned the world with fine arts, patronized decorous ornaments, sought mechanical invention, and has labored with a distinct conception and purpose of rendering man's life more comfortable, more useful, and grander in all the elements of a splendid civilization. Yet it has secularized the faith as much as its fundamental principle would allow. It has substituted party spirit for the spirit of the gospel; secular organizations for the simple church of Christ; and brought in a system of sermonizing which is a mockery for Scriptural exposition and interpretation. Division, and its long train of bitter fruits, may be taken as the peculiar evil, in a moral point of view, of Protestant creeds.

The conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing analysis, is this: No human formula of faith can be substituted for the word of God without producing the most serious intellectual and moral evils. In other words, a human creed is necessarily a fountain of evil. No remedy exists against its bitter fruits. The subversion of them is, consequently, an object of benevolent and pious exertion.

Our brotherhood stand, not upon a human creed, not upon speculative deductions, but upon the divine teaching or doctrine of the Lord Jesus and the apostles. To us the Scriptures are profitable for doctrine, because they teach the salvation of God. The Bible is not an arsenal from whence the mere dialectician may draw his weapons. It is not a book of mottoes, of maxims, of aphorisms, of proverbs, of proof-texts, to be *improved* through speculative logic,

and twisted into the support of any and every species of abstract doctrines which issue from ambitious intellects. It is not a mere warming pan for genius—a stimulant to aid men of talent and learning to elaborate scientific systems of religious philosophy. It is not a book designed to aid men in becoming the author of metaphysical theories and the founders of dogmatic sects. But on the other hand, the Bible is a divine revelation. It teaches what God has done for man, and what man must do for himself. It teaches salvation from sin, and death, and the grave. It is a book of *facts*, of commandments, of promises, and of threatenings. There is no scientific theory in it. It reveals a plan of salvation; but that plan is not in a form of human science. The facts are given and proved. Their significance is clearly stated. Terms of acceptance with God are positively specified; promises are tendered; precepts instituted; threatenings denounced. The course the sinner must take in order to be saved, is pointed out and defined with more than human perspicuity and simplicity. How to be pardoned, or how one is to receive it, at the hand of God, is a fact of divine revelation; and plainer than it is, no man or angel can make it. The Christian life also, or the way a disciple must live in order to be saved eternally in heaven, is revealed with the transparency of the purest light. The way—the entire way of salvation, is traced as with a golden path of rays. It is visible to every sort and condition of intellectual capacity that is at all responsible. Jesus Christ can penetrate all hearts; and he is most kingly in those minds which are not able to manipulate him with philosophical instruments, but whose simple faith casts out fear, and unseals a love for Him that is deeper than the seas. Christ is the central fact of the Christian religion. He teaches the soul. It is under his guidance, instruction, leadership, that a man grows up into friendship with the living God, and is fitted for companionship with angels and glorified spirits in the mansions of love

and peace. It is by a humble, cordial, reverent reception of the inspired teaching that all else that is divine and good, follows, in daily outgrowth. To him who accepts Christ in his teaching, all promised divine gifts descend in faithful abundance. To believe and obey, is better than to argue and create formulas of abstract doctrine. To take Christianity as we find it in God's own book, is better than to re-cast it in the moulds of human wisdom. A divine Christ is better than a human pretended savior; and God's truth is better than logical deductions—than the stiff, lifeless, barren gospel formulas, such as we meet with in human creeds.

The Jews and the gentiles heard the gospel from the lips of the apostles. They believed it and obeyed it, and were saved. No human formulas were put between their minds and the gospel. The people believed what was preached to them. They received the truth, itself, in the love of it. The gospel, as preached by the apostles, is preserved in the pages of the New Testament, and he who believes it and obeys it, stands upon the same principle that the first disciples stood upon. A human creed or *synopsis* of the faith is no more required now, by saint or sinner, than it was in the days of the apostles. What saint and sinner then needed, saint and sinner now need—the gospel of the grace of God—the truth as it is in Jesus. No Christian, in apostolic times, ever dreamed of meeting any want, either of the church or of the world, by uninspired formulas of the faith. Such things belong to a later age—to ages when the love of intellectualizing Christianity into theoretic forms had triumphed over the simple faith of Christ, and the piety of the heart, nourished by divine truth. The apostolic church was distinguished for its faith in the divinely revealed gospel, and not for theologies, or formulas of doctrines, or by-laws—mechanical forces that operate on the mere surface and leave the heart unrepewed.

Our brethren have done well in recovering and reinaugurating the religion of

Christ upon its own unique principle—faith. They have fairly solved the problems of the sufficiency of the Scriptures alone to sustain and support the life they impart, without any of the supposed water of life sucked out of human creeds. That a religious community, with no other bond of union than the word of God—with no symbol of faith but the Christian revelation—with no definitions either of faith or practice, other than those furnished in the New Testament,—in a word, that a religious community committing themselves entirely and alone, to the holy Scriptures; possess every necessary or essential means to evangelize the world, and to “perfect holiness in the fear of God,” has been demonstrated, amply demonstrated, in the history of the brotherhood; so that it is no longer an experiment, but a developed fact, that human creeds are altogether useless, and the word of God sufficient for the church in every condition and emergency.

But the same old tendency to depart from faith, and to seek salvation at the altars of reason, is alive within us; and solicits us to follow in an easier way—or, at least, in a path sprinkled with richer scenery, and trod by greater and more popular crowds of adventurers. The novelty and excitement of newly discovered truth wears away. The conflict slackens, and the din of strife dies, and silence invites to meditation and reflection on the advantages of the contest which seems to have been finished. Depression ensues, and in contrast with unappreciated truth, and almost unrewarded exertion, stand the temples of error, adorned with the magic of art and beauty, thronged by crowds of gay unquestioning votaries, who lavish praise, and more substantial tokens of love, upon the presiding genius of the sacred desk. The heart yearns for ease and pleasant times, and for fame, that serves to rescue from oblivion a perishing life; and we begin to feel that the rigid severities of truth, after all, are not worthy the sharp and self-pruning contest that is necessary to maintain them. Why not compromise just so much

as gives offense to intellectualized and pious people? Why not secure for the truth the approbation of the orthodoxy? A formula of faith, drawn up with due discrimination, would show the doctrine in a *tangible* form; and though points of difference might still remain, yet, in essential matters, orthodox “views” could be reached without injury; and then, the way to honor is open, and her prizes within reach. The trial is great, and as time rolls on, it becomes greater and greater still. The influence of example is absolutely tremendous. The tone of society, like the law of gravitation searching every atom—penetrates our whole being. The voice of a nation—of Christendom, seems almost like the voice of God, and the soul bends before it as the grass before the wind. Here lies our danger—that, after having crossed the Red sea, and left the land of bondage and sorrow behind, we begin to sigh for the flesh pots of Egypt, and end by returning into slavery. Is it possible that the brethren can ever be brought to write creeds and subscribe them, and thus convert the religion of the Son of God into human speculation? I cannot answer this question satisfactorily to my own mind. That there is a tendency to this retrograde movement in the “synopsis,” I am sadly and sorrowfully forced to believe. For a time such a thing as the “Synopsis” may be used, not as a creed or test of fellowship, but as a pretty means to stop the mouths of gainsayers. Still no one who thinks, can fail to see that the prime motive is deep down in the heart. If it becomes “fashionable” for our pastors and congregations to write out and publish such documents for “the information of the public,” then it will not be long before we shall have quite an *interesting variety* of them, pointing to every region of speculation; nor much longer before they will become “prisons” for the children of God—cells, cold, and dreary, and comfortless in which to chain the immortals whom Christ had blessed with perfect liberty. In this court, nothing lies before us but endless strife, division, wars of words, angry de-

bates, confusion, shame and disgrace. The flood gate once hoisted, and who can withstand, or roll back the rush of waters?

But let us hope for better things. I am satisfied that our brethren are not yet ready for this movement. The act of the church in Detroit feels the way, and breaks the ice. It is a fitting occasion for the brethren to utter their sentiments and views. Perhaps it is best to have a thorough expression from the brethren, that we may know how and where we stand. I have freely expressed my own opinions and convictions, and trust that I have done it in the spirit of the Master. For myself I am free to say, that the Scriptures are amply sufficient to teach the public the faith and practice of the church of Christ.

J. W. Cox.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

ELDER LORD :

Dear Sir—In my last article, I had merely begun to describe the wondrous work of God—had but noticed the first link of animal life which forms a grand chain from the lowest order of life up to God Himself. I will now notice this chain, link by link, from the Monad up to Man. The whole record of the animal and vegetable creation, or the links of this grand chain are contained in the fossiliferous strata of the earth. These strata are no less than thirty-six in number, and represent as many distinct geological ages of the earth. They may be represented by so many volumes of history piled one upon another—the lowest containing a history of the lowest order of animal life, divided into many chapters, each chapter treating of a higher order of life than the preceding, until the volume is finished. The next volume treating of a still higher class of life, and one distinctly

marked from the first. The third of a still higher, and so on, to the last and topmost volume which treats of man; this volume treats of the human period, the last of the geological series. What volumes are yet to be added to this library of God's creative plan, time yet to come must answer.

Creation has been progressive. As the earth has undergone change after change, each change maturing it more and more, and fitting it for the sustenance of higher classes of life, as they have been added. Thus in the upper Silurian system, the surface of the earth was so changed from its previous condition, that it could support the lowest class of fish-life, or the first of the vertebrate class; and here we find the first traces of this class of life. Animal life has been divided into four great classes, the radiated, articulated, molluscan and vertebrated. In organization, they stand as here named. The lowest class is the radiated. This is the first class of life that had a being on the earth, and at one time of the Silurian age, were its sole monarchs. After this, when the condition of the earth could support it, the articulated superceded the radiated, and they in turn were the monarchs of the earth. The articulata were superceded by the molluscan, and this in turn by the vertebrata. Each appeared, the one after the other, as the earth progressed towards maturity and could support them. During the Silurian period, the earth was, in its most imperfect period, capable of supporting life, and in accordance with a wise plan, we find none but the lowest and most imperfect classes of life. These were the lowest classes then, and continue to be such at the present time, though the species of these classes are of a much higher degree of organization than those of the Silurian period.

We come down to the old red Sandstone, and find the fish the reigning dynasty, the species advancing in organization as we approach its closes. There we find master fish, in life and armor, both of offence and defence, such as the world has never since equalled. We come down to

the Carboniferous age, and find the second class of the great vertebrate division added, the reptile. This is a higher class of life than the fish, but why is it added now? Because the time has come when the condition of the progressive earth could support this class of life. This class superceded the fish, and were for untold ages the ruling monarchs of land and sea. [It was at this age that God began to provide for coming man, for it is from the monstrous vegetation of this period, that the coal we now burn was prepared.]

But we hasten on, and pass the monstrous forms of reptile life, such as never inhabited the earth before nor since, and reach the Oolitic period, where we find the third class of the vertebrate, the bird.—This class is higher in the scale than the reptile, and does not come upon the earth until that time in the great creative plan, when the earth was fitted for its reception. The dynasty of the fish and the reptile had served their purpose, and had to be superceded as such, but not to cease entirely, they still lived, but as subservient classes; and still live as such. The bird took their places as the reigning dynasty, but not in so eminent a degree as they had of the others. But they, in turn, were to be superceded by a still higher class, the fourth and last division of the vertebrate type of life—the Mammalia, to which man belongs.

The mammalia, or that class which suckles their young, is the highest class of animal life known to the naturalist, and is the last class found by the geologist. It cannot be a mere coincidence that, the geologist, beginning at the lowest rocks containing the remains of animal life finds, as he proceeds towards the surface, higher and still higher types, classes, genera, and species of animals. Nor can it be a mere coincidence, that of the geologist as he proceeds from remote time to that of recent date, should find these remains bearing the same classification as that embracing the living animals of to-day. These classifications are nearly the same—the radiata of to-day has its representative, but

in lower species, in the Silurian rocks.—The radiata of to-day is the lowest class of living animals, and was the first class introduced into creation. The same classification holds good with regard to the remaining three great classes, both living and extinct.

This evidence must be received—there is no getting around it. And what does it indicate? That creation has been formed after a definite and progressive plan; that classes of life have been introduced as the condition of the maturing earth could support them; that the lowest orders were introduced first, when the earth could support none higher; that these were succeeded by higher classes, the previous classes maintaining a minor position, while the last introduced class was the reigning dynasty of the period, as man is the ruling dynasty of the present period. Before man was introduced, the mammaliferous brute was the reigning dynasty, but as soon as man was called upon the stage, they lost their superiority, and retired to a minor position. The four dynasties of the vertebrate type of animal life, have succeeded each other in as regular order as the four great empires mentioned in "Rollin's Ancient History." The lower have always given place to the higher. The progress has always been toward the higher—there has been no retrograde movement. Who dare say, that there is anything here that God did not desire? Will any man be so presumptuous as to say that God has been thwarted in any of His plans, thus far in His creative plans? No man in his right senses will say that He was.

That nature, has been progressive, and that God had from the first foreseen and embraced man in this plan, we have but to refer to the brain of the animal world.—By what is man so distinguished from the animal world? Every one will say by his intelligence. Upon what depends this intelligence? The superiority of his brain, the organ of intelligence. Then note the progressive organization of this organ as we ascend the scale from the radiata to man.

Down in the radiate class, among the sponges and polypes, there is found no traces of a brain whatever. Among some of the classes below the fish, we find what is called the sensory ganglia. When we ascend to the fish, we find the brain in proportion to the spinal chord as 2 to 11; in the reptile, $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; in the bird, as 3 to $1\frac{1}{2}$; in the mammalia, as 4 to 1; and in godlike reasoning man, as 23 to 1. Thus the brain, proper, begins in the fish, the first class of the vertebrate type, and ultimates in man the last class of this type.

But let me direct your attention, for a moment, before closing the present article, to the present species of animal life upon the ever teeming globe. Here we find no less evidence of a definite plan in creation's works. From the microscopic animalcule, so small that the breadth of a human hair would cover a hundred of them, and millions of them could be contained in a cubic inch, to the largest whale, the interval of space between them would be as 1 to 34,560,000,000,000,000,000. This vast interval of space, almost incomprehensible to man, is filled up of every conceivable variety of animal life.

In the vegetable kingdom, the interval between the smallest and largest organism is not much less. These vast intervals are filled up with 144,000 species of animals, and 100,000 species of plants.

This is the order of God's creative plan, and it has been wrought out in almighty wisdom and power, and I would challenge the world to point out one single instance where God has failed, or made a mistake, or where anything is not as God designed it to be.

I will, before coming to my argument bearing directly upon man, adduce my argument in support of the character I have ascribed to the Creator of the universe, drawn from the architecture of the heavens. The earth with all the wonders so briefly noticed, is but a mere atom of the Deity's glorious works, is but as a single drop compared with the mighty ocean. The earth is but one of eight planets, of similar charac-

ters, revolving around our sun, all in perfect harmony, making their revolutions upon their own axis and around the sun, in exact time, to even a second—from swift flying Mercury, which makes its revolution in 87 days, moving at the rate of 100,000 miles an hour, to far distant Neptune, situated 2,854,000 of miles from the sun, whose motion is very slow, compared with that of Mercury, moving but about 10,000 miles an hour, and being 168 years in passing once around the sun. What almighty wisdom and power manifested in but one, and our own, solar system. But this is but one system among a myriad of others.—Then what infinite power must it require to form and govern the whole!

The fixed stars which bejewel the sky, and of which there has been calculated to be at least a million, are undoubtedly the suns of other systems of worlds, as our sun is of our system. Our sun, which is 800,000 miles in diameter, is thought to be a monstrous body of matter, but when compared with some of the fixed stars, dwindles into insignificance. I will make but one comparison: Dr. Herschel estimated the star Vega to be 33,440,000 miles in diameter, that is, 54,874 times larger than our sun.

These stars or suns are so remote from us that, our imagination, in even its most lofty flight, can scarce reach them. The distance of the nearest ones, we can hardly comprehend. Sirius is calculated, by Prof. Struve, to be ninety-three billions of miles from the earth—while the star named 61 Cygni is, according to Bessel, 63,070 billions of miles from us, a distance so vast that light, moving at the rate 192,000 miles per second, would be 10 years in passing over the interval. Great as this distance is, it is yet comparatively small when contrasted with some of the stars composing the Milky Way. Sir Wm. Herschel, in gaging this portion of the sky, found well-defined stars, so remote, that he believed it would take light not less than 120,000 years to reach the earth. He observed others still more remote, appearing as mere hazy

lights, and which he believed so remote that light would be 300,000 years in traversing the interval. Who will dare limit the wisdom and power capable of producing the above results?

When we remember that each star is a sun surrounded by a retinue of worlds, and probably each inhabited by intelligent creatures as we are, circling through the realms of boundless space, without jar or discord, each in its allotted place and at its appointed time, what must we say? Infinite in perfection, matchless in wisdom, and unlimited in power. We can come to no other conclusion. All is perfection and harmony. But will arise the natural inquiry, why, amidst this universal harmony, does the discord claimed to have originated in man, arise? Can this really be so? Are the inhabitants of those millions of other worlds, in the same fallen and depraved condition that is claimed for us.

Yours truly, G. L. PURDY.

LA PORTE, July 25, 1863.

DR. G. L. PURDY:

Dear Sir—Your reply to my letter of June 30th is before me. I tender you my thanks for your courtesy in acceding to my request. I am satisfied the change made by you in the phraseology will meet with the approbation of the common masses.—As you say, it is now free from ambiguity, and can be comprehended by all classes of readers—and contains, essentially, all that was embodied in the first proposition. I agree with you, that under this proposition, “you can bring *all* the facts in nature and the Bible, in affirmation of the proposition”—and “outside of these facts, there is no evidence.” I agree with you, that “we cannot believe a thing unless we have sufficient *reason* or *evidence* to prove it.” I agree with you, that the proof of anything

is nothing more than bringing forth the evidence to establish it.” Without proof there can be no belief. With you, I accept the definition of nature as given by Webster. That which you predicate of the Bible, I do not understand fully, but I think I shall understand you, as you proceed with your proof and argument. As you say, all irrelevant matter should be left out, and the argument limited to the subject matter in issue. I agree with you, that the subject is an important one, and involves momentous consequences—consequences pregnant with weal or woe; and the subject should be treated with that high consideration it deserves. Nothing should be taken for granted. The proof brought forth to sustain the affirmation must be clear, definite, unambiguous, unequivocal and logical. Like you, I shall endeavor to perform my part thoroughly and faithfully. I will try to meet every argument in kindness, in Christian courtesy and candor. I regret, as much as you do, that we are not privileged to call each other by the endearing name of “Christian brother”—*perhaps, the time may come when we can.*

Your remarks in reference to the doctrine of “partial salvation” are in point and relevant. Dates render nothing sacred with me. Ancient philosophers and academic sects taught us, that after death there is a reward for the good, and a punishment for the wicked. The Jews taught us, that God would reward the good with everlasting joy or pleasure, and punish the wicked with everlasting misery or “eternal punishment.” It was taught before and after the birth of Christ. It was taught at the birth of Christ, through his life time, at the time of his death, and it has been taught ever since. Age, nor date, nor time, nor distance cannot add sacredness to the doctrine with me. My respect for such a doctrine rests upon a more solid basis. If God authorized “His Son” and the twelve Apostles to preach “punishment for the wicked,” and “reward for the righteous,” then the doctrine will command my

respect. If it is taught in the word of God, the denial of it by the "neo-Platonists" of Germany, the "Moravian," the Shaker, the Dunkard, or the Unitarian of Europe or America, shakes not my confidence in its stability and soundness. If not taught in "the word of God," I could not accept it, if all the "philosophers of old"—the Jewish sanhedrim—the Christian councils—the Romish powers—the orthodox clergy and dissenting ministers should thunder it in my ears. I bow but to one "authority," and that authority, "Almighty God through his only Son." If future punishment has sometimes been disproportionately presented by "orthodox preachers," to warn and frighten the sinner into their system of human contrivance, you will not ask me to defend their wild imagery. If a "Pollock" in lively but wild fantastic imagery, eloquently described the "worm that never dies"—"hell with its rolling billows"—"the lake of fire"—the groans and misery of the damned; you will not ask me to defend him, I feel quite well assured, any farther than the Bible warrants a defence. In my proof, and in my defence, I will only bring forth from "nature" and the "Bible," such declarations as are in apposition with the proposition. I regret as much as you do, that the words "burned in a lake of fire and brimstone"—"burning hell"—"fires of hell," etc., were used by "untaught" men, to frighten, and that they are still used to frighten timid men and women into hysteria. I regret, as much as you do, that the rationale of Christianity should have been abandoned, and such a substitute for the "*gospel*" should have been introduced, to convince men of the claims of Jesus the Christ.—The teachers of the Christian religion are privileged to instruct others in the things taught by the "Savior" and his "Apostles." To their teaching we must be confined—no more—no less will do. Now, my "dear sir," you will not hold me to a defence of these whims, notions, and fancies of the orthodox preachers; I know you will not. I am assured, that *you will hold*

me to a strict account, for all things I may hereafter affirm.

I now enter the arena with you to vindicate the attributes and character of God—"the God" of nature and the Bible. Whatever characteristic or attribute he has manifested, I shall defend as right—I shall defend it as right, whether found in nature or in revelation. I shall maintain, to the best of my ability, that God is the author of all that he claims to be, and that his designs in reference to the salvation of man, have been carried out on his part, and he now awaits the action of man.

That this plan is perfect, I believe. That he will do all things well, I do not doubt. That he will do justly by himself and man, I do not fear—I do not question. That He stands as the Creator—the Ruler and the final Arbiter of matter and mind, I fully believe. That He *foreknows all his own work*," from the "beginning"—that He has made ample and suitable provisions for the finale, I have no doubt. That man was created, and surrounded by all the necessary relations to make him happy in his primitive state; but that, from some cause, he is not happy now, few will deny. That something is wrong therein, we agree.

That God has tendered to man suitable conditions by compliance with which he can release himself, if he will, from the present state, and reinstate himself in his primitive happiness, I firmly believe. I believe in such a God. I honor such a God. I revere him, and in the hands of such a God, I am willing to rest my final destiny, as "you say."

Permit me, "my dear sir," to call your attention to one point alluded to in your introductory epistle. It is in regard to your being a child of God and an heir of the eternal world. That man can be a "child of God"—that he can be an heir of the "eternal world," I agree with you.—But how? In the course of your argument, you will, of course, develop the whole matter, I do not doubt.

We now come to your conclusions. We must now part company. Against some of your affirmations, I am now obliged to enter

my solemn protest. It is my prayer, that our Heavenly Father may vouchsafe to you, health, strength, reason, and the rightful exercise of all the faculties of mind which you now possess, to maintain the truth. If you are in error, "my dear sir," I thank God through our Lord Jesus Christ, that I am privileged to entertain the fond hope, that you will yield to your convictions, and bow to the mandates of heaven's King. If I am in error, in entering my protest against your affirmations, I hope God will vouchsafe to me the rightful exercise of my reasoning powers, that I may discover it; and I can assure you I will act accordingly. With these assurances, I shall await your first argument, and the proof to sustain it.

Permit me to subscribe myself your friend and well-wisher.

M. N. LORD.

THE ALTAR.

With sacrifice the altar is inseparably connected. The blood that atones for sin must be shed upon it. Without the altar the victim dies in vain. It is a divine institution. It holds an important and essential position in the GREAT PLAN of pardon. It is that element of the Remedial System which sanctifies and gives efficiency to blood, as an atonement for sin, Matt. xxiii. 19. The significance of this fact is to be found in the character of the antitype, of which the altar and its victim were but types to indicate, in shadowy outlines, the nature of that victim whose blood should effectually atone for sin.

Symbolizing the divine nature of the Son of God, we can see how important and essential an element the altar was in a system of types and figures. We can understand why such a strange injunction was given in regard to its erection, that no device of man should fashion its form.

We can see why it was that before every act of worship in the patriarchal age, the altar was first erected. In every place where the patriarchs pitched their tents, an altar was raised. No victim was accepted unless offered on an altar. And as sacrifice and the altar were the only institutions or ordinances of worship during the patriarchal age, no act of worship to God was performed in the absence of these. All worship gathered around, and radiated from the altar, as all the elements of the great remedial system center in the divine nature of the son of Mary. Whether it be prayer, or praise, or thanksgiving, or supplication, all are offered on the altar of his divinity, which gives to them their acceptance with God. Hence, the various kinds of offerings, under the Jewish institution, were all offered on the altar. Under the Christian system, if Christ be not divine in his nature, he can be the foundation of no acceptable worship to God, for it is his divine nature that sanctifies the human, and gives efficacy to his blood as an atonement for sin. This is the office of the altar under all the dispensations of religion; and its inseparable connection with sacrifice is seen in the union of the divine and human natures of the sacrificial victim of the new covenant. His human life was the sacrifice (Isaiah liii. 10) which Christ offered for the sins of the world; and this life, like the lives of the victims offered by patriarchs and Jews, was only efficacious in atoning for sin when the blood was poured on the altar of his divinity. This is the only altar known to the Christian system, of which the sacrificial altar of the Jewish institution was the type, and from which it derived its importance and significance.

THE PRIESTHOOD.

In the earliest ages of the world the office of the priesthood was not so distinct, isolated and specialized as under the Jewish institution. The religion was that of the family, and not of a nation. The giving of

the law at Sinai was the first attempt to bring families together to constitute a nation, and govern them by one system of laws. Hence we have laws more specialized, and ceremonies in greater detail, all of which is as much an advance on the elements of the remedial system known among the patriarchs as a nation is an extension of, and an advance beyond, the family.

Under the patriarchal system, where every family constituted a distinct and separate assembly of worshippers, the father officiated at the altar, as priest. After him came his first born who enjoyed special and peculiar privileges above others of the same family. He inherited a double portion of the estate, and became successor to all the honors and dignities of the family. He became the priest of the family, and as such officiated in the family altar. If the father were a king or a prince, the first-born succeeded to these titles. But these states or conditions were accidents. They did not belong to every family. If kings and princes officiated at the altar as priests, they did so, not by virtue of their rank and distinction among men, but because of their relation in the family. The priesthood was limited in the family to the father, or first-born, or oldest son.

It was the duty of the priest to officiate at the altar. He took of the blood of the victim and sprinkled it round about and upon the altar, and burnt the sacrifice on the altar. He did this both for himself and for those who came with their sacrifices to the altar. He stood as an intercessor, by virtue of his office, between God and the sinner, presenting the blood of the victim to God in behalf of the transgressor. On account of his own sins he was required to offer sacrifices for himself. An intercessor should be without offence towards either party concerned in the sacrifice. It seems to have been necessary to the perfection of the system, that one other than the sinner should offer the blood of the victim. One has no power to intercede if he be as much involved in guilt as the sinner. Hence he must atone for his own

sins by sacrifice before he is prepared to intercede for another.

The ordination of the priesthood looked to man's condition under sin. He had sinned, and been denied the presence and favor of God, and on what ground could he hope to regain the lost favor? He had nothing in himself that could secure this again, and God could not, consistently with the dignity of His character, make overtures to man to return in the absence of any redress of the wrong he had committed. The penalty, that overhung his transgression was death; and if it were suspended, it was but for a time, that something might be interposed in man's behalf.

The institution of sacrifice could only do this in part, and the victims that were then ordained as sacrifices were only potent when presented by the constituted intercessor, and as they foreshadowed the voluntary interposition of another and a higher life in behalf of the sinner. God foreseeing the last, ordained the first. But who shall offer it? He who interposes is the only one competent to become the offerer of the sacrifice, as the priest. The sinner cannot become the priest because he has nothing to offer. The priest only has the offering, and he alone, therefore, can officiate at the altar.

During the time that these things were but rudimentary, and could be but rudimentary, their full development could not be presented. Their full development and perfection could only be seen when these rudimentary elements should be centered in one person. And foreseeing this fact and that there should appear in the course of time, one who would propose to become a mediator and intercessor between the parties, this fact was prophetically declared in the ordination of the priesthood. The priesthood, therefore, of the patriarchal and Jewish institutions derived its importance and significance wholly from this fact. It published the necessity of an intercessor, and the utter hopelessness of man without some one to appear in his behalf.

If intercession be the essential and pe-

cular function of the priesthood, as the apostle Paul seems to affirm, (Heb. vii. 23-6; ix. 23-6,) then we can see very clearly why the sinner cannot himself become the priest, under a system which shall completely redeem man from the guilt of sin; but that another person, not involved in sin, should present the compensation which shall deliver the man from sin and at the same time do no injustice to the character of God. If, under the patriarchal and Jewish institutions, men "who are encompassed with infirmity," were constituted priests, the fact only discovers still more the imperfection of these institutions. And the imperfection of this priesthood is discovered by this very fact, that men who are sinners themselves, were appointed to this office. It must be evident, then, that any one who shall become an intercessor in such a case as we have in the transgression of man, must not himself be involved in the difficulty. For if he be a sinner, he is in the same condition as those for whom he proposes to intercede; and if he can intercede with success, the sinner may have equal hope to do the same. If, therefore, the essential function of the priesthood be intercession, then it is perfectly evident that the priest must be without sin.

We have thus reached the same conclusion in regard to the priesthood that we find in regard to sacrifice: that the requirements of both demanded just such a victim and just such a priest as we have in the son of Mary and the son of God. But notwithstanding these essential requisites of the priesthood, the ordination of the priesthood of the patriarchal and Jewish ages was important and necessary, in order that man might be schooled to the contemplation and anticipation of just such a person as this institution was designed to foreshadow. It was important that he should be taught the nature and function of such an office by daily observance and reliance on it. It served to teach him how much he was indebted to the intercession of another for the favor and pardon of God. It taught him that sin prevented

him from approaching God in his own person, and that he could find acceptance with God only through an intercessor. It taught him that he must rely on another for the presentation of his petition for mercy and pardon, and that, if his prayer were answered, he owed the favor to the intercession of his friend. It made him realize that he was forever lost if some one did not intercede for him; and thus realizing his hopeless condition, his gratitude stirred the deepest emotions of his nature to adore the mercy of God, and to bless and praise the intercessor. Such a feeling as this was inspired in the hearts of patriarchs (Gen. xiv. 20) and Jews (Judges xvii. 13; Malachi ii. 7) for the person and character of priests. They revered them because they regarded them as their intercessors with God.

Intercession, then, being the fundamental idea of the priesthood, we observe at once the propriety, and the necessity, indeed, of the introduction of a third party who shall not be involved in sin, to offer the expiatory sacrifice for the transgressions of the sinner. The priesthood is seen from this fact to be an essential element of a remedial system, without which man cannot be saved from sin. It is deeply laid in the wants of man, and is urgently demanded by his hopeless condition. It is inseparably united with sacrifice and the altar; and so long as these continue to be essential to man's salvation from sin, so long will the priesthood be an essential element of a remedial system. H. C.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

LA PORTE, Aug. 19, 1863.

DR. G. L. PURDY :

Dear Sir :—Your communication in the Review of August 18th, 1863, now lies before me. The course you are pursuing, in opening the discussion, I approve. It will limit the discussion, and make it more interesting to the readers.

You are correct in your anticipations. I shall not enter upon the discussion until you have reached the main proposition, and fairly opened your argument. I will attentively watch your introductory, or prefatory remarks, as well as your minor propositions; and whenever I deem it imperatively necessary, will enter up my objection, in order that you may notice it hereafter. It is not my wish that these objections arrest your attention at this time—nor do they demand it; as the discussion upon the main issue will embrace them all.

Permit me, then, to notice a few items in the communication before me. An analysis of your general proposition, discovers the following special propositions :

1st. "That the 'whole creation' of God has been, and now is being, wrought out after a definite and well-matured plan."

Without any accompanying qualification, this proposition is excepted to.

2d. "That God comprehended and founded this plan in all its magnitude and minutiae, and foreknew all things concerning it from the beginning."

You will pardon me—but the truth demands that I should object to this proposition.

3d. That in this creation, God had an eternal purpose to fulfill, which purpose was—the Creator's glory and man's greatest good.

I have not quoted the proposition and deduction in full. A part of it I approve, and a part is objectionable. After delibe-

rate reflection, I have determined to object to the proposition—qualifiedly. Hereafter, it will claim, and it shall have my attention; and then I will state clearly my qualifications.

Finally, "As God's provisions have been, etc.; we can find no cause why God's plans are not the same towards man, the greatest and best of His works."

This proposition does not require any attention as it now stands. When developed, in proof and argument, we will give it our attention.

Your theory concerning the formation of the earth has been approved by many able and wise philosophers. It has met with that consideration at their hands which it deserves. The truthfulness of the theory has been questioned by great, wise and good men, and is still on debateable ground. I do not think the truth or falsity of it affects the main proposition or argument—therefore, it does not require my approval or disapproval.

You must not think that I enter my objections upon the record, merely for the sake of objecting to the several propositions—for I can assure you, that such objections are the result of years of serious and prayerful, as well as careful reflection. Nor will these objections ever be urged unless the necessity of the case demands it. Your own use of the proposition will determine the strength or force of the objections.

As I have already stated, these objections do not demand your attention now, and you will please pass them by, until you reach them in the development of the subject.

I have read your communication carefully, and I am pleased with its tone and style. Go on, "my dear sir," and "God speed you in the right." Permit me to subscribe myself
Yours,
M. N. LORD.

"HE DIED IN A MILITARY HOSPITAL IN TENNESSEE."

On the 4th of July, 1856, in the great hall of the old College building at Bethany, in the presence of a very large assemblage, the degree of A. B. was conferred on a class of *twenty seven* young men, by our venerable and venerated Bro. Campbell. The "Baccalaureate Address" delivered on that occasion closed thus—"Go, then, young gentlemen, into the broad field of the world, armed with the *sword of the Spirit* in your right hand; the *shield of faith* in your left. Place on your head the *helmet of hope*; on your breast the *breastplate of righteousness*; on your feet, the ready-made *gospel of peace*; and around your loins, the *girdle of sincerity and truth*. Thus armed, you will triumph over every form of infidelity—over every lust and passion that may war against the land. Thus panoplied, and thus wrestling against foes and snares without, and lusts and passions within, your lives will be honorable and useful; your death will be calm and triumphant; and a crown of glory that fadeth not away, will be awarded you by that righteous Judge, who has promised to honor them who honor him, and to award to every man according to his works."

For years we had been joint participants in all the labors, cares, pleasures, etc., connected with the varied scenes of College life. But on this day we made our valedictory to our President, Professors, and fellow-students, and listened to the parting advice of that noble old man of God, whose furrowed cheeks and whitened locks showed that he had neared the dividing line between time and eternity. In a few hours more the parting hand was given, and we separated, the most of us, to meet no more on earth.

Of that *twenty-seven*, *six* were associated together as editors of the *Stylus*, a little

monthly published by the three Societies. Of course, our intimacy was very close, and we felt a peculiar interest in one another. But we separated. Rolling prairies, broad rivers, cloud-capped mountains intervened, as we scattered over our vast, and then prosperous and happy land. We had our ideal life most gorgeously painted; bright visions of long life, happy days, flowery paths, and all that could make this world desirable, loomed up cheeringly and invitingly in our horizon. But alas! poor, frail, perishing man! How short and uncertain that life you so much covet! We had not been long away from Bethany when the sad intelligence came that W. A. Hall, of Tennessee, one of the most promising of the *six*, had yielded to the cold embrace of death,—had cut loose from his moorings here, and gone to that far-off spirit-land whither his Father and elder Brother had invited him. With that victim death seemed to be satisfied, and the remaining *five* lived on with various occupations and success. For the last year or more, I have lost sight of all of them, save Bro. John A. Brooks, until the other day, when I read this sentence: "I suppose Bro. Miller told you of the death of Bro. Pyron. *He died in a military hospital in Tennessee.*" Was it really so?—did my eyes actually see it? or was I under the influence of some frightful dream? Pyron, the generous, confiding, great-hearted, noble-souled Pyron, so dear to the hearts of all who knew him, "died in a military hospital in Tennessee."

While grim-visaged war, with all its horrid attendants, is overrunning our once peaceful and happy land; while thousands upon thousands of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons are pouring out their blood upon the gory field, where host encounters host in deadly conflict; while very many are suffering, groaning and agonizing in some hospital, just waiting their turn when death shall deliver them; even the tender heart becomes so accustomed to the frightful work, that we can read of all these dreadful scenes almost as unmoved as adamant. But, even now, when a dear friend

is stricken down under great suffering and trial, it reaches a sympathetic chord, and makes us feel that death is still clothed with many terrors.

How our dear brother became the inmate of a hospital, I know not. All I know is, "He died in a military hospital in Tennessee." 'Tis a short but sad story, indeed.—We think it a great trial to be sick for a few days when we are at home, have a mother, wife, sister, or some kind friend to watch over us and respond to our every want; but he, always so kind and sympathizing, must die away from home, no parents, brother, sister, friend to stand by and minister, but where to the fearfulness of the disease must be added the harrowing thoughts of former happiness contrasted with present suffering. But those days of agony and trial are over; he has gone a little in advance of us to that happy land where the "wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

To show the brightness of his intellect, the devotedness of his spirit, the goodness and tenderness of his heart, I will give a few extracts from some of his articles published in the *Stylus*. The first on the Immortality of the Soul—"The flowers will fade; the streams shall cease to seek the ocean; nations and empires shall be consumed by time as with a moth; the earth shall pass away; the moon shall fade with years, and the stars themselves shall be no more;

'All earthly shapes shall melt in gloom,
The sun himself must die;'

yea, all this beautiful universe shall sink into nothingness, but the soul shall remain unchanged; yes, the soul will live, and forever brighten in the ascending series of an infinite progression in spiritual grace and beauty, or quench its light in a night more fearful than the grave.

"Who would not prove this truth in his life, or would banish this hope from his heart? Let such an one, like Babylon's wicked king, crop the grass with the beast of the field, considering himself as beyond

the pity of his God—unworthy the sympathy and society of men. Why these tears—these heart-burthening sighs—these lurking thoughts of futurity—these secret springs of joy that transport our spiritual being from the trials and troubles of time to the reality and repose of eternity—if the soul be not immortal?

"The soul cannot die. We have seen the ivy stretching its spiral coils around the withered oak, clothing it with new aspects of beauty and emblems of life; so this hope, the prime restorer of our life, flows with its consolations like a noiseless stream, cheering the worn and weary heart and renewing the soul with immortal youth."

We will now give an extract from a most beautiful article on Flowers—"The poets say that the flowers which fade in autumn make the rainbows of spring. Will they never cease from making us happy, even when they have faded from the earth, yet will they shine the brighter in the bow of the heavens? When you went to the grave at evening, how sweetly did they smile above that loved form, and as those bitter tears fell, they caught them in their "trembling bosoms," bared to heaven like thine own heart, and with that earnest prayer did their sweet odors rise.

"Did you not think them a beautiful emblem of that pure spirit which now blooms in a land that knows no fading? Did you not charge these holy sentinels to guard that sacred spot, and scent with odors the revered ashes of the departed? In the stillness of that twilight, the mourner hears a gentle whisper, 'Plant flowers on my grave and water them with thy tears, if this should console thee, for my spirit is at rest.' A faded flower! what a subject for serious contemplation! How many of us have learned the lesson it teaches! Frail arm, weak, vain, perishing mortal, read thy own destiny in the printed chapters of its falling leaves. See in this the mournful caravan, with sable plumes and solemn pace, move to the newly-made grave, and hear the tearless clouds fall upon the faded form of youth and beauty. "If a man die, yet shall he

live.' Happy thought, bright hope, dearer to my soul than light to my eyes.

'In trailing clouds of glory does it come
From God—who is our home,'

bursting upon the soul like some hallowed dream, so tender, so pure, so divine, so glorious and inexpressibly grand, that death itself is but an awakening to the heavenly symphonies of that goodly land, where there is no fading, no sorrow, no death—where all their songs are songs of joy and peace, and the grave only a vestibule where the spirit clothes itself with the apparel of immortal youth, and forever blooms in the land of unfading flowers. Yes, fair flowers, we welcome you again. Farewell, ye snows, which dreamed so long on yonder hills—hills of Bethany!—heaven-reaching spires of our happy home!—who can forget them? You will stand pyramids in memory for long, long years to come—freed from the bondage of winter and clothed with the vesture of spring. Go, old winter, and seek colder hills than ours on which to stretch thy snowy pinions; and deeper valleys than these, in which to spread thy stainless mantles—these vapory beauties have vanished, and winter's tears come trickling down the sunny hills. Farewell, ye mournful winter winds, ye shall no more shake the hill-tops in your fury, or break the silence of the valleys with your murmurs. The giant oaks and tender vines shall fold their arms in silence, and spring shall clothe them with beauty, and nature shall spread them in peace.

"Come, welcome flowers, come yet again; for the load of that simple heart which waits to greet you; for the eye that moistened at your approach; for the soul that smiles with tender emotions at your return;—will you come with joyous smiles? will you hem up those ragged garments of nature? will you clothe her solitary places with beauty, crown the hills with the garlands of spring, crowd her valleys with the marching columns of your varied beauties, and fill this soul with unspeakable joy and praise?"

I might present many other extracts, some, perhaps, even more chaste and beau-

tiful than those above; but it would make my article too long. I will give a short extract from his last piece before his graduation—"To you, my fellow-graduates, I speak in particular. A 'wide, wide world' opens before us; before us, then, are trials that will take a manly heart to endure, and temptations, a strong one to resist—fears untold and dangers unnumbered. Let us not go doubting and hesitating, but like men, with a heart purified by its trials and ennobled by its conflicts, with a life made honorable by the sincerity of our motives, and useful, by a straight-forward and manly course of action, we will have no need to blush for any word we have spoken, or any deed we have performed."

So far as I know, he ever lived in conformity to the noble principles so clearly and beautifully presented in his writings, and now he has gone to enter upon that immortal and glorious life, of which he used to take such great delight to think, and talk and write. The hope of other days is now glad fruition to him.

Could we but lift the veil, and learn the history of that little band of *twenty-seven*, how sad a tale might be told, how *much* of suffering might be revealed, and how *little* of that ideal happiness so ardently hoped for only seven years ago. But such is life! no, such is not life, but such is the dread reality that this world has in store for us. But is this life? No.

"Life is real, life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal;
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not written of the soul."

To all who may deign to read this humble tribute to the memory of a departed brother, I desire to give a parting word of advice. Look not for happiness here, but lay up treasures in heaven. Build not airy castles; revel not in golden dreams of worldly fame and honor; picture not to yourself that happy day when men may admire and applaud, and imagine that this will be happiness enough for you. The applause of to-day may give place to the hiss of to-morrow—the conquering hero of to-day

may be the humbled and disgraced of to-morrow. Men may applaud, and honor, and worship even, the heartless, soulless wretch, who is loathsome in the sight of God,—an heir of eternal infamy; but God approves that meek, humble and trusting heart which strives for that honor and wisdom that comes from above. The applause of men can't save us from the "horrible pit;" the approbation of God can raise us up from the hospital, or from whatever place we may occupy, and crown us with glory unfading.

May the Lord be with us and guide us safely along life's journey. May ministering angels attend us in death, and may the portals of heaven open wide to receive us at last; is the prayer of

J. A. MENG.

Elizaville, Ky., Aug., 1863.

atack it. But, then, these "human contrivances," as you are pleased to term the various religious sects, embrace all the sects of the Christian world, except the Disciple church, as you will contend, which is a mere moiety when set in opposition with all the other sects. All these sects, or systems of "human contrivance," claim to be sanctioned by the Bible. As they cannot all be right, which is wrong? Now, if the Disciple church is right, the others must be wrong, and the result is, that at the least possible calculation, nine hundred and ninety-nine, out of every thousand of professing Christians, are wrong, and always have been. Now, according to the partialist's view of salvation, what are the resulting consequences to this vast majority?

In referring to your reply, you have not disputed the attributes which I have affirmed to belong to God; therefore, these are established. You also agree with me, that God *foreknew* all things from the beginning; "that He stands as the Creator—the Ruler and final Arbiter of matter and mind;" "that His plan of creation is perfect," and "that He will do justly by himself and man." The above then are established facts.

We now come to man, whose place in creation, and whose final destiny we shall attempt to investigate. Man is the last, the highest, and the best of God's works. He is the crowning point, the pinnacle, and the ultimatum of all the rest. Nature, science and revelation give him this position. He came upon the stage of existence the last of created beings, and in organization and faculties, stands highest in the chain of animated nature. He, like all classes of life below him, came into being at the allotted time and place of God's creative plan, adapted to the place he was to occupy, and surrounded by all the circumstances necessary for his desires and happiness. He was created in the image of his God, and pronounced by his Maker not only *good*, but *very good*—better than all else God had made. Made in the image of God, we conceive to mean—not in bodily

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

SHILOH, Sept. 10th, 1863.

ELDER M. N. LORD—

Dear Sir: Your reply of July 30th is now before me, and in regard to which I shall say but a few words, as you differ in but two or three respects from the positions I have taken.

In regard to its always being taught that God will reward the good and punish the wicked everlastingly, it will come up for discussion in due time, and I need say nothing of it here.

I am glad to hear you confess, that the vehement preaching of "hell fire," "the worm that never dieth," "burned in a lake of fire and brimstone," and other terms of similar significance, are not necessary "to frighten the sinner into their system of *human contrivance*;" nor are they necessary to reform the world. You request me not to ask you "to defend their wild imagery." All I can request of you is, defend the system of partial salvation, as I shall

form, but in mind, intellect, or reasoning faculties. In intelligence we are like God. God's intelligence is *infinite*, and man's but *finite*. In mind the same in *essence*, only differing in *degree*; but how *great* the degree; great as a moment of time compared with the endless ages of eternity. Man, then, in intelligence, is the image of his God. Having the possession of these faculties, man is a *co-worker* with God, advancing and perfecting himself, and moulding creation, to a certain extent to his wants. He is the only being that has ever improved upon the work of God. The earth was left crude to his hand—he has improved it, and made it bountiful and beautiful. Had not man possessed this image of God, the earth would have remained as God left it, an unfruitful and desolate wilderness. Man could have improved it no more than the animals which have not these faculties.

All of animated nature below man, was created with organizations adapting them to the places they were to occupy; and so, also, with man. In both, the same law holds good, and man is no exception to the general rule. His endowment with intelligence does not exempt him from it. God, in His foreknowledge, saw the result of this intelligence, and what influence surrounding circumstances would have upon it, and made ample provision for it. In His almighty wisdom, He could as well prepare for man, with all his exalted faculties, as for the lowest form of life, with scarce any faculties. It does not argue, because man possesses higher faculties than any other form of being, that God could not, or did not adapt laws for His government as perfect and as much in accordance with His wishes, as those applying to the lower classes. God can govern intelligence as well as instinct, or other attributes of the brute creation. Animated nature, including man, is a grand chain, each class of life constitutes a link, and you cannot break it. Man is the last link in the chain, the *link that binds the chain to the great God of nature*. Can any man who has rightly

reasoned upon the subject, believe that the last link, the one immediately below the Creator, be less perfect than the one most remote, or any intermediate one. No person attempts to claim that any link except man, is imperfect. Why should the link that was most perfect at its creation, be deemed defective now? We claim the whole chain to be perfect, as God, in His foreknowledge and forever designed it to be.

In my next article, I shall commence the investigation of man in relation to God, and why he sinned, and the cause of this sin, or from whence it emanated.

Yours truly,

G. L. PURDY.

WHAT IS POLITICAL PREACHING.

There has been for some time past a necessity for some definitions. We have no objection to *political preaching*, provided the announcement is for that kind of preaching, at the right *time*, in the right *place*, and by the *right men*. But we do not want it under the name of preaching the gospel, in the congregation of the Lord, nor when assembled for worship. Nor do we want it from the same man who preaches the gospel. We never knew a man who was a successful preacher in both departments at the same time. It is making two preachers of the same man, and either the political preacher or the gospel preacher must go under. So far as our observation goes, it generally turns out that the gospel preacher sinks and is altogether absorbed in the political preacher. We know some men who only aim to be preacher enough to serve as chaplain on public occasions, solemnize marriage, and go on the cars for half fare. These are great men at political meetings, fairs, fourth of July celebrations, railroad celebrations, etc., etc. They are always

present, and precisely in the right place, with an "appropriate and eloquent prayer." They are on hand at great Masonic celebrations, Odd-Fellows' processions, meetings of the Sons of Temperance, temperance meetings of every kind, or almost any other kind of meetings, except religious meetings, with a prayer ready, and a few appropriate remarks. They preach on Lord's day, but should there be a prospect of doing good, and the brethren press them to stay, and preach two or three days longer, they have pressing business, a sick wife, etc., etc., at home, or an engagement to marry somebody, and must leave. Now, we do not say that these men do no good, or that they should cease preaching; but we do say, that they accommodate themselves to the world, make their preaching yield to the influences of the world, and do but a tithe of what they might do if they were devoted preachers of the gospel. We give it all the time as our decided impression that the preacher of the gospel should devote himself exclusively to his work, and that in every other sense, except as a preacher of the gospel, to have the highest influence, he should be only a private citizen. For the good of the church, and for no political purposes, do we insist on this. Nothing will excite dissension in the church more readily than for the preacher to turn politician and commence making political speeches; nor will anything destroy the religious influence of the preacher faster. This, too, will have no bearing on one political party more than another. Any political party will make a tool of a preacher when it can, and then chuckle over the achievement. The preacher is a weak man and easily gulled and deceived when he will allow himself to be thus used.

But what is political preaching? Is it to teach "every soul" to "be subject to the higher powers;" that "there is no power but of God;" that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" that he who "resists the power, resists the ordinance of God;" that "they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation;" that "rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil;" that the ruler

"is the minister of God to you for good;" that "he bears not the sword in vain;" that he "is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath on him who does evil?" If this is political preaching, then Paul was a political preacher, for this is from him.—Rom. ch. xiii. But this was not political preaching then, nor is it now. He here says nothing about the form of government, nor the character of the rulers, whether he thought they were good, might be better or worse; but that they were such as God had been pleased to give, and that it was their duty to *obey them*, whether they liked them or not. Such is the duty of Christians now, no matter whether the Chief Magistrate, or any other officer, was their choice or not, he is the legitimately constituted authority—the minister of God, no matter by what party elected. As Christians, their duty is plain—they are bound to obey him. He who resists violates both the civil law and the law of God, and is on the road to ruin.

We have spoken thus freely, because we are credibly informed that certain men in Illinois are talking about *peace doctrines*, with revolvers in their pockets, threatening to resist the constituted authorities of the land, and profess to quote us in justification of their conduct. But those who have read us know that nothing we have written can afford a shadow of justification for such conduct. We did, at an early period in our troubles, express conscientious scruples about fighting, not in *this war*, but in *any war—fighting at all*; nor could we say, if all we had and life itself were at stake, that these scruples have been removed, though we admit the whole question a difficult one. But there is one question about which there is no doubt. That is, whether a Christian may resist the constituted authorities of the land. There can be no doubt here. He who resists, no matter under what pretense, *violates the law of Christ*. As the venerated Walter Scott said to us, the last time we saw him, and only a short time before his death, "A *peace* man must be an unconditional submissionist." So we say, unless rulers should forbid the preaching of the

gospel, or the worship of God. Let no man who resists the civil rulers talk *peace*, or refer to us as ever having said anything in justification of their conduct. Such men are on the high-road to war, to universal anarchy and ruin. We say this, not for any political purpose, but religiously and in the fear of the Lord, in view of the most terrible responsibilities, to save brethren and churches, who have been cleansed by the blood of Jesus, from sinning and bringing on themselves, as some have done, swift destruction. If a few brethren, whom we loved dearly, had listened to private counsels we gave them, in kindness, they would have been saved from terrible ruin which has befallen them.

We want no *Republican* churches, nor *Democrat* churches, but *Christian* churches. We will defend no *Republicans* nor *Democrats*, as such; no *Republicanism* nor *Democracy*. In one word, we will not act *politically*, but *religiously*. Never in our lives have we had as good an opportunity to exhibit to the people of this generation the genuine Christian character, the meekness, gentleness, kindness and love of Christ.—We are the last people with whom the civil authorities should have any trouble. Certainly Christians can live under a government and do well, where men of the world can.

It is not preaching *peace*, nor *submission to the civil government* that will do good now, so much as good conduct, the manifestation of a good spirit, kindness and a disposition to conciliate those in fellowship with us in the same congregations. Quiet men, really peaceable men, who love the church more than the world, will generally get along well. But some men will be in a muss. They must preach *peace*, or *war*, or something, just at the time when their preaching, whether right or wrong, can only create contention. They must have an excitement, an upheaving or commotion of some sort, even if it be at the expense of sinking all the good they have done. Let us patiently wait our time. The Lord will open our way presently, and afford us a vast

opportunity for doing good, and we shall see such a triumph of the gospel as we have never beheld. We shall come out from under the war cloud soon, with much dross purged out, and the pure gold will shine brighter than ever. The Lord hasten the day.

By the way, neither the civil authorities nor the military have ever oppressed, distressed or interrupted us in *any way*. By the blessing of Heaven, they have allowed us to pursue our legitimate work without the least molestation, for which we are thankful. B. F.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. VII.

John's interview with the Priests and Levites at Bethany has already been related, as well as that of Jesus with Nathaniel, which happened a few days afterwards; but we are not informed where the latter occurred,—only that it took place after Jesus had resolved to go into Galilee. Possibly it was on the road to Nazareth. The next place we find him is at Cana, in Galilee.

It might be regretted that the sacred writers were not more particular in telling precisely when and where each event they record took place, were it not that this apparent negligence in regard to particulars of time and place, observable in many parts of their writings, affords us a strong argument in favor of the truthfulness of their narratives. We cannot fail to perceive, if we read attentively, that the authors' minds are so engrossed with the facts they are relating, that they pay little attention to order, time, place, or anything else but the narration of what they think will prove Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God. And we

could not wish for any stronger proof of the honesty and integrity of a witness, than to see him so wrapped up in the leading facts he has to relate, as to pass over all unimportant circumstances of time and place.

Thomas Hartwell Horne, in his "Introduction to the Study of the Bible," vol. I., pages 64 and 65, says: "In short, it does not appear that it ever entered the minds of these writers, to consider how this or the other action would appear to mankind, or what objections might be raised against it. But, without at all attending to such a consideration, they lay the facts before the world, at no pains to think whether they will appear credible or not. If the reader will not credit their testimony, there is no help for it: **THEY TELL THE TRUTH, AND NOTHING ELSE.** Greater mark of sincerity than these it is impossible to find in any historical compositions that are extant; and they show that they published nothing to the world but what they believed themselves. Like honest and faithful historians, they are concerned about nothing but the truth."

But though they were so engrossed with the great truths they were publishing to the world, as to relate many things without informing us when and where they transpired, yet in many instances they descend to the minutest particularity. Their omission of particulars in some cases is not, therefore, to avoid detection, as if they were practicing deception, they would wish to do, by leaving out whatever might lead to their exposure. It was owing to their being in possession of a great number of facts, which they wished to relate as briefly as possible, that they were compelled to omit, not only some less important events, but many particulars, the narration of which could not have benefitted those for whom the Gospel was written.

That we may be able to form something like a connected view of the travels of Jesus, we may do well to acquaint ourselves a little more with the geography of the country which was the scene of his acts and teaching.

Bethany—(not that Bethany near Jerusalem, where Lazarus lived; but that called in the Common Version, "*Bethabara* beyond Jordan,")—is situated on the eastern bank of the Jordan, about ten miles from its mouth,—or where it empties into the Dead Sea. If we ascend the river about fifty miles from Bethany; (or Bethabara,) we shall come to the southern extremity of Lake Tiberias, which is twelve or fifteen miles in length. We have thus measured about seventy-five miles of the length of the River Jordan, to the west of which lies Samaria, which is situated between Judea, on the south, and Lower Galilee, on the north. Therefore Jesus, in going from Bethany beyond the Jordan to Nazareth in Galilee, had to pass through Samaria, and travel a distance of about seventy miles.—Nazareth is about half-way between the Lake Tiberias and the Mediterranean Sea. As Jesus traveled much in the vicinity of Lake Tiberias, we may observe further, that the country of the Gadarenes is on the east of that Lake; Chorazin and Bethsaida on the north, one on each side of where the Jordan enters the Lake; and Capernaum on the western shore, a few miles south of Chorazin. Cana is a little west of Capernaum, on the road to Nazareth, and Nazareth is about twenty miles farther west.—Jesus appears to have been on his way from Nazareth to Capernaum, when he performed in Cana of Galilee his

FIRST PUBLIC MIRACLE.

It was, perhaps, some time in March, A. D. 30, according to our way of computing time, that Jesus and several followers—Peter, Philip, and Nathaniel, and two others who had accompanied him from the banks of the Jordan,—were invited to attend a wedding in the town of Cana. The mother of Jesus was there. Perhaps it was the occasion of the marriage of one of her relations. According to the customs of the Jews, there was great festivity at weddings, and wine was one of the indispensables.—Neither Jesus nor his disciples were *Sons of Temperance.* Nor was Mary a *Daughter!*

Though I doubt not they were all temperate.

There appears to have been an unusual number of guests at this wedding—more than the friends expected—for the wine “fell short.” Probably a number had come in on account of Jesus being there; for one whose extraordinary character was so well known, would be very likely to draw a crowd around him wherever he went.

And Mary seems to have known something of Jesus’ ability to perform miracles. Indeed, it is not unreasonable to suppose that, as he had shown his superior wisdom at twelve, when he disputed with the teachers, he had also, during the eighteen years which elapsed to the time of his immersion, given some proofs of his wonder-working power: though I do not believe the miracles—or trifling acts,—ascribed to him in the Apocryphal Testament, were ever performed by him. However, as soon as Mary discovered that the wine was out, she comes to Jesus and says to him: “They have no wine.” Why should she tell him this, unless she thought he had the power of supplying the deficiency?

It appears that Jesus, though it is likely he had performed a number of miracles before, was not very anxious to bring himself into public notice, by doing what would draw the attention and excite the admiration of the people. He says, in reply to his mother: “O woman, what have I to do with thee? My hour is not yet come.”—Whether he said anything more to her then or not, we cannot tell; but his mother seemed to understand that he *would do something*, and “says to the servants: ‘Whatever he says to you, do it.’”

It was according to Jewish custom to have a large supply of water at feasts, for purposes of purification, or cleansing,—that is, for washing hands, and the cups and plates, etc., used on the occasion. Therefore, they had placed in some convenient part of the house, six water-pots; or large stone jars, which held “two or three measures apiece.” We cannot tell how much those jars held; but Dr. Philip Doddridge

thinks that the six probably contained about fifty-four gallons, which would be nine gallons apiece. The precise quantity, however, is immaterial to us.

Jesus commands the servants to “fill the water-pots with water.” They filled them up to the brim. And he says to them:—“Draw out now, and carry [some] to the ruler of the feast.” And they carried it. When the ruler of the feast tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not where it was from, (though the servants who had drawn the water knew); the ruler of the feast calls the bridegroom, and says to him: “Every man sets out the good wine first; and when they have drunk freely, then that which is worse. Thou hast kept the good wine till now.” Here the writer from whose narrative I have quoted,—John the Apostle,—says: “This beginning of miracles Jesus worked in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him.”

The reader will observe, that the effect produced by this miracle was *conviction*.—The disciples were convinced of the Divine mission of Jesus, that is, that he was sent from God. This was the design of the miracles which he performed—to convince a number of competent witnesses that he was the Christ. The Evangelists had a similar design in writing a narrative of the wonderful performances of Jesus, namely, the conviction of the world. I will now present the reader with Horne’s definition of a miracle, and then conclude with quoting some of his remarks on the DESIGN and CREDIBILITY of miracles.

1. DEFINITION.—“A *miracle* is an effect or event, contrary to the established constitution or course of things, or a sensible suspension or contrivance of, or deviation from, the known laws of nature, wrought either by the immediate act, or by the assistance, or by the permission of God, and accompanied with a previous notice or declaration that it is performed according to the purpose and by the power of God, for the proof or evidence of some particular doctrine, or in attestation of the authority

or Divine mission of some particular person."

This is a very full, complete, or comprehensive definition, and I would suggest that the unlearned reader review it *seven times*, in order to a perfect understanding of it.

2. DESIGN.—“A miracle becomes a proof of the character or mission of him by whom it was wrought, by being *professedly* wrought for the confirmation of either. A miracle is the testimony of God. From the perfect veracity of Him, who is the Supreme Being, it irresistibly results that he never can give, nor rationally be supposed to give, his testimony to anything but truth. When, therefore, a miracle is wrought in confirmation of anything, we know that that thing is true, because God has given to it his testimony. The miracles of Moses and of Christ were wrought to prove that their doctrine and their mission were from God; therefore they certainly were from God.”

3. CREDIBILITY.—“Whatever miracles are wrought, they are *matters of fact*, and are capable of being proved by proper evidence, as other facts are. To those who beheld the miracles wrought by Moses and Jesus Christ, as well as by his apostles, the seeing of those miracles performed was sufficient evidence of the Divine inspiration of Moses and Jesus Christ. The witnesses, however, must be supposed to be acquainted with the course of nature, so as to be able to judge that the event in question was contrary to it. With respect to the miracles recorded in the Scriptures, this cannot be doubted: for no man of ordinary understanding could be incapable of ascertaining that the event was contrary to the course of nature, when the Israelites passed through the Red Sea, and afterwards over the river Jordan, the waters being stayed in their current on either side; when diseases were healed by a word; when sight was imparted to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and the powers of speech to the dumb, merely at command, and without the use of any other means: especially when a corpse, that had begun to putrify, was restored to life by the speaking of a word. But to *other men*, mi-

racles, like other events; admit of the evidence of testimony.”

WM. PINKERTON.

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

NO. I.

But “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

This important passage has been subjected to various interpretations. First, some have supposed the inability of the natural man to arise from a want of revelation; so that he was naturally incapacitated from knowing or receiving the truth. But this cannot be strictly true, for he must have some knowledge of the Gospel in order to pass sentence upon it, and account it to be foolishness. Secondly, others suppose the inability to arise from the mere *unregeneracy* of the natural man; they regard it as a *moral* inability; only to be removed by a direct and immediate operation of the Spirit ere he can know or receive the Gospel. On the other hand, we maintain that this inability is not what is called *Moral Inability*; neither does it arise from the *unregeneracy* or *depravity* of the natural man; but it arises from the *method* which he pursues in deciding upon the merits of revealed truth; it is an inability which ever presents itself when men lean to their own weak understandings, and set up their own petty standards of judgment, instead of receiving the Gospel with a devout and humble faith. The natural man is depraved; but it is not his *depravity*, but his *method of reasoning* that prevents him from knowing or receiving the truth. Let us look to the passage.

I. The “things of the Spirit” are the truths of the Gospel. “Eye hath not seen,

nor ear heard, neither have entered into the mind of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God hath *revealed* them to us by his Spirit. Now we have received the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God; which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth." "Whereby, when ye *read*, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which, in other ages, was not made known to the sons of men."—1 Cor. 2. Eph. 3. Therefore, "the things of the Spirit" are the *revelations of the Gospel*.

II. By what *method* are we to know and receive the truths of revelation? Evidently, by *faith*.

1st. There are several methods of receiving truth. First, by the testimony of our senses we become acquainted with many facts. Second, by the exercise of our reasoning faculties, we into possession of a large class of truths. By this method we receive the truths and principles of Mathematics, which contain their own evidence, and which is made apparant in demonstration. It is impossible to reject them, for they become self-evident. The facts of self-consciousness are also of this class.—Third, we receive truth also on the testimony of others. We know a great many things because we have been told them, or have read of them. We do not know the thing for ourselves, but we believe it on the testimony of other persons. Our certainty in such cases, is based on the reliability of the testimony. The truths of the Gospel are of this class: we do not know them for ourselves, or from our own personal observation, but we believe them on the testimony of others. We may judge of the *probability* of many things that are told us by the circumstances under which they occurred, or from the nature of things generally; but we cannot thus judge of the facts of the Gospel. It is just as *probable* to us that man will be raised from the dead without any body, as with it; with a natural

body, as that he will be raised with a spiritual body. We have no rational criteria, by which to determine the probability of Gospel facts. We can only look to the *credibility* of the testimony. Again: We can demonstrate mathematical truth; but not the truths of revelation. These are no premises from which to deduce, by reason, the truths of revelation. They were all *mysteries* until *revealed*, and then they ceased to be such. Therefore, as the truths of the Gospel do not come under our personal observation, and as their truth or falsity can not be demonstrated on rational principles, we must receive them on the *credibility of the testimony* which presents them to us.

2d. What is the office of Reason in regard to revelation? It can only ascertain the character and credibility of the testimony. There are limits to religious thought, or moral reasoning; and we reach those *limits* before we reach the truths of the Gospel. The German Theologians have attempted to give rational demonstrations of Scripture doctrines, but their reasonings are fallacious and absurd. We can only *believe Scripture* on testimony; we can not demonstrate it. If one waits till he can reason it out, he will never know or receive it. *Reason*, then, can only decide upon the *credibility of testimony*.

3d. Regeneration makes *no difference* in our natural abilities or powers, to understand revealed truth. The *natural* man has the same *faculties* and *powers* to know the truth that the spiritual man has. The natural man has the rational faculty and the spiritual faculty also; that is, the faculty to exercise *faith*. The spiritual man has only these two faculties; but he brings faith into requisition, and the natural man does not. When the natural man throws aside his carnal wisdom, and looks to the divine testimony, he can know the things of the Spirit. A long, continued habit of exercising faith in the sacred Oracles will strengthen the faith faculty, as exercise strengthens the body; but the *natural* powers and faculties of the unrenewed man,

with respect to spiritual exercises, are just the same as the natural faculties and powers of the regenerate man.

4th. We can only understand the truths of the Gospel by faith. Whoever has attended to the operations of his mind enough to distinguish between faith and reason, will see the truth of this statement. The Gospel comes to us in the shape of testimony. Its doctrines manifest a superior, moral excellency, and a beautiful adaptation to their several ends; but they are entitled to our credence on account of the credibility of that testimony which is confirmed by miracles, and signs, and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. To the man who disbelieves the doctrine of the Resurrection because he can not see *how* it could be done, we might say with Paul, "*thou fool,*" our faith rests not on the wisdom of men, but on the confirming power of God.—Therefore the Gospel can not stand in human reason or human wisdom; but in *faith*, by which alone we may know its truth.

5th. Faith is the revealed means of understanding revelation. This is so apparent to any reader of the Scriptures that it scarcely needs mention. The passages requiring, urging, defining, and commending faith are almost innumerable. We adduce but a single one—"Faith is the conviction of things not seen." The facts of the Gospel, and the hopes of eternity are unseen by us, but faith is the conviction of them. Faith is knowledge, truth, and reality to us. Observation and reason bring their objects to our inspection; but faith believes on testimony, and becomes the conviction of unseen things. If, then, faith is the conviction of revealed truth, if it is required in numberless passages, and every other method discountenanced, it must be the revealed means of understanding the Gospel.

6th. The "things of the Spirit" are *spiritually* discerned when we look upon them with a cordial faith. We can not look upon these facts themselves; and by wisdom we know not God; therefore, by faith on the best authenticated testimony,

we are to receive the truth. Peter says—"Though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of your faith even the salvation of your souls." The spiritual emotions and convictions of the child of God are by faith. Hence it is by *faith* that divine truth is *spiritually* discerned.

III. What are we to understand by the *natural man*? The word translated natural, is elsewhere rendered *sensual*, not having the Spirit.—Jude. James says *sensual* wisdom. The natural man, then, is an unregenerate, unspiritual man. But it is not on account of his character, that he is said to be unable to know or receive the truth, but on account of his method of reasoning he does not discern *spiritually*, that is, by faith; he will not believe, and there lies the difficulty. He is just such a man as some of our modern skeptics, spiritualists, and rationalists. A rationalist can not receive the things of the Spirit of God, because they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are *spiritually* discerned. The rationalist looks upon the doctrines of the Gospel, and cannot see *how* such things can be so; and, as a consequence, rejects it. A spiritualist can not know or receive the things of the Spirit because they are *foolishness* to him. His system is diametrically opposed to the Gospel. They are unregenerate men, but their *inability* to know the truth does not arise from their *unregeneracy*, but from their *method* of judging divine truth. Paul meant by *natural* man just what we mean by Rationalist, Skeptic, or Spiritualist.—These are all *natural* men, because they adopt gross, natural methods of judging the truth. The Gospel "destroyed the wisdom of the wise; and brought to nothing the understanding of the prudent." And doubtless many of those would-be wise men were destroyed with their systems—their oppositions of science, falsely so-called.—But let the rational, skeptic, or natural man throw away his opposing system, and look to the Lord by faith, and he shall

know the truth. The *natural* man, then, is so called, not because of his character, but because of his models of *thinking*, and his inability to know or receive the Gospel arises not from his *depravity*, but from his *method* of judging divine things. All men are natural men by *reason*, until they become spiritual men by *faith*.

This passage does not teach us the necessity of "direct influences," but a humble trust in the Great Redeemer. The *spiritual* method is by *faith*. The *natural* man is one who adopts a *different method*.

REMARKS.

The foregoing is worthy of a careful reading, which it will doubtless receive from many close thinkers. Though it contains an item or two to which we do not assent, it is sound and valuable in the main. It is certainly correct in deciding that "the things of the Spirit," are the things revealed in the gospel, and that these things are to be apprehended by faith in the divine testimony, or that they are to be learned from the gospel. This, we think, is indisputably correct. This, too, is the great point in the whole matter. We have, however, taken the "natural man," of this passage, to be an *uninspired man* in antithesis with an *inspired man*. The uninspired reasoner, or philosopher, the wise man, the disputer of this world, was the man who claimed that he could know God, the mind and the will of God, without the gospel, and without the apostles. These men knew something of the gospel of the apostles and what was being accomplished by them, but did not understand it. They did not know the things contained in the gospel, "the things of the Spirit," but simply knew that the apostles were preaching something new, and that it was carrying the people with it by thousands, but it was all foolishness to them. The apostle, in reply to these men, states that they did not receive the things of the Spirit, the things in the gospel, that, on their ground, or without the apostles, or their preaching, they could not know

them, for they were spiritually discoursed, or perceived. So long as they rejected the revelations of the Spirit, they could not know them—that the world by wisdom, by reason, science, or philosophy, without the revelation of the Spirit, through the apostles, could not know them—did not know God. But, says the apostle, we have the Spirit—the Spirit of inspiration—and the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. We, that is, we the apostles, have the mind of Christ, and the things hid for ages, kept secret since the beginning of time, are now revealed by us, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This wisdom the princes of this world knew not, nor, indeed, can they know it by reason, nature, science, philosophy, or any means, except to come and learn it from the gospel which we preach.

Of course these were unregenerate men, but the apostle is not arguing that, on that account, they could not know these things, or could not understand the gospel. He has no such question as this before him. But he is simply assuring them of their dependence on the gospel, the revelation through the apostles—that they would not know the things of God in any other way but by the gospel. His argument is not, that they could not understand the gospel because they were unregenerated, but that they could not know the mind of God, without the preaching of the apostles, or without the gospel, because they were not inspired.

The passage, when understood, is an eternal refutation of all pretence to understand the mind of God, or to know the Deity, in any valuable sense, by nature, reason, science, philosophy, spirit-mediums, or in any way, except through the revelation by Christ and the apostles—the *gospel*, as inscribed on the holy pages of the New Testament. There is but one way of salvation, and but one revelation of that one way, and he who refuses to come to that one revelation, to find that one way of salvation, will grope in the dark. He cannot know it, for God has made no other revelation of it.

Atheists may prate and try to ease their consciences, by maintaining that there is *no God*, but this *no being* can claim to know, without claiming omniscience, which is absurd. The Deist may claim to know God, by reason and the light of nature, but the vain, absurd and contradictory theories in reference to the Deity put forth by Deists, prove that they know nothing about it. The shallow pretences of Spiritualists, to reveal another world to us, and the mind of God, are at once swept to the four winds, by the simple fact that they have failed to furnish us dispatches of a single battle in advance of the ordinary news. If they cannot tell us what is going on in this world, only by the ordinary channels of information employed by the rest of us poor mortals, we certainly may not depend on them for information about another world. We had better go to the infallible information given by the apostles.

B. F.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

NO. III.

DR. G. L. PURDY:

Dear Sir: In article No. 3, you have, with a master mind, described the massive structure of the earth, up through its several strata, from its centre to its circumference. You have carefully, but in general terms, laid before the reader the evidences of organic, animal life, as found deep embedded in solid rock. You have traced these various forms and organic structures, in the earth's formation, from their first appearance in the Palæozoic rocks, to the earth's surface, or the Alluvial Drift. You have advanced, step by step, from the lowest order of organic life—a mere point in existence—an indivisible life atom “in the Kingdom of the Radiata,” up to the highest conception of the “Grand, Supreme Intelligence” of the Universe, as developed “in the Kingdom of

the Vertebrata.” You commenced with the “Monad”—the dividing line between the vegetable and animal structure—a mere point in animal organism—a living point, almost if not altogether void of any evidence of sensation or ganglia, and rising up through the thousands or myriads of structures you arrived at *man*, who possesses the most perfect brainular and nervous formation in animated nature. You carefully note the progress of organization, as you ascend in the scale from the Radiata to man. In the lowest order—the Polypi, Sponges, &c.—you find no traces of brain whatever, among some classes below the fish you find what is called nervous centres or “ganglia.” All will admit that the nervous system is nearly equally developed in the Mammifera, Birds, Reptiles and Fish.—Even insects have nervous centres, sending out lateral nerves. A nervous system is discoverable, even in Molluscous animals, but when we commence at these lower organic structures, possessing in the smallest degree a brainular development, we find the brain in proportion to the spinal chord as 2 to 11 and as we advance to man as 22 or 23 to 1, as you say. You sum up the whole in these few words. You say, “that nature has been progressive, and that God had from the first foreseen and embraced man in this plan, and to convince us of the fact, we have but to refer to the brain of the animal world.” You then ask, By what is man so distinguished from the animal world? Every one will answer, by his intelligence. Then you ask another question—“upon what depends this intelligence?” Your answer is—*upon the superiority of his brain the organ of intelligence.* Now, my dear sir, if you have no qualification to make in reference to your answer, you will permit me to offer, at a suitable or proper time, a serious objection to such answer. If, however, in the development of your argument, suitable modifications should be made, I shall not urge my objection. I agree with you in the facts, but cannot admit your conclusion. Like you, my dear sir, I am lost in thought when I contemplate this wondrous

edifice, inhabited by man. If I accept your solution of the Earth's beginning, there was a time when this whole earth must have been a liquid, fiery glowing mass, rolling its onward course through space.—Time rolls on, and there appears an incrustation of Mica, clay and gneiss. Another strata is demanded, and the upper and lower greywacke, or the silurian group, is laid upon the former—and so on up through the carboniferous, the permian, the trias and the oolitic, to the diluvian drift or quarternary rocks. And all this the result of laws conceived and executed by the Great Master Intelligence of this universe of organic mind and matter. When we turn our face backward and gaze into the explored as well as unexplored depths of that eternity which we have already past, and turning again, look forward to the immeasurable length and breadth, and depth, and height of that eternity yet to come, our souls sink within us, and we feel our almost utter nothingness in the scale of creation. What proofs of intelligence, wisdom and power, are scattered among us. And oh! how little appreciated by erring mortal man.

Now, my dear sir, if these witnesses have been summoned by you to prove the existence of one Intelligent Designer, then I shall not object. If you offer the facts and phenomena of nature to prove that this Intelligent Designer, through the force or power of a law or laws, conceived and executed in wisdom, produced this mass of organic life and matter, then I have no objections to urge. If you put forward these things as proof, that by law this Intelligence created a moving mass of organic life, and then by a law adapted to the end designed, changed this moving mass of living matter into a mass of "immobile" matter, and thus reached the end of his design, the earth's formation, then I have no objection to present. If you offer these witnesses in proof that the design of God was to create this earth and to place man upon it, then I have not a word to say, nor have I an opposing sentiment—but on the other hand, I can heartily concur with you.

If, however, you offer such evidence to prove that God (or that which is equivalent to it, the law of God) has never been thwarted in any instance, you will, in kindness, allow me to differ with you, and I can assure you I will try to maintain that difference and prove to you, and satisfy you, too, that your position is logically untenable.

Again, if you offer the facts, in reference to the nervous and brainular formation, as proof of the power of adaptation, "or adaptation, foresight" in this Intelligence, then I have no objection. If, however, you affirm that the muscle called the brain was or is necessary to the development of intelligence, I shall deny. The latter position was assumed by the French and English infidel philosophers, during the last quarter of the past century. The position is untenable, and should you deem it proper to urge the proposition, "that man's intelligence is dependent for its existence and development upon the superior muscular organism of the head,"—unless you qualify it, I shall be obliged to urge my denial. Your own argument would convince me of the error of such affirmation, if there were no others to urge.

Again, if by progression, you mean that God created the second organic animal structure more perfect than the first, I have no objection to make. If, however, you should slide almost imperceptibly into the sophism that the second is but "a progressive development" from the first, I shall seriously object. As your argument, or rather as the basis of your argument, is yet undeveloped, I will wait for the forthcoming deductions.

I enter these provisional objections in order to a preservation of a disputant's right, and a foundation of future arguments, if such arguments, with accompanying proof, should be deemed necessary. I agree with you, my dear sir, in the infinite perfection, in the matchless wisdom and power of God. I cannot agree with you in your adjective phrase—"unlimited" power, unless you qualify the expression, nor would I deem it prudent to affirm, that because he is match-

less in wisdom and infinite in perfection, that therefore he never created or never was the Author of anything imperfect. Nothing but my religious zeal would allow me to perpetrate such a sophism. Be careful you do not commit yourself to such a policy. In Christian kindness, and with the best feelings in the world, permit me to say that, although Mr. Pollock and others have poetized the inhabitants of other worlds, and have told us they were in an unfallen state, still I have always thought the expression once used by Sheridan, to check the imagination of his compeers, was a just one. "Gentlemen," said he, "you draw upon your imagination for facts." Now, Doctor, should you occasionally take a flight on fancy's wing to other worlds, do not offer your visions as proof the ultimate happiness of all mankind. We hardly know how to handle the subtle relations of imagination, creation and reproduction. But, when we stand man up before us as a living fact, when we gaze at his wonderfully complicated organism, when we analyze his organic structure, from its frame-work to its outer adorning,—we are awe-struck with the grandeur and majesty of the conception and finish of such a godlike being.

Then, to contemplate that a being, for whom the Creator has wrought out so much—that a being, clothed with so much majesty and grandeur—the offspring of such a godlike conception or thought—should arrest the attention of the archical hosts of heaven, in his acts to thwart the will of Almighty God,—it is fearful, indeed. If man has treated God with contempt; if he has made the attempt to thwart his plan—oh! let us not shield him from his guilt, but try to find the way to relieve him.

These remarks will not demand your attention until met in the regular course of argument. You will pardon the oversight, if I have entered my objection too soon.—Feeling assured of the exercise of such courtesy, I remain yours,

M. N. LORD.

Laporte, Sept. 1st, 1833.

CONTROVERSY.

Truth and error are ever antagonistic. God is the author of one, the devil of the other. Truth and error can no more be harmonized than can their respective authors be reconciled. The conflict is irrepressible. The earth is one vast battle field upon which has been waged an incessant warfare between God and the devil—between truth and falsehood—between good and evil—between freedom and bondage. The contest is one of mighty interest to God, angels and true humanity. The battle is fierce and ever presenting variable features. Now truth triumphs and the devil trembles. Then error is victorious and heaven mourns. But the world's history has ever demonstrated the truth of Bryant's poetic stanza:

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
Th' eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

The life of the "Author and Finisher of the Faith"—the Founder of the Christian Church—was a life of constant controversy. He was the long looked for Messiah, presenting himself to a people who anticipated his coming, but whose prejudices, arising from national pride and false education, prevented a proper recognition of his claims. They had fixed their standard—a human standard—and would receive no person who fell below it. They expected to see a wealthy deliverer—the Savior was poor. They expected pomp and parade. The Savior was humble. They looked for military genius. The Savior had none. They expected royalty. The Savior was of too humble an origin, from too mean a city—too poor. Had too many ignoble companions, discoursed too much about heavenly things to sit with success upon the throne of David. He did not seem to have that magnetic power necessary to unite and enthral Israel and lead them on from conquest to conquest until the kingdoms of this world would be at his feet and swayed

by his mighty sceptre. Their standard was fixed; Jesus of Nazareth did not come up to it, and hence his rejection. "He came to his own and his own received him not." It was the object of his labors to break down these prejudices, and show by the prophets, by miracles, by inimitable instructions, by every honorable and powerful argument, that he was the *Anointed*—the *Shiloh*—the Son of God. This being established, he hoped to conquer the wills and win the hearts of all men.

His life was necessarily a life of great controversy. True, he did not spend time arguing the case as we do; but like a skillful logician he took the shortest route to conviction by proving that *His voice was the voice of God*. It would then follow that his *ipse dixit* was an end to all controversy. True, he frequently made use of the *reductio ad absurdum*; resorted sometimes to the *argumentum ad hominum*, and occasionally gave other specimens of the highest reasoning, yet he mainly labored to establish his authority and inspire respect, by demonstrating that he was Emanuel—God with us—the Son of the Highest—and that therefore, the world must hear and heed without a single demur.

He did not bring conviction to every mind. The eyes of the majority were closed; their ears stopped; their hearts had waxed gross; the God of this world had blinded their minds; their prejudices could not be overcome. The Savior was arraigned, tried, condemned and crucified on account of these deep prejudices and false standards, and because of a consciousness of inability to meet the truth with fair argument. They hoped to crush it by foul means. However, like Sampson, he destroyed more enemies of truth in his death than in his life. He rises triumphantly from the grave, and seeing a world still in ignorance and in sin, commissions his apostles to go into all the world, and by the advocacy of the Holy Spirit convince the world of sin, because they believed not on Christ—of the righteousness of the Savior, because God received him as an innocent and crowned him king of kings—of judgment, because the prince of the world is judged, (*i. e.*, on the principle that if the fountain is condemned, the stream is condemned with it.) He told them to go into *all the world*, preach the gospel to *every* rational person, and that too with the avow-

ed purpose of winning all men to the Savior if possible. This was a great undertaking—a work which could not be accomplished without controversy and agitation. The work was pre-eminently *radical*. The ax was to be laid at the *root* of the great tree of error. These holy men were compelled in their preaching to present principles which had a tendency to destroy the whole system of religion then in vogue. Religion, too, was, at that time, so intimately connected with civil politics, both among Jews and Gentiles, that they could not preach without, to a great extent, revolutionizing civil government. The gospel was so antagonistic to the then existing state of affairs, that the apostles were liable to incur the charges brought against them, such as "*heresy*"—"turning the world upside down"—"*teaching customs unlawful for others to observe,*" &c. They were liable, too, to be arraigned before civil and ecclesiastical dignitaries as the Savior had told them. The Savior had said he came to send a sword, which would turn the nearest and dearest friends against each other. Preaching such a gospel in such circumstances would necessarily produce such results.

Preaching the gospel to *every person*, could not but compel them to meet the Gnostic philosopher—the Platonist—the Judaizer—the speculatist—the materialist—the Pharisee—the Saducee—were heartily disposed and well qualified to dispute every inch of ground to be gained by the standard bearers of the cross. Hence, we find the apostles and evangelists of the New Testament preaching the gospel positively, controverting error, disputing with learned; agitating the people and with the whole armor on, battling bravely for the right. Of course these were stormy, and even bloody times. In the kingdom of nature God sometimes restores the equilibrium by terrific lightnings, terrible hurricanes, awful earthquakes, and fearful volcanic eruptions. Some are frightened, some some injured, and some killed, but the air is purer and *terra firma* a more congenial home as a legitimate result. So in the kingdom of grace—the battle is sometimes severe—controversy high, and agitation fearful; but the end is "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will among men."

A history of many of the controversies which have existed in the Church since its foundation would doubtless be interesting to many readers. I propose at my leisure to introduce some of them. M.

THE
AMERICAN CHRISTIAN
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. II.

CINCINNATI, 1863.

No. 4.

HISTORY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. VIII.

JESUS ATTENDS THE PASSOVER AT JERUSALEM,

And shows his authority in his Father's house, by driving traders and brokers out of the Temple.

The inspired Apostle, John, further informs us, that after Jesus had performed his first public miracle at the wedding in Cana, "he, with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples"—all "went down to Capernaum," which, the reader will remember, is situated on the northwestern shore of the Lake or "Sea of Tiberias." But "they did not stay there many days; for the passover of the Jews was at hand; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." This was about the first of April, or the beginning of the harvest season in Palestine.

This passover, observed by the Jews every year, was a great feast in commemoration of the departure of the children of Israel from Egypt, under Moses. It was a time of offering sacrifices, and a great many cattle and sheep were killed. It was, doubtless, inconvenient for those at a distance to bring cattle and sheep all the way to Jerusalem; and some, perhaps, not being cattle raisers, were compelled to buy sacrifices. Therefore it appears that merchants, or cattle dealers, took occasion to have these animals for sale at the temple.

Jesus, then, coming to the Holy City, "found in the Temple those who sold oxen

and sheep; and doves, and the money-changers sitting. And having made a whip of small cords, he drove all out of the Temple, both the sheep and oxen; and poured out the changer's money, and overthrew the tables; and he said to those who sold doves: "Take these things away from here: do not make my Father's House a house of merchandizing." And his disciples remembered that it is written: "Zeal for thy House consumes me."

Upon this the Jews, answering, said to him: "What sign dost thou show us, seeing thou doest these things?" How astonished the Jews must have been! I sometimes wonder why they did not try to drive him out of the Temple, when, according to their ideas, he must have seemed a great intruder. But they are filled with astonishment, and ask for a sign or miracle to be performed, as evidence of his authority.

"Jesus, answering, said to them: 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'" Astonishing! In great surprise they exclaim: "FORTY-SIX YEARS was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in THREE DAYS?" They thought he meant the great Temple in Jerusalem. "But," says the biographer, John, "he spoke of the Temple of his body," which he knew would be destroyed, or killed, and then raised up again the third day. At this time the disciples understood him no better than the Jews; but after his resur-

rection from the dead, John says, "his disciples remembered that he said this: and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus spoke."

The writer adds: "Now when he was in Jerusalem, at the Passover, on the feast day, many believed on his name, seeing the miracles that he performed. But Jesus did not trust himself to them, because he knew every thing, and had no need that any one should testify of man; for he himself knew what was in man." What a vast number of miracles Jesus must have performed! How many are recorded by the four writers of his biography! and how many are only mentioned incidentally, as above, where the miracles he performed in Jerusalem are alluded to as having convinced many persons that he was the promised Messiah! But he would not trust them; for he knew that it was in the hearts of some to kill him, if he did not prove to be the kind of a Messiah they expected.

It was during this visit to Jerusalem, that Jesus had that memorable

INTERVIEW WITH NICODEMUS.

At that time the Jews were divided into several different sects, of which the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes were the principal. The Pharisees were the most important, while the Sadducees, according to some writers, were "the most ancient of the Jewish sects." (See Horne.) The Essenes, spoken of by Josephus, (Wars, B. II, Chap. 8, Sec. 2.) are not mentioned in the Scriptures; but Josephus describes them as a very pure, and sanctimonious sort of people.

Of the Pharisees, Thomas H. Horne says (Intr. to the study of the Bible, Vol. 2, pp. 144): "The Pharisees were the most numerous and powerful sect of the Jews. * * * They derived their name from the Hebrew verb *Pharash*, (which means) to separate; because they professed an uncommon separation from the apparel and customs of the world to the study of the Law, and an extraordinary devotion to God, and sanctity of life, beyond other

men. Hence, one of them is represented as thanking God that he was *not as other men are.*"

"There was a man of the Pharisees," says John, "named Nicodemus—a ruler of the Jews. The same came to him"—that is, to Jesus—"by night, and said to him: 'Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, unless God be with him.'" It appears that the wonderful miracles which Jesus had been performing in Jerusalem, had excited Nicodemus, who desired to have an interview with the Savior; wishing, no doubt, to learn something more fully about his mission. His coming at night is not positive evidence that he was afraid to come in the daytime. The sacred writer does not accuse him of cowardice. But, wishing to consult him about weighty matters, he sought him when he would not be thronged by a multitude of people.

To the above language of Nicodemus, or to some question which he may have put to the Savior respecting the Reign of Heaven, Jesus replied: "Truly, truly, I say to thee, unless a man is born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Nicodemus is filled with surprise at the significant language of the Savior. He does not understand him, and says to him: "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Jesus answered: "Truly, truly, I say to thee, unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Do not wonder that I said to thee: 'You must be born again.'—The wind blows where it pleases, and thou hearest the sound of it, but canst not tell where it comes from, nor where it goes to. So is every one that is born of the Spirit."

I prefer *wind* to *spirit* here, not because I think myself a better scholar than those brothers in Christ from whom I differ, but because it seems the most natural sense which the original word can be supposed to

have in this place. I have read what some have been pleased to write in favor of rendering this passage, "The Spirit breathes where it pleases;" but must confess that it seems an unnatural rendering. The Spirit is not, in any other place which I remember, said to "breathe where he pleases."—He is said to do many things; but never to *breathe* so far as I recollect. Further, Jesus speaks of hearing "the sound"—of what? Of the Spirit's breathing, or the wind's blowing? But why speak of the operation of the Spirit in this way, and then, as if he had been making a comparison, say: "So is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Does not the Great Teacher's meaning seem to be this: He is aware that Nicodemus is ignorant of spiritual things, and in order to make him understand something of them, he directs his mind to that invisible, yet powerful agent—the atmosphere—and assures him that, as the wind blows where it pleases, and he could hear the sound of it, and observes its effects, without knowing where it came from, or went to,—that is, without perceiving it as a visible object,—so it was with every one born of the Spirit? One who is born of the Spirit is able to hear its teaching and to observe its power, with the assurance that they are the teaching and the power of the Spirit of God, without being able to *see it* or to *know*, by *observation*, where it comes from, or how it operates in the world. This view of the subject does not involve the popular notion about spiritual influences, that the Spirit of God operates in a mysterious way in the conversion of sinners.

It may be that this passage is not fully understood. But that Jesus was making a comparison between these two invisible agents, the wind and the Spirit, in order to make Nicodemus understand the spiritual nature of his Kingdom, seems to me plain and easy to believe.

Nicodemus does not yet understand him, and says: "How can these things be?"—Jesus, answering, says to him: "Art thou a teacher of Israel, and dost not know these

things? Truly, truly, I say to thee, we speak what we know, and testify what we have seen; and you do not receive our testimony. If I have told you earthly things, and you do not believe, how shall you believe if I tell you heavenly things? No one has ascended up into Heaven, but he that came down out of Heaven—the Son of Man, whose [abode] is in Heaven." Here the Teacher speaks of having come down out of Heaven, which, he informs Nicodemus, is the place of his abode. Is not this telling him of heavenly things?—Whether Nicodemus believed him, or not, we are not informed; but Jesus goes on to speak of his mission from God. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whoever believes on him may have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believes on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world might be saved through him.

He that believes on him is not condemned; but he that does not believe has already been condemned, because he has not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgment: light has come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil. For every one who does evil, hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd. But he who does (according to) the truth, comes to the light that his actions may be made manifest as having been performed agreeably to the will of God.

WM. PINKERTON.

SPIRITS IN PRISON.

BRO. FRANKLIN: As you "aim to give wide and liberal range for investigation," please allow me a word in regard to "the spirits in prison."

I agree with your first position, that "the spirits of whom Peter speaks, lived in the time of Noah, and were disobedient while the ark was preparing;" but I cannot endorse your second item, in which you claim that the Spirit of God, and that of Christ, are identical. There may, perhaps, be a sense in which they are the same; that is, allowing spirit to mean *disposition or temper of mind*; but the Spirit of God, as an *entity*, usually called in the Scriptures, the "Holy Spirit," cannot be identical with the *personal spirit* of Christ, for reasons too obvious to require mention here. And as this is the pivot upon which your whole view of the passage is made to turn, you will pardon us for requiring some better proof of it than mere assumption.

Our translators, by rendering the particle (*en*) "by," instead of "in," as in the line preceding, and beginning the word spirit with a capital, have seemed to favor the idea that "the spirit," in the passage, is the Holy Spirit by which Jesus was raised from the dead. But there is nothing in the passage to favor this idea. On the contrary, it furnishes good evidence that "the spirit" referred to was Christ's own personal Spirit; for it is antithetical with "the flesh." If the expression, "the flesh," means Christ's personal flesh, then the expression, "the spirit," means Christ's personal Spirit. There is the same proof of the one as of the other. Our translators had no authority for beginning the word spirit with a capital, and certainly *in* would have been a better translation of the particle *en* than "by." Substituting for the obsolete term "quicken," the word *lived* or *survived*, and we have the following as a fair translation of the passage: "For

Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God: being put to death in the flesh, but survived in the spirit, by which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." The idea is, that Christ was put to death in the flesh, or, as to his *body*, while his *spirit* lived, and went into the spirit-world, and preached to the spirits of the antediluvians then in prison. Where else could *spirits* be except in the spirit-world? Bear in mind that Christ "*went*" as well as "*preached*." Where did he go if not into the spirit-world when he was crucified? Bear in mind also that it was "*Christ*" who preached, not Noah. I do not deny that Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and preached faithfully to the antediluvians of his time. But Peter says nothing about the preaching of Noah in the passage under consideration. He says it was "*Christ*" who did the preaching he refers to. Bear in mind, moreover, that it was to "*spirits in prison*," and not to men and women in the flesh, that the preaching was done. The whole matter may be summed up thus:

1. Christ "*went*" not in the Spirit of God, but in *his own personal spirit*.
2. Not to the old world, but to *the spirit-world*.
3. Not *before* the flood, but *after* his crucifixion.
4. He "*preached*," not *through Noah*, but in *his own spiritual personality*.
5. Not to men and women *in the flesh*, but to *spirits in prison*.

These five points of contrast exhibit the difference between your position and mine, on the subject of the spirits in prison. I cannot resist the conviction that the passage under consideration fairly teaches the doctrine, or establishes the fact, that Christ, after his crucifixion, went in the spirit into the invisible world, and there preached to the spirits of the antediluvians who were disobedient in the days of Noah,

while the ark was preparing. *What* he preached the passage does not declare.— But perhaps a similar passage from the same writer may throw some light upon the subject. 1 Peter iv. 6: "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Here we have a *gospel preached to the dead*. But to the dead in *what sense*, it may be pertinent to enquire? I answer, to the *literally dead*; and my reason is, that they are contrasted with "men in the flesh," and must therefore be men *out of the flesh* or departed spirits. The gospel was preached to such for an object, namely, their reformation, "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but *live according to God in the spirit*." Here then is a *judgment after death*; not a judgment to consign men to an irrevocable doom, sending the righteous to heaven and the wicked to hell, to be happy or miserable to all eternity, but a judgment, *reformatory* in its character, like the judgments inflicted upon men in the flesh, the end whereof is salvation, that they might "*live according to God in the spirit*." I care not where men may be, either in this world or the next; the *locality* is indifferent; if they are brought by the "gospel" and by a discipline of "judgment" to "*live according to God in the Spirit*," they are *saved* in the true Christian sense of the term—are reconciled to God and living in communion with his Spirit.

W. W. CLAYTON.

Auburn, N. Y.

REPLY.

This should have received earlier attention, but, owing to the many things demanding our attention, it could not. The mind of our correspondent is exceedingly fruitful, to discover in one rather obscure expression of Scripture, of an even dozen words, a stupendous system of preaching to spirits in the spirit-world, reformation by judgments, &c! His power of perception is so wonderful that he perceives things in this passage which are not in it

at all. Since he and others are perceiving, or think they are, something in this passage as fine as the discoveries of Popery and Restorationists, long since exploded and defunct, we must follow them and learn from their profound expositions and criticisms. We are a little slow, and can not keep up with young America, specially when he gets on the retrograde movement back towards the Romish theory of delivering souls out of purgatory, or Restorationists, in encouraging men not to repent in this world, with the hope of "another chance" after death. One man tried this theory, in Nashville, a few years ago, and soon found himself fallen. A few young men undertook to teach us some lessons on the influence of the Spirit, several years ago, by which they were sliding back into the anti-scriptural theories exploded by the reformers of forty years ago. These landed overboard and have amounted to nothing since. Several new experiments are now being made, by adventurers, all of the retrograde character. We regret it; but if men will experiment, specially in exploded articles, we cannot help it; they must take the consequences.

We have not our article before us, but recollect no such position, or making no such point, as that "the Spirit of God and that of Christ are identical," nor do we now see any use we could have had for any such position. It is not "by *his* spirit," nor "by spirit," but "by *the Spirit*." It was *the Spirit of God* by which Christ was quickened. It was not the Spirit of Christ that was put to death, nor was Christ revived *in spirit*; but Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened *by the Spirit*," or made alive by the Spirit, or raised from the dead by the Spirit of God. The antithesis is not between *flesh* and *spirit*, but between *death* and a *resurrection from the dead*. It was by the Spirit of God that Christ was quickened, made alive, or raised from the dead, after he was put to death. See the following: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he

that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit, that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11.— Christ was put to death in the flesh. The same that was put to death was quickened, or made alive. It was not the spirit of Christ that was put to death, but the body. The body then, which was put to death, was quickened by the Spirit of God, and he who quickened Christ by his Spirit, "shall also" (as he did the mortal body of Christ) "quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit" (the Spirit of God) "that dwells in you." Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit of God, by which Spirit of God he also went and preached to the spirits in prison.

But before we proceed, we have another little matter for our correspondent, as he is fond of something a little novel as well as learned. We should like to know what quickening, reviving, or making Christ alive *in spirit*, means! Quickening means making alive. Did Christ die in spirit? This subject needs a little light. We are perfectly aware that the Greek preposition *en*, should, in many instances, be translated *in*; but it is equally true that, in many instances, it should be translated *by*. The rule is, that where it indicates *place*, it should be translated *in*, but where it indicates *agency*, it should be translated *by*. In the expression, "quickenened by the Spirit," "by," in the common version, is from *en*. Does *en*, in this instance, indicate the *agency* by which Christ was quickened, or the *place* in which he was quickened? The reading is not, as we have before shown, "by his spirit," nor "by spirit," but "by the Spirit." The passage does not mean that he was "quickenened *in* the spirit," implying that the spirit was the *place* where Christ was quickened; but he "was quickened *by* the Spirit," implying that the Spirit was the *agent* by which he was quickened. God quickened him by the Spirit, by which also he will quicken our mortal bodies.

It is worthy of notice, that our correspondent has no use for the definite article, in this passage. He throws it out entirely.

With his theory of revival *in spirit*," he has no use for the article "the." But it is not "revival *in spirit*," but made alive *by the Spirit*. It is, then, the Spirit of God by which Christ was raised from the dead, that is mentioned here, and by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison. Filling up the ellipsis, the passage will read as follows: "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which (Spirit) he also went and preached to the spirits in prison." There is nothing about his going *personally*, or *in person*, but "by the Spirit," and that the Spirit of God.

What puts it into the mind of our correspondent that this preaching was done between the death and resurrection of Christ? There is not an intimation of the kind in the whole passage. This is simply assumed, or inferred, without anything to infer it from. This theory stands then simply without one scrap of evidence.— Are we, then, called on for evidence that this preaching was done in the days of Noah while the ark was being prepared? We, then, give the following:

I. We have proved that Christ did this preaching by the Spirit of God.

II. Gen. vi. 3, the Lord says: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." This proves that the Spirit of God did strive with man while the ark was being built.

III. We have no account of any preaching from God, without employing human speech through which to convey it to man. This leads us to look for the visible agent through whom this preaching was done.

IV. We find Noah a preacher of righteousness, at the time the preaching was done, and among the very persons to whom it was done.

V. The disobedience was in the days of Noah, and certainly the disobedience was at the time when the law of the Lord was laid before them in the preaching.

VI. The long-suffering of God waited at the same time, and not thousands of years after, while another dispensation was offered them "in the spirit world."

This put together amounts to this: Christ went, by the Spirit of God, which inspired Noah, and through him did strive with the people, by preaching to them, while the long-suffering of God waited, during their disobedience, in the time of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, but they were in prison when Peter wrote. The import of the passage is, "by which also he went and preached to the spirits who *are in prison*." The preaching was not done in prison, and if they had obeyed the preaching, they would not have been put in prison. The same idea is found in 1 Peter iv. 6: "For, for this cause *was the gospel preached to them that are dead*." It *was* preached, in the time of Noah, that they might be judged according to men in the *flesh*, but they *are now dead*. They are called "spirits," because separate from their bodies when Peter spoke of them; but they were in their bodies in the time of Noah, when they were disobedient, and when the long-suffering of God waited.

B. F.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

SHILOH, O., Oct. 3, 1863.

ELDER LORD:

Dear Sir:—Your second and third articles are now before me, and demand some attention at this time, although the points may be brought up again, at their proper time. I had intended to devote the present article to the subject mentioned in my last,—man's relation to God and the cause of sin. But as there is a difference between us upon two fundamental principles, I must, in justice to myself and cause, revert to them, and see whether or not your objections are valid. The first principle is the foreknowledge of God. If I understand your language, you both affirm and deny this attribute of God. In your article of

July 25th, you use this language: "That He *foreknew all his own works* from the beginning—that he made ample and suitable provision for the finale, I have no doubt." The italics are your own. In my last article, No. 5, I noticed this admission on your part, of God's foreknowledge, and received this point as being established.—You may judge that I was somewhat surprised, when in your next article, of Aug. 19th, I read the following language, quoting a proposition of mine, which you number "2nd":—"That God comprehended and founded this plan, in all its magnitude and minutæ, and *foreknew all things concerning it from the beginning*." In regard to this proposition, you speak as follows: "You will pardon me, but the truth demands that I should object to this proposition."

Both propositions involve the foreknowledge of God. One you affirm, but the other you deny. I am at a loss to understand you, and will, therefore, leave the matter until you define your position upon this attribute of God—whether God FOREKNEW and COMPREHENDED, in all its particulars, His creative plan from the beginning.

The second point or principle upon which we differ is: Does man's intelligence depend upon the superior organization of his brains. Now, this proposition, confined to man, in which sense I used it, and in which sense I presume you received it, I do most emphatically affirm. You, however, have objected to it in the following words: "If, however, you affirm that the muscle called the brain was or is necessary to the development of intelligence, I shall deny."

The first principles of mind, intellect, or what you please to call it, embracing man's understanding, prove that conceives, judges and reasons is a very obscure thing to reason upon. The first principles of mind are really beyond the grasp of man's own mind. We know of it but by its effects, and from these only can we reason. We further know that it is that immortal principle within us which knows no death nor decay—the principle that so distinguishes us from the brute creation, and which requires a so

much larger brain for its development, and the principle which so closely relates us to God.

Intelligence, or mind, first originated in the Deity, and He imparted a portion to each individual. God's intelligence is *infinite*, and that of man but *finite*. Whether God possesses a *brain* or not, I do not know, and I presume that you will not venture an opinion upon the matter. But a few things we do know, which belong to this subject, viz.: that man possesses a brain and a mind, and that the mind cannot exist *without* the brain, and that when the brain is diseased, the mind is impaired.

In all kindness, let me say that if I can understand your language, when you say, "that the muscle called the brain was or is not necessary to the development of intelligence" in man, you array yourself against the best physiological authors.

The brain I do not believe to be the origin of mind, any more than I believe the ear to be the origin of sound, or the eye of light; but the ear develops sound for the purpose of hearing, the eye light, for the purpose of seeing, and the brain mind, for the purpose of intellection,—thinking, reasoning, etc., etc.

That the brain is for the development and use of the mind, let us look at a few facts. Why is it that, in the highest animals, the *brain*, compared with the spinal cord and nerves, is but as 4 to 1, while in man, it is as 23 to 1? The reason is very plain,—the animal had no mind for the brain to develop and use, and, therefore, the brain would be useless. But, on the other hand, man was endowed with a mind, and would require a brain of its present size. If not, why encumber man with a useless appendage? It is another physiological fact, that our most intellectual men have possessed large brains. The infant, in the beginning of its life, manifests but little intelligence, if any, although it has the principles of a mind within it.—These principles of mind, I contend, are perfect, but lie dormant, until such a time when the brain becomes developed enough to exercise them. I need not mention how

the mind progresses with the body, from childhood to maturity, for the fact is patent to all.

The mind cannot be developed without the brain. Witness the idiot, whose brain is deficient; the man whose intellect has been destroyed by disease or injury of the brain; and the aged man, whose mind has failed, and brought upon him what is expressly called a second childhood, from the brain failing with the rest of the body as age advances.

These remarks I think are sufficient to establish the position I have taken.

With a few more remarks, I will close my present article, and await your reply.

My remarks are in reference to the facts, or witnesses, as you style them, which I brought forth to prove that creation is the work of one almighty, intelligent, and unlimited Designer, and that this Designer formed it after a definite plan, which was foreknown and present with Him from the beginning, and in which plan all things are executed as God designed they should, and foreknew they would be. In reviewing these facts, you say that if I merely use them for the above purpose, you "heartily concur in them;" if, however, "I offer such evidence to prove that God (or what is equivalent to it, the law of God) has never been thwarted in any instance," I "will allow you" to differ with me. This, as I have said before, is the rock upon which we split. I contend that God has created no being that can thwart His purpose—you contend He has—and that this being is man, and him alone, the last and best of his works.

What is it to *thwart* God? To frustrate or defeat Him. Can a *finite being* defeat the *Infinite One*? When the *Infinite Being* has created myriads of intelligences for happiness, can a finite being frustrate this purpose, and send the great majority of them to regions of endless misery and unutterable woes for one? I cannot believe it.

In closing your last article, you say your remarks will not demand my attention until met in the course of regular argument. I like to keep the rubbish cleared up and my

way unobstructed. The objections I have noticed in this, I thought demanded attention at this time. I will proceed with the regular argument as fast as I can, and do my subject the justice its importance demands.

Your truly, G. L. PURDY.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

ART. IV.

LA PORTE, Oct. 27, 1863.

DR. G. L. PURDY :

Dear Sir,—Your article, No. IV., now lies before me, and it requires an answer from me. 1st. I will direct your attention to a mistake or a misconception on your part. In your review of my article, (under date, of July 25th, 30th), you say: "I am glad to hear you confess that the vehement preaching of 'hell fire,' 'the worm that never dieth,' 'burned in a lake of fire and brimstone,' and other terms of similar import, *are not necessary* to frighten the sinner into their systems of 'human contrivance,' nor are they necessary to reform the world." Now, my dear sir, if you will read my article, from which you make such quotation, you will discover your error. It reads as follows: "I regret, as much as you do, that the words, 'burned in a lake of fire and brimstone,' etc., were used by 'untaught' men to frighten, and that they are still used to frighten timid men and women into hysteria." Again, "If future punishment has sometimes been disproportionately presented by 'orthodox preachers,' to warn and frighten the sinner into their systems of human contrivance, you will not ask me to defend their wild imagery." You will have the candor, my dear sir, to acknowledge the correction, for nothing can be clearer than my meaning. Instead of its reading and meaning that

these things "*were not necessary*" to frighten men into their "systems of human contrivance," it inferentially reads and means that they "*were and are necessary*" to frighten both men and women into these human systems, and I sometimes seriously question whether these systems would have had an existence to-day, had it not been for such declamation or preaching. While I am satisfied, and feel compelled to acknowledge the pernicious results of such teaching to moralize the world, still I feel it imperative upon me to affirm and maintain a well established principle—a principle acknowledged by Paul and by all the ablest Christian jurists in the world, *that law should not only be remuneratory but vindicatory*. I am desirous that ye have a proper understanding of my ideas in regard to the above mentioned matter, and thinking you might have been a little careless in reading my articles, I deemed it prudent to say this much.

2nd. I will now introduce another subject which, perhaps, might be omitted in this article; but fearing that a controversy may hereafter arise, I mention it to avoid all such discussion. You say, "I have not disputed the attributes affirmed by you of God." If you mean by this that I have not disputed that which you affirmed of the creative power of God, then I can assure you that your affirmation is correct. But if you mean that I have not made any objection to your position in regard to the foreknowledge of God, you can easily disabuse your mind of such a mistake by reading my article, No. II., dated Aug. 19.

You will, in kindness, allow me the privilege of recapitulating. In your first article, dated June 29th, you introduce your subject in a general manner, and in rather a declamatory style make some affirmations as follows: "Deity stands as the cause, creator, and ruler of the universe, and in whose realms *exists no rival or dictator*. Knowing *all things* from the beginning He has created them as he designed them to be—*for He holdeth all power in his own hand, and there never has existed a being,*

whether he be man or angel, arch-angel or devil, who has had the power to change or to thwart any of His plans and operations. There is nothing that now exists that God did not see and provide for; and, from the characteristic attributes of God, there is nothing that now exists that was not for the best—*sin not excepted, etc.*

In the second article, you developed and summed up, in part, the elements of the above declamation, and I then entered my objections against a part of your positions, which you will find in Article II.

Your summing up reads as follows:—"That God comprehended and founded this plan, in all its magnitude and minutiae, and foreknew *all things* concerning it from the beginning—from the smallest atom to the final destiny of man," etc. I read and re-read this general summary, and made the following objections in the following words, deeming it both opportune and prudent to do so: "*You will pardon me—but the truth demands that I should object to this proposition.*" These are the words of my objection.

You will please understand me now. I do not object to the fact that God has a *creative attribute*, but I do object to your declaration that God has no rival or dictator in his realms, if you offer the latter as proof of God's attribute, or if you offer such declaration as proof of your proposition.

My greatest desire, my dear sir, is that I should be understood by you. You say, "That I agree with you *that God foreknew all things from the beginning.*" Now, if you will read the article with more care you will find the following language: "That this plan is perfect, I believe, etc. That He *foreknows all his own work* from the beginning—that He has made ample and suitable provision for the finale I have no doubt." Now, sir, you can see the difference between the declaration, "God foreknew *'all things'* from the beginning"—which is current Scripture with the orthodox, and the declaration, "God *foreknows all his 'own works'* from the beginning,"

which is current Bible Scripture. I will further elucidate this matter. I will make your affirmation and deduction, and then my own, in order to show the difference in the two propositions.

"God foreknew *all things* from the beginning." All the sins of mankind are *things*; therefore, God foreknew all the sins of mankind. This is a logical conclusion from the premises.

I will now state the Bible propositions of foreknowledge, in reference to Adam, the first man, and his first sin, which will be sufficient for the present purpose. "God foreknows all his *own works* from the beginning. Adam's, or man's first sin, *was not the work of God*; therefore, it cannot be logically and sylogistically affirmed that God foreknew it, as it is only affirmed that he foreknows his own works, *and not man's works*, from the beginning." But you will say, the Bible declares that "God foreknew *all things* from the beginning." Permit me to say, that the declaration cannot be found in any version of the Bible with which I am acquainted; nor do I believe it can be found in any correct version of the Bible now extant—if it can, you will give me the chapter and verse. You will then ask: Did not God design that Adam should sin, and did not Adam, in sinning, do as God designed? This is your affirmation, in your first article, and in the last paragraph in my first article, in general terms, I objected to it, as well as the declaration, that man, angel, archangel, or devil, has not, nor never had the power to thwart the plans and operations of God.

I have a few more thoughts upon this subject, and will state them as concisely and clearly as possible. While I affirm and maintain with you, that God, as Creator, and in exhibition of his creative power, planned, executed and completed the material universe, by the force of law adapted to reach such end, and now controls it by the force of law ordained and adapted to meet the requirements of such universe of matter—still, my dear sir, although he has thus created it, and now controls it, and in

generalization his design has not been thwarted, so far as the union of matter is concerned, I am far from believing and affirming that *his will or design has never been thwarted in the creation and government of the intellectual universe*. The distinction between matter and mind is too wide to be overlooked by you or me. If you will carefully analyze your last paragraph in your first article, under date of June 29th, you will discover a sophism you have fallen into, in reference to the attributes of God. This fallacy, into which you have been precipitated, is the result, no doubt, of the faultiness of the system you advocate, or the influence of erroneous instruction, impressed upon your mind by orthodox preachers, commentators, and the mass of human creeds, are the several causes combined. You say "that God either designed Adam to sin, or he did not so design him. If God did design Adam to sin, it was in accordance to his will, and was for the best interests of the human race, and therefore fully provided for, leaving God still a perfect being. If God did not design Adam to sin, then Adam sinned contrary to the will of God, and therefore *was superior to God*, thus making God imperfect, for he has created a being which he *cannot* control, limiting his power in this respect." Your sylogistic reasoning is based upon the attribute of perfection, and your hypothesis is, that God himself being *perfect*, therefore he can create nothing *imperfect*.

Your attention is now demanded to this point: Does it follow, my dear sir, because a man is an expert mechanist, and *can* make and finish a piece of mechanism perfectly, like a nicely constructed and well finished watch, that he *cannot* make a poor and an imperfect piece of mechanism, or that he *cannot* make a poor and imperfect watch? If a mechanist *can* make a perfect piece of machinery, he certainly *can* make an imperfect one. Now, sir, apply this reasoning to God's attribute of perfectness, and if God *can* construct a machine perfect in all its parts, no rational man would like to assume that God *cannot* construct an im-

perfect piece of mechanism. Nor does it follow, because the architect has constructed a machine, however perfect or imperfect it may be, that such piece of mechanism is superior to the architect or constructor.—Nor does it follow, because human governments make laws to govern the citizen, and the citizen disobeys the laws, that the citizen is superior to the government. Nor does it follow, because Adam, the creature, transgressed the law that God ordained for him to obey, that Adam, the creature, with all his imperfections, is superior to God, his Creator. Permit me to say, in all Christian kindness, that it will not stand the test of a logical analysis, to reason in this way, because a piece of machinery is imperfect, therefore, its author could not have been perfect; or because a piece of mechanism is imperfect, that it is superior to the mechanist; or, because we have men in our State who transgress the law, that our legislators were not perfect, or that such transgressors of the law are superiors of the State government,—any more than it will stand the test of a logical analysis to reason: because man transgressed the law of God, that he is superior to God, or that God, the Law-giver, is imperfect. God may be perfect in all his attributes; he may make a perfect or imperfect law, and man may transgress his law—still it does not challenge the perfectness of God's attributes, nor the perfectness of his law, nor his superiority. When, with a master hand, you grapple with these matters, I will give them all the attention they demand. I will now direct your attention to another matter. You have stated "that God created a being that he could not control, therefore he has limited his own power." I studied upon this matter for some time, and hesitated to answer it until fully developed. I will, however, state, if you should affirm that God has no power to limit his own power, that I shall object to such affirmation.

Now, sir, I have noted carefully the objections made in my first and second articles, and called your attention to that which I conceived to be a sophism in your funda-

mental proposition and deduction. If I have misconceived any point in your promise, or in your deduction, or if I have misconstrued any matter, you will please note it, and I will cheerfully retract and correct such matter. You probably did not have my article, No. 2, before you, when you wrote your article No. 4; hence the mistakes made in reference to my objections. The two last paragraphs, in article No. 4, I will carefully examine, and I will answer such parts as I deem necessary.

Accept my assurance of kind Christian regard for your welfare, and permit me to subscribe myself

Your well-wisher,
M. N. LORD.

POWER OF THE GOSPEL.

"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."—Rom. i: 16.

The apostle, in writing to the brethren at Rome, had to adapt his arguments to the prevailing errors, opinions and practices of the Roman Church. The church, being built out of both Jewish and Gentile materials, was in continual commotion.—The Jew, although he had believed and obeyed the gospel, was still contending for the law and the tradition of the Fathers. Abraham was yet claimed as their father, and circumcision as an obligatory ordinance to be imposed upon both Jews and Gentiles. The Jew, thus boasting over the Gentile; and the Gentile, probably, claiming his privilege of favor through his previous ignorance, kept the church at Rome in a vacillating and unrighteous condition.—The Apostle, in view of all these facts, and being in possession of the true condition of the church at Rome, assumed, at once,

the grand proposition to which he intended to bring both Jew and Gentile: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." To this the Jew must come, and also the Gentile. It is written, says the Apostle, "The just by faith, shall live." This being true, the power of the gospel unto salvation consists in the fact that, "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed by faith, in order to faith." The Apostle then shows, that neither Judaism nor Heathenism have any claims for justification by faith. He proves both under sin, and as having come short of the glory of God. The Jew, after all his boast in the law, circumcision, the Oracles of God, and the tradition of the fathers; and the Gentile, after all his boast of ignorance and gods made with hands, must both come to the gospel of Christ in order to justification and peace with God, through the Lord Jesus Christ. Neither Jew nor Gentile, the one under law, the other given over to vile lust, had, previous to the gospel, been under a system of faith.

The power of God unto salvation, therefore, is not in the law by Moses, nor in the claim of being a fleshly child of Abraham by circumcision, for neither requires faith as a principle of action. Neither is this power in gods of man's invention, nor the general platform of ignorance, for heathenism is not of faith, neither those who do heathenism can live by heathenism. Still, it has been written, "The just by faith, shall live." What is it, then, that contains this principle? The Gospel of Christ. And why? Because "therein is the righteousness of God by faith revealed," or therein—the Gospel—the justification of man by God is revealed, upon the principle of man's faith. Here, and here only, upon a principle of faith, not flesh, law, nor ignorance, man finds remission of sins, justification and peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ. The Gospel, then, is based upon the principle which is written, "The just by faith, shall live." It is the revelation of the justification of man by

faith, and contains the wisdom, will, love, mercy, and long-suffering of God for man's salvation from sin. But, lest we be accused of too much conformity to modern revivalism, we will define what the Gospel of Christ is. It is apparent to every sensible mind, that the very nature of Apostle's affirmation requires an answer to the question: What is the Gospel of Christ? Paul considered the Romans in possession of this matter, hence he did not, like he did to the Corinthians, deem it necessary to elaborate this point to the Romans. It is the great misfortune of modern preachers, to excite the passions, exhort and cry, and use more physical than intellectual power to convince the people that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and, after they have done all their preaching, a man, like the young man at Sunday School, is as liable to say, "Mr. Genesis" wrote the first book of Moses as any one else. The Gospel of Christ is plainly stated by Paul to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xv. This being the Gospel, the Apostle's affirmation in Romans, in substance, would be as follows:—For I am not ashamed to proclaim "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"—"for in it the justification of God by faith is revealed, in order to faith;" as it is written, "Now the just by faith, shall live." Power is a term expressive of "force, strength, influence, faculty of doing, state, legal authority," &c.

The Gospel, therefore, is the force, strength, influence, or legal authority of God unto man's salvation from sin and its effects. This power is exerted in, and through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and comprehends the moral, spiritual, and physical power of God unto man's salvation. Moral and physical power, however, are but two effects of spiritual power. Spiritual power is the one power of God, which is known in its moral and physical effects. The spiritual power of

God unto man's salvation, in the effect of moral and physical force, is expended in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. His physical power, in the Gospel itself, is seen in the effect of miracles, signs and wonders, in attestation of His Son's mission, and, above all, in "the mighty power" He wrought when He raised Christ again from the dead. In those physical demonstrations, also, is exemplified the future "mighty (physical) power" which will be wrought in the resurrection of the dead, and the glorification of the Saint's animal bodies. This comprehends the ultimate or final salvation of man.—But there is a "seed" before a germ, and it is necessary that the seed should be sound and not faulty. The seed (animal body) that is planted by death, will, when raised, be in its own "rank"—have its own germ. Hence there will be a *rank* or order of germs among resurrected bodies.

This rank and order will not be the effect of physical causes or physical power, but will be the effect of the moral nidus, in which the embryo formed its terrestrial mould. This resolves upon the "deeds done in the (seed) body." If the deeds are evil, and so continue till the "seed" is planted, the germ will be, when raised, of the same kind, state, rank or order. The whole Book of God is in conformity to the fact that, if God makes man happy hereafter, He must make him holy in this life, or have him holy in this life. This state of holiness is the effect of obedience to the Gospel of Christ, actuated by faith; for salvation is predicated of "every one that believeth" *only*. Hence the Gospel of Christ, in respect to salvation from sin, has no power of God in it, physical or moral, for the salvation of "every one that" *does not* believe. There is, then, something in belief as well as the Gospel, to reach the power of God unto salvation.

The question now is, What power does God put forth in this life, to make man believe, obey, and become holy? The answer is, the Gospel power—go and proclaim "that Christ died for our sins according to

the Scriptures: and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures:" "he that believeth and is immersed, (obeys,) shall be saved—have his past sins forgiven, and become a prospective heir of Christ—a child of God, a saint, a Christian, &c.; but he that believeth not, shall not be saved—have his past sins forgiven—but shall be condemned. The Gospel thus proclaimed, read or understood, with the motive of "Eternal Life" to those who believe and obey, is all the influence, force, strength, spiritual or moral, that God performs upon man's body, soul, or spirit in this life, in order to man's salvation. The power of the Gospel, therefore, in respect to "present salvation," is strictly moral, and *only* moral. But, says some one, I cannot see such strong moral power in the Gospel as thus to control my mind.

Let us, then, more closely examine the facts which constitute the Gospel. The first fact presented in the Gospel, is DEATH. Is there power in death? or does death produce a moral effect upon the living? Behold the hand of death! The animal and vegetable kingdoms alike bow to the monster death. The mighty leviathan, though he ploughs the mighty deep, and defies the power of his enemies, must finally be still in death—no escape! Even the lark, which soars beyond the limit of human vision to view the bright luminary of heaven, is pursued by the monster death; and its little body, so supple and fleet, finally becomes the food of worms. And man—yes, the mighty man, where shall he flee to avoid death? Past generations are swept away by death. Individuals and families are yet dying around us. Scarce do we find one over three score and ten. Yet all the wisdom of past ages, and the boasted intelligence of the present, have failed to find an antidote to mortality.—There is no "balm in Gilead"—no medicine to prevent "mine eyes closing in death," my body being removed, and lie buried in earth. Then, is there no power in death? But this is not the death in the Gospel—

no, but it is the death of the Lord Jesus Christ—God's only Son. He died for our sins, although He was in the form of God, thinking it no robbery to be equal with God; but He took upon Himself the form of a servant, made Himself of no reputation, became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Yes, He died a miraculous death! Nature sympathizes with His dying groans. And when He gave up the Spirit and cried, "It is finished," nature burst forth with sympathetic commotion. The sun, from the sixth to the ninth hour, was clothed in darkness. The earth, rocks, graves, and temple made known the mighty struggle. Then, as to the *power* of God in the death of Jesus, to control the intelligence of man, we say, in the language of Jesus Himself, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The next fact in the Gospel, is a BURIAL. How solemn to behold that lifeless lump of clay, folded in its white costume, and placed in its coffin! Behold those friends marching to the last resting place of that pale form! See their tears! and, when the clods commence sounding on the vault, hear the last involuntary gush come forth, "Farewell, dear child, till the resurrection morn!" Then, is there no power in a burial? But this is not the burial in the Gospel—no, it is the burial of the Lord Jesus Christ—God's only Son. His body was enveloped in linen, and laid in a sepulchre hewn in stone. The next, or last fact in the Gospel, is a RESURRECTION. What a scene it will be in that great day, when the "last trump" shall sound, and the sea, death and hades give up the dead which are in them! Behold all nations, kindred, tongues, and people who have left their earthly bed, stand before the throne of God! What a demonstration of power! Then, is there no power in a resurrection? But this is not the resurrection in the Gospel—no, it is the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ—God's only Son. The great stone rolls from His sepulchre; angels visit His resting place; light and immortality springs

forth, and Jesus is coronated KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. Is not this a demonstration of power? Finally, to those who cannot see the moral power of the Gospel in these great facts, who cannot be brought to faith and repentance, and finally, to obedience by all the solemn powers of death, burial, and resurrection which awaits the future of all living, and love of God, exemplified in the death, burial, and resurrection of His only Son,—"for oursins according to the Scriptures," must be, to all intents and purposes, beyond the reach of the power of God unto salvation. His physical power, not a preached gospel, is their only hope.

W BAKER.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

NO. III.

For the sake of convenience, we will arrange the third class of Bro. Daugherty's questions as we did in previous instances. That is, we shall state each question by itself immediately preceding the answer, to save printing the questions twice and yet to have them connected with the answers. This is of the more importance as the answers, in some instances, are lengthy.

QUESTION I.

"Is the written word all the Spirit from the Lord we are to receive in our time?"

ANSWER.

We have no use for the prefix, "written," to the word of God. We have no unwritten word of God, or traditions, as the Romanis's have. There is no word of God that we know anything about that is not written. The word of God is in the Bible and no where else. This word of God is not only not "all the Spirit from the Lord we are to receive in our time," but it is not "the Spirit from the Lord" at all, any

more than the word of Bro. Daugherty is Bro. Daugherty himself. The word of God is the word of Christ, the word of the Spirit and word of the apostles. The word is from God, as its author, brought to the world by Christ, and delivered to the apostles, and addressed to man by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who spoke through the apostles. It is called the word of God, because it is from him, as the author. It is the word of Christ, because he, as God's apostle, brought it from heaven and delivered it to his original twelve apostles. It is the word of the Spirit, because Jesus told the apostles that it should not be them who spoke, but the Holy Spirit should speak in them, and he accordingly inspired them with the Spirit, who brought all things to their remembrance and spoke through them. It is the word of the apostles because it was spoken by them. Still, the word is not the Spirit at all, and the Spirit is not the word. The word is the sword of the Spirit, and not the Spirit itself. The word is the medium, or means through which the Spirit communicates the intelligence to the human understanding, the truth, or considerations which induce man to turn to the Lord. Still, neither the word nor the intelligence communicated through the word, is the Spirit itself, but the word of the Spirit, containing intelligence from the Spirit. The power of God, of Christ, the Spirit and the apostles, is put forth through the gospel to turn man to God. Hence this gospel of God, of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the apostles, is called the power of God to salvation to every one who believes.

The power of God exercised in turning man to God and saving him, is in the gospel, put forth through it and brought to bear on man for his salvation in preaching. But receiving the gospel, believing it, being turned and saved by it, is not receiving the Spirit. Atter man hears what God says, through Christ, by the Spirit, in the word preached by the apostles, believes it, is turned to God and saved by it, or receives remission of sins, he has the promise that

he shall receive the Spirit. The promise is not that he shall receive the word of the Spirit, for that he must receive before he can come to Christ at all. It is not that he shall receive a holy disposition of mind, a calm and serene temper, or the influence of the Spirit, but "the Spirit." "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Father, Father." See Gal. iv. 6. "But if the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he who raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." See Rom. viii. 11. "And we are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them who obey him." See Acts v. 32.—This, we take it, is not the supernatural gift of the Spirit, or power to work miracles, but that which is common to all Christians; the indwelling of the Spirit, producing the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, &c. If any man inquires *how* the Spirit dwells in the Christian, or the philosophy of this indwelling, we can only say, that we cannot tell how the human spirit dwells in the body, *how* it is separated from the body, or exists separate from the body, but we can believe the facts that the human spirit dwells in the body, is separated from it at death and exists separate from it after death. We know that the body cannot live without the spirit, though we do not know precisely what office the spirit performs, or how it keeps the body alive. Equally true, we believe it to be, that the Christian cannot live without the Spirit of God, though we may not be able to tell how the Spirit dwells in us, how it gives us Spiritual life, or precisely what it does for us.—God dwells in his people and they dwell in him. So Christ dwells in the saints and they in him, but to tell all about *how*, or the philosophy of this indwelling, is what we do not attempt. Facts we must receive, whether we understand them or not. Philosophy we only receive so far as we understand it. We confidently believe that God exists, but *how* the self-existent and unorigi-

inated One exists, no man of intelligence will undertake to explain. We confidently believe that the Spirit of God exists; that he entered the apostles and inspired them; but *how* he exists, or entered and inspired men, employed their vocal organs and spoke through them, sensible men do not undertake to explain. We believe the Spirit of God dwells in the saints, from clear statements of Scripture, but to explain all about *how*, what he performs and *how* he performs it, we leave for some being who knows vastly more than we do.

QUESTION II.

"Does the Spirit operate upon, or influence men by any other law, or in any other sense, than through the Word, as I may operate on a distant friend through an epistle.

REPLY.

This question needs some limitations, definition and explanation before an intelligent answer can be given. If the question should be explained, as we do not suppose was intended, to mean, "Does the Spirit operate on, or influence men" to prophesy, speak by inspiration, do miracles, &c., we answer, that he may do so in some other way "than through the word," though we cannot explain *how* any more than we can explain *how* any other miracle was performed. If the question be explained, as we again do not suppose was intended, to mean, "Does the Spirit operate on, or influence" Christians "by any other law, or in any other sense than through the word," we answer, that there is no law of God but the word, and that we do not know that the Spirit does not operate on Christians or influence them in any other way except through the word, and therefore, do not affirm this negative ground, or *what we do not know*. We know that the Spirit does operate on, and influence Christians by the word, or they would not be commanded to "hear what the Spirit says to the churches." This we may affirm. We know further, that if the Spirit does operate on, and influence Christians in any other way than through the word, that that is *his*

work and not *ours*, and that he will do his work without our theories in reference to it as well as with them. But the operation, or influence put forth through the word, depends on human agency, or *our work*, and we should attend promptly to *our part*; that which the Lord has appointed for *us to do and do it*; and we need have no fear that the Spirit will not do his work all right, whether we understand how he does it, or precisely what he does or does not.

But if the question be explained, as we suppose was intended, to mean, "Does the Spirit operate on, or influence" the sinner, to turn him to God, in any other way than through the word, or through the gospel, we do not affirm the negative proposition, that *he does not*. But if any man shall affirm that the Spirit, in turning the sinner to the Lord, does operate on, or influence him, in any other way than through the word, *we deny it*. But, up to this date, we do not now remember that any man of note, character and ability, in any controversy, has affirmed this, or anything equivalent. We have never succeeded in finding a single man of note and influence who would affirm anything of the kind. This we can but note; that during all the vaunting, foaming and denouncing; while all the fulminations, misrepresentations and anathemas have been issuing forth against us, touching this question of the Spirit operating any other way on the sinner to turn him to God than through the word, not a man of note has been found who will affirm that the Spirit operates in any other way than through the word, define that *other way* and try to prove it. We affirm that the Spirit operates through the word, in turning sinners to the Lord. No body denies it. Where is the man who will affirm that he operates in some other way, define that *other way* and undertake to prove it? Not a man of intelligence, standing and influence will do this. No; in every debate, so far as we now recollect, held between Disciples and others, on this subject, the Disciples have been compelled to place themselves in a logical disadvantage

or have no debate, by affirming a negative—that the Spirit *does not* operate in any other way than through the word, instead of their opponents affirming that the Spirit *does* operate in some other way. We must tie our hands behind our backs, and then give the champions of orthodoxy one-third of the distance start in the race, or they will not run at all! Why will not these vaunting champions of orthodoxy come up to the work like men of honor, and affirm this darling pet item of orthodoxy; this, with them, vital point, that the Spirit, in turning sinners to the Lord, *does operate in some other way than through the word*?—They believe it, preach it, sing it, incorporate in their prayers, in their newspapers, tracts, books, private conversations and Sunday-school teaching; but when it comes to the point, they will not affirm it in debate. Why will they not hold one fair debate on this subject? Why will they not debate on this subject unless we give them the advantage by affirming a negative? Certainly he who believes the Spirit does operate in some other way, in turning the sinner to God, preaches it, sings it and prays it, ought, in debate, to affirm it, and try to prove it, if he desires any body to believe it, or even to believe him sincere.

We write not thus for Bro. Daugherty's sake, as it is certainly not applicable to him, but for many others whom we are thankful thus to reach.

QUESTION III.

"If the Holy Spirit is not directly given to any person now, why are we taught to pray for it, to be filled with it, and that it helps our infirmities, and bears witness that we are the children of God?"

REPLY.

This question is considerably mixed up. The first part of the question has been answered in answering a previous question, and serving as a premise in this, is thus set aside. The Spirit is given to the children of God now—to "them who obey him." The latter part of the question, or the argumentative part, evidently arises from a misapprehension of the import of

the words, "the Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." The Spirit bearing witness, is the Spirit bearing, or giving *testimony*. This testimony is to prove a proposition. The proposition is, that "we are the children of God." There are two assumptions implied in this question, neither of which can be admitted. 1. That this testimony of the Spirit is *not in words*; for no one believes that the Spirit, now, directly from heaven, in words, testifies that we are the children of God. 2. That this testimony of the Spirit is *not in the Bible*. The testimony of the Spirit, bearing on the proposition, that we are the children of God, is in the Bible and in words—the words of the Spirit, uttered through the apostles. This testimony of the Spirit, set forth by the apostles, shows the process through which we must pass to become the children of God—the precise steps to be taken and the conditions to be complied with. This testimony makes out one part of the case.—Still, it does not complete the case. It does prove that we are the children of God. We want another witness, to testify that we have gone through this process, taken the steps necessary to become the children of God. Our own spirit testifies that we have done this, and thus the joint testimony of the witnesses prove the complete proposition that we are the children of God. The testimony of the Spirit, through the apostles, shows the faith, repentance, confession and immersion required to become a child of God, and our own spirit bears witness, or testimony *with* the Spirit that we have the faith, repentance, confession, and immersion, and thus makes out the complete case, establishes the proposition that we are the children of God.

If a direct operation, or influence of the Spirit, or a direct gift of the Spirit, brings the evidence, or proof that we are the children of God, then, the proof, or evidence is a *direct, immediate and new revelation from God!* The evidence that we are the children of God is not in the Bible at all!

This is a new thing; that the evidence that a man is a child of God, is not in the Bible, but a new and direct revelation! This brings us to a new issue, which may be stated as follows: Is the evidence that we are the children of God in the Bible?—Stated in this way, we affirm. It might be stated as follows: Is the evidence that we are children of God in an immediate, direct and new revelation from God? Stated thus we deny. The testimony of the Spirit, through the apostles, is reliable, but all these professed new testimonies from the Spirit are doubtful. We do not believe in any new revelations. Abraham said to the rich man in hades, "If they will not hear Moses and the prophets, they will not hear though one should rise from the dead."—So, if they will not receive the testimony of the Spirit, in Christ and the apostles, they will not receive any testimony now contained in new revelations. We must not turn our ears away from the truth to idle and empty fables.

QUESTION IV. "Is it right to pray with and for the penitent sinner inquiring the way of salvation?"

REPLY. If, when the apostles came to a penitent sinner, inquiring the way of salvation, they commenced praying with and for him, and exhorting him to pray for himself, it is right for us to do so too. It is right for us to follow them. Let us take a few examples. A vast multitude of sinners, cut to the heart once said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" And Peter answered and said, "Repent and pray, and let us join in praying with and for you, 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." As many as gladly received his word, prayed and were prayed with and for and the same day there came to the altar of prayer about three thousand souls. Acts ii. 38. Again, "Ananias said to Saul, Arise and pray, and let me pray with and for you, and wash away your sins

calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii. 16. Paul said to the enquiring jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And he spoke to him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house. And the jailor took Paul and Silas and washed their stripes and prayed and was prayed with and for, the same hour of the night." Again, "the eunuch said to Philip, see here is a mourner's bench; what doth hinder me to pray and be prayed with and for? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest. He answered and said, I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they both went down to the mourner's bench, both Philip and the eunuch and he prayed with and for him." I am not quoting from the King James' version, but from a new one, made for the occasion. This reading suits the general practice precisely, and we ought to change the Bible or the practice for consistency sake, if for no other reason. There is prayer enough required in the Bible, more than we can induce the people to practice, without practicing it where it does not belong. It is not a proselyting institution. When we find inquiring penitents, the best thing we can do is to answer their inquiries, as the apostles did, by telling them what to do. Tell them what the apostles told inquiring persons: "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." "Arise and be immersed and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," &c. When we find a man inquiring for anything, we tell him, if we know, where he can find it. Peter did this on Pentecost. Annanias did the same when he came to Saul. The apostles did the same in every case, and never failed to show the sinner the way to pardon. They had no seekers, continuing to seek and mourn, who could not find pardon. All who came to the apostles inquiring were shown what to do to be saved, or pardoned. They never made a failure.

Not so this modern seeking system. Many under this system continue to seek and mourn till the day of their death and find nothing.

QUESTION V.

"Is no church in gospel order except those that meet every first day of the week to commune?"

REPLY.

It is certain that no church is in gospel practice which does not meet every first day and commune. The meeting on the first day is in commemoration of the Lord's resurrection on that day, and there is no reason for meeting for that purpose and not celebrating his death and sufferings. This the first Christians did as regularly as the first day came, and this too, we should do, as we bear love to the Lord who died for us and bought us with his own precious blood.

QUESTION VI.

"Is it right to hold in fellowship any church that does not practice weekly communion?"

REPLY.

It is right to try and make any church which does not thus practice, feel their obligation so to do. This can be done where the love of Christ is in it; and where that is not the case, they are dead anyhow.

QUESTION VII.

"Does God call men, or the Holy Spirit separate them, (Acts xii. 2.) to the work of the ministry, since the days of the apostles?"

REPLY.

None in our day are called as the apostles to the work of the ministry. Jesus appeared to them in person and said, "Come, follow thou me." None are now sent as they were, for, in person, present with them, he said, "Go, therefore, and disciple all nations"—"preach the gospel to every creature," &c. None are qualified in our day as the apostles were, either to preach, or prove that the Lord sent them. They were miraculously endowed by the Holy Spirit, inspired to guide them into all truth, enabled to speak in every language under

heaven, and demonstrate their divine embassy by the most stupendous displays of supernatural power. That no man in our time is called, sent and qualified as they were, is simply what every man, who thinks, positively knows for himself.

QUESTION VIII.

"If men are not called by the Holy Spirit, by what authority do they preach?"

REPLY.

By authority like the following from Paul: "The things which thou hast learned of me before many witnesses, commit to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." This is authority from the inspired Paul, to Timothy, to commit the things he had learned of Paul to faithful men that they, in turn, might teach them to others also. They have thus been transmitted from faithful men to faithful men till they are now in our hands, and the authority still stands good and will till the end of time, to teach others also.

QUESTION IX.

"As no practical man is called to preach by the written word, may not every man lawfully excuse himself, and thus leave the world without a ministry, unless called by the Holy Spirit?"

REPLY.

The faithful man, who is qualified, and has the love of Christ, is *particularly* called to preach and he must preach. His happiness is so identified with his work, to which, in the providence of God, he is called, and the pressure of his obligation to turn man to the Lord, when he knows that he has the ability—that God has afforded him the gifts, that he cannot cease preaching without destroying all his happiness. Those men who can cease preaching so easy, as many do, had about as well cease as not, for they have not love enough for man to save men, or they would not think of stopping. A man who has fine ability to save men, and cannot be moved by the grand idea of winning souls, saving souls from death and ruin, has never known the love of Christ, nor appreciated the importance of the work of preaching, and is unfit for so

grand and Godlike a calling. Good men preach the gospel because they are constrained by the love of Christ and cannot rest while they see their race rushing into ruin, and not make an effort to snatch them as brands from the burning. B. F.

HISTORY AND TEACHINGS OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

NO. IX.

JOHN AND JESUS BOTH ENGAGED IN IMMERGING.

After the interview with Nicodemus, which took place in or near Jerusalem, Jesus came with his disciples into the country districts of Judea; "and he remained there with them, and immersed." John, also, not being yet thrown into prison, "was immersing in Enon, near Salim, because there was much water there; and they (that is, the people) came, and were immersed."—Enon was some forty miles up the Jordan river from Bethany. As the writer does not tell us for what purpose this abundance of water was needed, there have been two conjectures, or guesses, about it. One, that much water was needed for the supply of the people, and of the animals, as a great number of people would require a good deal for drinking and other purposes. This is very suppositional, and, I think, highly improbable. It is far more reasonable to suppose that, as there were no doubt many places in Judea where water was scarce, John chose Enon on account of the abundance of water there, which made it more convenient to immerse the multitudes of people who flocked to him. Adam Clarke thinks it "probable" that the people "*dipped themselves*," as "the Jewish custom required the person to stand in the water, and having been instructed, and having entered

into a covenant to renounce all idolatry, and take the God of Israel for their God, they *plunge themselves under the water.*" This is admitting immersion, but not agreeing very well with the declaration of Scripture, that *John immersed the people.*

About this time, "there arose a question between John's disciples and a Jew, about purifying." The Jews had been accustomed to various washings and immersions for purposes of purifications, and the idea of being purified by immersion was not new to them. Naaman had been purified, or cleansed from leprosy, by *seven immersions.* Indeed, immersion in water is most beautiful, and to me seems the only proper symbol of spiritual purification.

What the question about purification was, we cannot tell; and it would not be profitable to trouble the reader with any of my *guesses* about it. Commentators fill up their books with too many *conjectures.*—Matters of fact should occupy our attention principally. We are informed that John's disciples came to him, saying: "Rabbi, he who was with thee beyond the Jordan, of whom thou hast borne testimony, see, the same immerses, and all come to him!—John, answering, said: "A man can receive nothing, unless it be given him from heaven. You, yourselves, are witnesses for me, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him. He who has the bride is the bridegroom. But the friend of the bridegroom, who stands and hears him, rejoices on account of the bridegroom's voice. This, my joy, therefore, is made complete. He must increase, but I must decrease. He that comes from above is above all: he that is from the earth is earthly, and talks about the earth. He who is from Heaven is above all. And what he has seen and heard he testifies, and no one receives his testimony. He who has received his testimony, has set his seal that God is true. For he whom God sent, speaks the words of God; for God does not give the Spirit by measure.—The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hand. He who believes on the Son, has eternal life; but he who does

not believe the Son shall not see life; but the vengeance of God hangs over him."

The above is surely not the language of an ordinary man. No worldly-minded Jew, or envious person, could have expressed such sentiments—"A man can receive nothing, unless it be given him from heaven." Entertaining such a sentiment as this, John could not become self-important and puffed up, or have envious feelings towards Him who was increasing in popularity above him, and who was attracting more attention than he.

It would be well if we could always fully realize our dependence upon God for all the blessings we enjoy in this life. We would not then become vain or self-sufficient. In harmony with the sentiment of John, are the words of James—"Every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above, and comes down from the Father of Lights, with whom there is no changeableness, nor shadow of turning."

John says, further, speaking of the importance of receiving the Divine testimony: "He who has received his testimony, has set his seal that God is true." The opposite sentiment would be, *he who has not believed has no confidence in God.* Who could thus make out God a liar? O, it is a fearful thing to reject the testimony of God.

THE INTERVIEW WITH THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA.

It appears, from the testimony of the Apostle John, that Jesus was more successful in gaining disciples than John the Baptist—that he immersed more than he—though Jesus did not immerse the people himself: his disciples did the immersing. And why? The writer does not say. We may suppose two reasons: First, that he could not consistently immerse in his own name; second, that it was not proper for him, who was to immerse in the Holy Spirit, to immerse in water too. But this is *conjecture.* Jesus, having learned that the Pharisees had heard of his success in proselyting, "left Judea, and returned again to

Galilee." He knew that the Jews would be excited against him, and therefore avoided them by going to Galilee.

In going there, it was necessary for him to pass through Samaria, for it lies between Judea and Galilee. "Therefore, he comes a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near the lot of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Now Jacob's well was there.—Jesus, therefore, being wearied with the journey, seated himself on the well. It was about the sixth hour," that is, about noon.

The disciples went into the city to buy food, and while they were gone, a woman of Samaria came to the well to draw water. "Jesus says to her: 'Give me to drink.'" The Samaritan woman, therefore, says to him: "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, being a Samaritan woman?" (For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.) Jesus, answering, said to her: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that says to thee, 'Give me drink,' thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." The woman says to him: "Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep; whence, then, hast thou that living water? Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank of it himself, and his children, and his cattle?" See how Jesus excited the woman's curiosity, and thus engaged her attention! He then condescends to speak to her of the "deep things of God."

"Jesus, answering, said to her: 'Every one who drinks of this water shall become thirsty again; but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him, shall never be thirsty; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.'" Not understanding his real meaning, but supposing he had the power to furnish some superior quality of water, by which she would be relieved of the trouble of drawing, and prevented from becoming thirsty, "the woman says to him: 'Sir, give me this water, that I may not become thirsty, nor

come here to draw.'" What simplicity! Such a woman was surely ready to receive and obey the Savior. It may be observed, that so far as John has reported what Jesus said on this occasion, there is no evidence that the Lord gave the Samaritan woman any explanation of what he meant by the "living water." May we not regard this "water of life" as the "knowledge of the Lord," which is a source of spiritual life and light and joy?

"Jesus says to her: 'Go, call thy husband, and come here.'" The woman answered and said: 'I have no husband.'—Jesus says to her: 'Thou saidst well, 'I have no husband;' for thou hast had *five* husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband. That thou hast spoken truly.'" She was living with a man to whom she was not married. Jesus knew her to be a great sinner, but he "came to save sinners." She was astonished at his knowledge, and "says to him: 'Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshiped on this mountain, and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.'" 77

Jesus says to her, "Woman, believe me, an hour is coming, when you shall not worship the Father in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem. You worship that which you do not know; we worship that which we know; for salvation is of the Jews.—But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeks all such to worship him.—God is spirit; and those who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The woman says to him, "I know that the Messiah is coming (who is called Christ;) when he is come, he will tell us all things." Jesus says to her: "I, who speak to thee, am he."

Upon this his disciples came; and they wondered at his talking with the woman. Yet no one said: "What dost thou seek? or why dost thou talk with her?"

The woman then left her bucket, and going away into the city, says to the men,

"Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did. Is this the Christ?"—They went out of the city, and came to him. In the meantime the disciples prayed him, saying: "Master, eat." But he said to them, "I have food to eat that you do not know of." Therefore his disciples said one to another: "Has any one brought him anything to eat?" Jesus says to them: "My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work. Do you not say, 'There are yet four months, and then comes the harvest?' Look, I tell you, raise your eyes, and look on the fields, for they are already white for harvest. And he who reaps, receives wages, and gathers fruit to life eternal; that both he that sows, and he that reaps, may rejoice together.—And in this is the true saying, 'One sows, and another reaps.' I sent you to reap that on which you have not labored. Other men have labored, and you have entered into their labor." Jesus speaks of its being four months till harvest. From this it may be reasonably supposed that the journey through Samaria, during which the above interview took place, was made about the first of December, or mid-winter, because the first of April was the beginning of harvest.

The sacred writer continues: "And many of the Samaritans of that city believed on him, on account of the saying of the woman, who testified, 'He told me all that ever I did.' When, therefore, the Samaritans came to him, they besought him to remain with them. And he stayed there two days. And far more believed because of his word. And they said to the woman: 'We no longer believe on account of thy saying; for we ourselves have heard, and know that this is in truth the Savior of the world.'"—

I regard this as an interesting narrative, and worthy to be reviewed, and reviewed again with care. More comments might be made, but the attentive reader will not need to have every sentence, every word explained. Indeed, a plain rendering of the original into the common language of

the people, would remove the necessity for a large portion of the matter of commentaries.

WM. PINKERTON.

"YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE."

NO. IV.

After considerable delay, caused necessarily by the force of circumstances, we again invite the readers of the Review to a further investigation of the subject above indicated.

We will first notice some of the "remarks" made by our worthy Editor on our article of Sept. 1st.

1. He doubts the language of Heb. vi: 6, being suppositional, and says, "it is not in the common version, 'if they shall fall away,' but *have or were fallen away*; and refers to a revised edition. But he must remember that that edition is not the common version. Whether the quotation in our article of Sept. 1st, "if they shall fall away," is correct or not, we will leave to the decision of the reader. The original, *parapesontas*, having fallen away, is correctly rendered in our common version, "if they shall fall away." Or it could be rendered "on the supposition that they have fallen away," or "had they fallen away." The phrase cannot be translated without having a supposition expressed or understood. See Arnol's Greek Prose, Section XXXIX. page 103.

2. In his second remark, he asks, "how did the dog return to his vomit, or the sow that had been washed to her wallowing in the mire, if they had not been saved from it?" It might be asked how did they return if they *were saved* from it? Or we would answer by asking another question,—How does the drunkard, who has been washed from the filth of the grog-shop by a resolu-

tion to live a sober life, but has not become a Christian, return to his "wallowing in the mire?"

But I am surprised that our worthy Editor, who loves the *Christian name* so well, should make it synonymous with "dog" and sow." Where, Bro. Franklin, do you get a "thus saith the Lord" for this? Or why do you not sometimes address your brethren and sisters with these very respectful terms?

3. We readily admit that God simply knowing who would be saved, and who would be lost, "does not prove that salvation is not conditional, that man is not free, or that true Christians may not turn away." And cannot see why such questions should be raised, as they had not been denied.—That salvation is conditional and man is a free moral agent, we most confidently believe. Then why this battling the air?

4. He then tells us a great many things that God has decreed, and thinks there are some more which he has not mentioned.—But why discuss at such length what nobody denies? It is plain to be seen. In this large catalogue of decrees, he frequently assumes the point in discussion. And thus by ingeniously garbling Scripture, attempts to make the impression on the mind of the reader that God has decreed that some shall fall from grace, as in the following instance: "It is the eternal purpose of God that every man who is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law—Christ is become of none effect to them; whoever are justified by the law are fallen from grace." Why does he bring in these passages garbled in this way? Why does he not assail the expositions given of these and some of the other passages in my previous articles, instead of passing them by and tacitly admitting the truthfulness of the expositions, and then afterwards using the passage in a contrary sense? For it is plain that if he had used the passages in their proper connection, the conclusions would have been far different.

For instance, "whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." The same apostle says, "by the deeds of the

law shall no flesh be justified." The conclusion, therefore, is, no one can fall from grace, in this way at least. Our Editor then all at once comes to a conclusion, and pronounces the doctrine of the saint's assurance "an empty theory, philosophy or speculation, of no value to any man, true or false." But why be in such haste to decide, Bro. Franklin? Please give the subject a full investigation before pronouncing so decidedly. If it is false and of "no value," why have all you Armenians marshaled all your forces to oppose it, thus allying yourselves with a Romish Council, that decreed "if any person shall say that a man who has been justified cannot lose grace, and that, therefore, he who falls and sins was never truly justified, shall be accursed?"—Surely, it can do you no harm.

But if it is true, how dare you or any other man pronounce it of no value? If God has revealed it in his Word, how dare presumptuous man say it is "of no value?" I thought you "*Christians*" believed in taking the *whole Bible*. That this doctrine is taught in the Bible is evident from the following Scripture: "Mat. xxiv: 24, "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." The idea is that the elect cannot be cheated out of their interest in the merits of Christ, for it is an admitted fact that in other things they often are deceived. This is the only sense in which we can see that it is impossible to deceive the elect, or the Christian.

But if there should be a quibble raised on this passage, the following will admit of none: Mat. vii: 22, 23, "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Christ here represents himself as addressing the wicked in judgment, and says, "*I never knew you.*" How could Christ say this, if he had once known some of them as his

disciples? Could they not reply, "You *did* once know us. For we exercised faith in your merits, were baptized into your name, you pardoned our sins, and we enjoyed communion with you in your Church?" Again, some of these characters correspond well to some of those who are said "to fall from grace." For they said they had prophesied, cast out devils, and done many wonderful works in the name of the Lord. Surely, they are equal to the best of those who are said to have fallen.

But if it should be said that Christ did not refer to *all* the wicked, and that he will not say to those who have *fallen*, "I never knew you," it will be seen that Christ himself tells whom he means, for he says, "ye that work iniquity." Who are those that work iniquity? Are they not all the wicked? And surely those who "fall from grace" are wicked.

It is also said in Luke xiii: 27, in the same connection, "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." Thus we see that at the day of judgment there will be none on the left hand whom Christ ever knew as his.

A. PHILO.

REPLY.

I. In our previous article, to which the foregoing is a reply, we wrote, "It is not, as in the common version, 'if they shall fall away,' but *have, or were, fallen.*" The printer made us say, "it is not in the common version," instead of, "it is not *as* in the common version," &c. We will now try again, and see if we can get it printed so that our correspondent can understand us. The passage in question, Heb. vi: 6, as we have it in the common version, is suppositional. But it is not, when correctly translated. It should not read, as it does in the common version, "If they shall fall away," but "*have fallen away.*" The whole passage will then read, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and *have fallen away*, to renew them again to repentance: seeing they crucify to them-

selves the Son of God afresh and put him to open shame." There is nothing suppositional in the case. It is not "*if* they were once enlightened," nor "*if* they have tasted the heavenly gift," nor "*if* they were made partakers of the Holy Spirit," nor "*if* they have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come," nor "*if* they shall fall away;" but it is "those who *were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and have fallen away.*" These had been Christians, but had fallen away, and it was impossible to renew them again to repentance. It cannot be rendered, "*if* they shall fall away," without making it incongruous with the whole connection.—The sense of the connection requires that it be rendered "*have fallen,*" or "*were fallen away,*" and there is nothing suppositional in the whole passage. They had been enlightened, tasted of the heavenly gift, been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and fallen away. It was impossible to renew them again to repentance. Persons who were enlightened, had tasted the heavenly gift, were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, had tasted of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, had been Christians. This is indisputable. These persons were fallen away, and the Apostle says it is impossible to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves afresh the Son of God and put him to open shame. They were fallen from grace and could not be restored.

II. We have taken our correspondent to be candid and sincere. But in his second paragraph, touching the dog returning to his vomit and the sow that was washed returning to her wallowing in the mire, he gives us a bad example. The little quibble that he makes is mere pettifoggery, cavilling and evasion. Before he turns out thus openly to sneering at the figurative language of inspiration, though the figure

may appear a little coarse in his refined eyes, he should throw down and repudiate his Bible. He should have intelligence enough to see that the comparison was not ours, but the comparison of the inspired Apostle, and that his weak sneer and slur were at the comparison of the inspiring Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation, who uttered this language through the Apostle of Jesus. We invite the reader to turn to II. Pet. xi : 20-22, and read, "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end of them is worse than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered to them. But it is happened to them according to the true proverb, "The dog is returned to his vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." To whom does the holy and inspired Apostle refer, when he says, "But it is happened to them?" Indisputably to those mentioned, verse 20, who had "escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," and as stated, verse 21, had "known the way of righteousness," but had again become entangled in the meshes of sin and overcome; turned "from the holy commandment delivered to them," whose "latter end is worse than the beginning." These are the persons of whom the Apostle speaks, and to whom he says, "it is happened to them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her own wallowing in the mire." They certainly did not become entangled *again* in the pollutions of the world, without having first once escaped from them. They surely did not depart from the holy commandment without having been restored to it. Or, to use the Apostle's "true proverb," the dog, unquestionably, did not turn to his own vomit *again*, without first having been saved from

it; and the sow that was washed did not turn to her wallowing in the mire again, without having been first saved from it.— Or, without a figure, a man did not turn back to his sins, without first having been saved from them.

III. Our correspondent says we tell of a great many things which God has decreed, and asks the question, "But why discuss at such length what nobody denies?" He then adds, "It is plain to be seen. In this large catalogue of decrees he frequently assumes the point in discussion." Indeed! and does "nobody deny," on the point in discussion, involved in this "large catalogue of decrees?" It runs in our mind that there is somebody who denies, when he is so mixed up and confused that he does not know which side he is on. But what is the point in dispute? Why, simply that in reference to certain persons, the caption under which he writes is true—that the Apostle could truthfully say, to certain persons, "Ye are fallen from grace." The issue is a plain one. I believe this statement of the inspired Apostle. He does not. He *denies* that any person can fall from grace. Paul is against him, and testifies against him. Hear him, "Behold, that I, Paul, say to you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man who is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of more effect to you, whoever of you is justified by the law; you are fallen from grace." Is this language garbled? Certainly not. Is it true? Surely it is. Then persons *may fall from grace*. The amount of the Apostle's argument is, that if any man Judaizes, goes back from Christ, under the law, claiming justification by the law, he has lost his interest in Christ, and has fallen from the favor of Christ and gone back to Moses. True, no flesh can be justified by the deeds of the law, but that does not prove that man may not turn back to the law and claim justification by it, and thus fall from the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A. Philo says, that we "all at once came

to the conclusion and pronounced the doctrine of the saints' assurance an empty theory, philosophy or speculation of no value to any man, true or false." This statement looks bad in print. We trust, when he reviews it, he will regret that he ever made it. Where, young friend, did we say this of "the saints' assurance?" Nowhere. You are responsible yourself and yourself alone for this. We never said any such thing of "the saints' assurance," as you ascribe to us. No, sir, we were not speaking of "the saints' assurance," but of the unfounded conceit, that the righteous cannot turn away from his righteousness; that Christians cannot turn away from the holy commandment; fall away, have their part taken away out of the book of life, out of the holy city and out of the things written therein, and fall from grace, and this false and delusive conceit, and not "the assurance of the saints," we pronounced an "empty theory, philosophy or speculation, of no value to any man, whether it be true or false." For this empty theory we have no respect, and all the time and labor spent in preaching it, is so much spent in diverting our minds from "the assurance of the saints." The assurance of the saints is found in such precious expressions as the following:

"But he that shall endure to the end, the same shall be saved. Matt. xxiv. 13.

"If you do these things, you shall never fall." 2 Pet. i. 10.

"Blessed 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." Rev. xxii. 14.

"He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in a white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." Rev. iii. 5.

"Not every one that saith to me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he who doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. vii. 21.

In these expressions, and any amount more of the same kind we have "the saints' assurance," and no "empty theory, philoso-

phy or speculation," but in such expressions, danger of falling away is implied, that we may not be true and thus fall, or fail of an entrance into that rest.

IV. But our correspondent sets out in earnest to prove that saints cannot fall from grace, in defiance of Paul's statement at the head of his article. It is impossible to deceive the elect. It is an easy matter to argue in his loose manner. He has not done enough close thinking to take hold of matters of this kind. It is easy to assume that the "very elect," and "the saints," mean the same, and assume from the implied impossibility to deceive the saints, that it is impossible for the saints to fall from grace. But this does not pass for argument among men who understand logic. Now, is it clear that the words, "the very elect," mean precisely the same as the words, "the saints?" Look at these expressions, compare them, and then, say whether they are the same in meaning. Please notice; it is not merely, "elect." Nor is it merely, "the elect." It is, "the very elect." The words "elect," and "saint," are not synonymous. There may be elect persons who are not saints, or saints who are not elect persons. There are different classes of elect persons, or persons elected for different purposes, and different elections. This is plain from the Lord's descriptive words, "the very elect." Does he mean by this, simply, "the saints?" Certainly this is not it. It is a more special class, than merely the saints, or people of God—the inspired elect, who had the Spirit of revelation, which searches all things, yea, the deep things of God, whom it is impossible to deceive; but one of these, and certainly a saint besides, said he labored to keep his body in subjection lest having preached the gospel to others he himself might be a cast away. See 1 Cor. ix. 27.

V. Our friend finds that the Lord will say, to certain persons, in the day of judgment, "I never know you." Certainly, there will be some condemned in that day, whom he never approved. But this does not prove that there will not be others there, whom he did once approve, who have turned away

from their righteousness, from the holy commandment, fallen away, fallen from grace and had their part taken away out of the book of life and out of the holy city and out of the things written therein, who shall be condemned. Those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, had tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, were once approved, but when they were fallen away and it was impossible to renew them again to repentance, he did not approve them.

The effort to include all who shall be condemned in the last judgment, in the expression, "all ye workers of iniquity," is simply a failure. He does not say, "all workers of iniquity," but "all *you* workers of iniquity"—a certain class whom he was addressing, and not all who should be condemned. B. F.

DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSALISM.

NO. V.

LA PORTE, Aug. 29, 1863.

DR. G. L. PURDY:

Dear Sir,—In my last article I directed your attention to my objections against your affirmations. I also presented a few thoughts for your consideration; with one or two syllogisms in regard to some common errors concerning the foreknowledge and power of God. I then promised to note the two last paragraphs in your article No. 4. Before doing so, I will slightly review the ground you have passed over. You affirm, first, that God has a great and glorious character—a character perfect in all its attributes—and you wish to delineate His character and His attributes. Secondly, that one of his attributes is creative, and another foreknowledge. Thirdly, that God planned,

created and executed, in the exercise of this creative power and foreknowledge, in such a manner, that nothing now exists that was (or is) not for the best—*sin not excepted*—and that from the exercise of these attributes, "*you deduce universalism.*" I will pass over your remarks, in reference to the argument between the religious denominations in regard to man and the introduction of some superior power, and come to the issue as stated by you.

You say, when summed up, it will reveal God in the following light: "He either designed Adam to sin, or He did not. If God did design Adam to sin, it was in accordance to his will, and the best interests of the human race, and therefore fully provided for, leaving God still a perfect being. If God did not design him to sin, then Adam sinned contrary to the will of God, and therefore was superior to God, thus making God imperfect." In your article No. IV, you have promised to discuss this under the relation of man to God; hence, I have nothing to say until such discussion appears. So far no proof is adduced of man's future happiness; and I now proceed to Arts. 2nd and 3rd. In these articles, you trace the exercise of the creative attribute of God, in its development, from the monad up to man; and offer the material universe as proof of this power or attribute, and, at the same time, claim "that the whole has been wrought out after a well-defined and well-matured plan," and God having foreseen and purposed all—"extending from the smallest atom to man"—that it was all done for the glory of God, and the greatest good to man. You also claim, "that nothing has occurred to mar the harmony, nor can any imperfection be discovered." I understand you, that these several propositions will be supported by proof. So far, the main idea, supported by your proof, is, that all created matter has been wrought out after a well-matured plan, instead of proving that "eternal happiness will be the destiny of the whole human family." I have one more remark of yours to attend to, and then I will proceed to the

to the close of article IV. You say, "I would challenge the world to point out one single instance where God has failed, or made a mistake, or where *anything* is not as God designed it to be." I think this challenge a strong one, and one you will modify upon reflection. If you only embrace the material universe, and apply it to some general results, the challenge might go undisturbed. If, however, you apply it to all the minutiae of created matter, you will be obliged to modify or withdraw it, for I shall certainly discover to you, that all things in nature are not as God designed, or as nature's laws, in their perfection are designed to work out. I now leave the matter, simply saying, that so far, I discover no proof that sustains the general propositions, nor can I say that I anticipated it at the present stage of the discussion:—but shall wait with patience—confident you will do the best you can to ad-
duce it.

I now come to your two last paragraphs in article IV. You say: "We now come to man, whose place in creation, and whose final destiny we shall attempt to investigate." You then affirm that man is *the last*, the highest, and the best of God's works. He was created in the image of his God—not in body, but in mind, intellect, or reasoning faculties. You say, essentially, the mind of God and man is the same; they differ only in degree. Now, my dear sir, knowing as I do the reasoning growing out of this, and its consequent deduction, I must, at this point, enter my solemn protest against such propositions. You say, that man is a co-worker with God. To this I object, and will, in due course of time, give my reasons. You say, "man is the only being who has improved the works of God." I shall be quite well pleased when you prove the proposition to be true, and for it you shall have my thanks, as it will fully support the truth, as well as my argument made in my last article on the proposition, "that though God was perfect himself, still his work might not always be perfect." If he did not perfect the earth, but left man

to improve it to perfection, it proves that man has something to do as well as God. You state that "God's laws, adapted to the government of man, are as perfect and as much in accordance with God's will as those applying to the lower classes." This is granted. You claim that man is the *last link* in the chain of creation, and that he is as perfect as any part of creation. If you mean that man considered as a material being, is the most perfect of God's works on earth, then I accept your definition of "*link*;" but if you mean that man, as a material and intellectual being, is a link in creation connecting the brute to a higher order of intelligence, I shall certainly object. If you reason, my dear sir, that because matter, a creation without inherent mobility, is governed by a fixed physical law, therefore man, a material and intellectual creation, with inherent mobility, is governed by a fixed physical law which he has no power to disobey, I shall certainly object to such reasoning, and give you *such a valid reason for my objection, that you will accept it at once, and never offer opposition thereto.* I will now attend to article No. V.

1st. You will learn something of my idea of the foreknowledge of God, in my article dated Oct. 27th, styled No. 4. I will make the matter clear. 1st. I admit that God *foreknows all his own works from the beginning.* I admit that *the material universe and the plan of man's salvation are the works of God.* 2nd. I deny that "*God foreknew all things.*" I deny the proposition, affirmed by you, "that God designed Adam to sin." I deny that *the sin of Adam, or the sin of any man or angel, is the work of God.* In order to make the matter still more plain, I will offer one or two syllogisms, like the two in article No. 4. Suppose I should affirm that God foreknows all *his own works* from the beginning; and I should then affirm, that *the sin of Adam was the work of God*; then it would logically follow, that *God foreknew Adam's sin.* But was Adam's sin the work of God? To answer this correctly, requires but a moment of time. We have a well established

principle in morals and in law, that all acts or deeds, chargeable to a person, must be done by himself or his authorized agent. Now, my dear sir, when you prove to me, or to the world, that Almighty God authorized Adam to transgress the (God's) law, and to eat of the forbidden fruit, and that Adam did do the work as God's agent, then, sir, I will be a Universalist. If, however, "God foreknew all his own works," as the Bible states, and you fail to prove that Adam's sin was one of the works of God," then the deduction, that God foreknew Adam's sin, would fail to follow from such premises. Your difficulty is in the minor premise.

If you affirm and prove, that God foreknew all things from the beginning, and then prove that Adam's sin is a thing, the deduction would be, that God foreknew Adam's sin. Your difficulty is in your major premise, in this latter syllogism, as it is in the minor premise in former syllogism. The syllogisms are both sophisms, as neither the minor premise of the first, nor the major premise of the last, can be proven. I affirm, that God never avowed to man that he foreknew all things. Now you understand why I admitted that "God foreknew all his own works from the beginning; and why I denied, that he foreknew all things from the beginning. If you will now take up my 2nd article, and connect my denial of your 1st and 2nd propositions, you will discover how it is that I am consistent, when I admit that God foreknew his plan of creation, and still deny that he foreknew all things.— You will discover a wide difference between my admittance of the attribute of foreknowledge in God, and your application of such attribute.

I will now attend to another point. It is in regard to man's intelligence. I now understand your position. If you will refer to your 3rd article, you will notice that your question reads as follows: "Upon what depends this (man's) intelligence? Answer: Upon the superiority of the brain. This I denied in article 3rd, with qualifications. You now affirm, in your ex-

planation, that, in order to the development of man's intellect, under the circumstances and conditions in which we find him upon the earth, it was necessary that his brain should be constituted as it is. If it is your intent to limit this matter to the present condition of man, we are agreed; and agree with all physiologists. You affirm "that man possesses a brain and a mind; and that the mind cannot exist without the brain."— You will allow me to enter my solemn protest against such a position, unless you limit it to man's present existence, and modify your affirmative. I will not support my protest at this time, but will refer to it again in this article.

Another point comes under my observation. You say, "mind first originated in the Deity, and he imparted a portion to each individual." As this proposition now stands, I shall be obliged to object to it. Your explanation of it, may be satisfactory. I will say, that, in God originated the plan of creating mind as well as matter, and that by a law containing all the force necessary to accomplish the work, God created both mind and matter. But I do not admit, that the mental or intellectual universe was an emanation from God, or created in mass, and a piece of this mass of mind imparted to each person. I believe I understand the force of such a sophism, too well, to pass it by unnoticed. I will attend to such sophism when urged, if urged at all.

It is my design to handle all these matters with care, hence I enter my objections as I pass along. You close your article by re-affirming your original proposition. Here "you allow" me to differ; and here we may differ widely. You affirm that God has created no being that can thwart his purpose. The difference between us, in this matter, will depend entirely upon the use you make of the word purpose. In your 1st article, you have given us an index of its contractive and expansive power; and our discussion will depend upon your exercise of such power. As I have not affirmed or denied any proposition in regard to the

purpose of God, abstractly considered, but have denied your affirmations in reference to the thwarting of the designs and operations of God, as developed in your 1st article; I shall, therefore, await your argument.— With me, there is a difference between a design and a purpose. I can see how a man can design without ever forming a purpose in regard to his design; and I can see how a man can purpose and have no design in his purpose. In a certain sense the terms are synonymous, but not in every sense; hence I wait your denouement.

I will now make you understand my view of the dependency of mind on matter. But two things exist in the universe—*matter and mind*. Mind existed before matter, or matter existed before mind. If matter existed before mind, then mind depends upon matter for its existence. If mind existed before matter, then matter depends upon mind for its existence. I affirm the latter proposition and offer Dr. G. L. Purdy, my opponent, as one of my witnesses to prove it. In your "facts of nature vs. atheism," you say, "that in all nature, in all the material universe, we discover design, order and harmony. Design, order and harmony discover law—law discovers a designer, contriver, first cause or mind. Hence the works of nature teach us, that there is an intelligent first-cause. That from the fact, that matter was created by this intelligent first-cause, that such matter, so created, is controlled (by law) by this first-cause, intelligence or mind; hence matter must acknowledge mind as its first-cause, and consequently as its superior, creator and law-giver. This intelligence or first-cause is Jehovah or God." Such is your reasoning. Reasoning, like the above, is sound and logical, and meets my approval. It makes matter dependent upon mind for its existence. If mind can exist and act (as proven by you) without matter, it follows that neither the brain of man nor angel is necessary to the existence of mind; nor is it necessary to the action and development of intellect. Still I acknowledge that God, in his adaptative foresight, has formed the brain

of man, and so adapted it to man's organic structure, that it is necessary in its present state and condition, to the development of mind. Remove the present conditions and the necessity ceases. Man may be placed in other conditions where his physical structure may be necessary to his happiness; but if you remove the conditions, the necessity will cease. If I disagree with physiologists at this point, I shall maintain such disagreement to the end. As a general proposition, it is not true that intelligence is dependent upon the muscle, called the brain, for its development. As a special and limited proposition it is true. I do not endorse the position, that mind is dependent upon matter for its existence or development; nor do I endorse the position, that mind is an emanation and impartation from God to man. A man's mind is as much an individual creation as his physical organism. You now understand me. I will now venture an opinion in regard to this first-cause. Does God possess a material muscle called brain, which is necessary to the development of his intelligence or mind? My opinion is, he does not. To support this opinion I quote John iv. 24: "God is a Spirit." I am anxiously waiting for your arguments upon the main issue.— Permit me to close this article with the assurance of my esteem for you and yours.

M. N. LORD.

P. S. I notice some typographical errors in your own as well as my articles: such as union of matter, for action of matter; promise for premise, &c. You will correct in your own reading. One favor I will solicit, my dear sir, and that is, please read my article a little closer, and you will see the difference between things and works, &c.

M. N. L.

THE POLITICAL PREACHER.

Whether a political preacher should be the subject of praise or blame, is a question not very easy to be decided, from the fact that very different thoughts arise in different minds, when political preachers and preaching are mentioned.

We have few works on political economy, so well known, and generally studied as the text book on that subject used in most of our Colleges, prepared by the learned and venerable Dr. Wayland, and the subjects of Tariff and Free Trade are freely discussed by him, no one, I suppose, would take the ground that, by employing his able pen on such subjects, this truly great man has lowered the standard of ministerial purity and dignity. No one thinks less of the justly celebrated Dr. Charming, because he discussed a political theme in his ever memorable letter to Henry Clay, on the annexation of Texas—indeed, many of our profoundest thinkers and writers on political science are ministers, and no one ever thinks they have sullied their robes by their investigations of such subjects. When, however, we speak of political preachers, very different associations rise up to those which cluster around the names of a Wayland or a Channing, we think of that class who, forgetting the purity and dignity of the pulpit, rush into the political arena, and outvie the veriest hacks of the party, in the buffoonries, and, to use no harsher terms, the indelicacies of the stump. The phraseology of the house of God is made to do service in the exciting canvass, and words which should never be used without awe and reverence, are made to perform most unseemly service.

Indeed, it is not unfrequently the case that the professed minister of Christ, in his zeal for party, acts as if he intended to burlesque his own profession—sometimes even he is led to indulge aspirations for office himself; and when these aspirations

are realized, the preacher becomes wholly merged in the politician, and thus not only he himself is lost to the church, but by conduct so unbecoming a professed teacher of the way of salvation, religion itself is brought to discredit.

From some cause or other, when a preacher turns stump orator he goes beyond the usual limits of propriety presented by that not over delicate class of speakers, who will ponder to the lowest instincts of the multitude to create a laugh, or make an impression. And those who listen to the clerical buffoon on the stump one day, and in the pulpit the next, are disposed to draw comparisons not at all creditable to the performer, and are ready to conclude that the versability which renders the preacher so mirth-provoking at the Saturday rally, may be the secret also of his Sunday sanctity—that both are put on for the occasion.

In many places in the South the people have been stirred up by inflammatory appeals from the preachers, and the most blood-thirsty and diabolical sentiments have been heard by the writer, from the class alluded to. Not content with urging their fellow men to arms, they have been to a man, the advocates of extermination, and from the lips of one minister I have heard the very course advocated, which was so terribly carried out in the Lawrence tragedy. Nor are we perfectly free from this spirit at home. Not long since I heard an eloquent young clergyman declaiming most bitterly against the rebels in arms, and when he was notified that his time had expired, he expressed his regret that he had not time allowed him to get the rebels to perdition. The patriotism of another reverend gentleman flamed out to that degree on one or two occasions that I heard him, that he was not satisfied with his tribute to the flag until he had planted the starry banner near the throne of God.—Another minister, distinguished alike in the field pulpit and the stump, while traveling in the cars, had his ire excited to the highest pitch by the remarks of a rebel colonel, who sat near him, which resulted

as follows, as reported by the Dayton Journal, and copied by the Cincinnati Gazette:

At last the rebel Colonel—in full rebel uniform—who talked loudly and defiantly, evidently desirous to attract attention—said that it was “the duty of the peace Democrats to elect Vallandigham. It was necessary to save them from Lincoln’s cursed tyranny. It was the most damnable tyranny on the face of the earth. Three months hence you people of the North will appeal to us (rebels) suppliantly to come up and rescue you from Lincoln’s despotism.”

Hardly was the sentence concluded when Colonel Moody, flaming with indignation, dashed his paper to the floor, sprang across the car, seized the insolent rebel by the throat, and thrusting his knuckles into his face, hissed through his teeth: “You infamous scoundrel! How dare you insult my Government with your treason? How dare you pollute this atmosphere with your insults to my country? Shut your mouth, or I’ll crush every bone in your infernal body.” Then the Colonel seized the rebel by the breeches, with force enough, almost, to raise him from his seat. The rebel hastily, and with considerable trepidation, stammered, “I’ll, I’ll stop, sir!”

Quoth the Colonel, “yes, you *will* stop, you infernal rebel! Stop *now*, or I’ll throw you out of the window”—the train was going at twenty miles an hour—“I know your rights as a paroled prisoner, you are under the protection of the Government. That does not authorize you to abuse and insult it. You have abused your privilege. No man in rebel uniform shall abuse my Government in my hearing without paying the penalty of his insolence.”

Now, if Colonel Moody acted as a minister of the Gospel on that occasion, we think his expressions were, to say the least, unbecoming; a milder rebuke would have been more in accordance with his profession, but, perhaps, the rebuke and threat were given by him as colonel, and not as a minister; if so, its objectionable feature vanishes. To see how very near the verge of profanity, if not of absolute blasphemy, the political preacher can go, we give the following extract from the Cincinnati Commercial, and if it seems somewhat coarse, our apology is, that its introduction may serve to warn others against making such

weak and unworthy exhibitions. It is as follows:

Chaplain Gaddis said, at the commencement of his speech, that even preachers might get mad under certain circumstances. He illustrated this by narrating the following:

At camp meeting once an old brother was detailed to bring sinners to the altar of repentance by sounding a horn. During temporary absence from his post of duty, an unregenerated person filled the horn with soft soap. When the brother came back to resume the vocation of Gabriel, he discovered the trick that had been played upon him, said he, “I have been a member of the church for forty-five years and a minister of the Gospel for thirty-five. I have never sworn an oath in my life, but damn me if I don’t whip the man that soaped my horn.” Pretty soon the altar was crowded with mourners, and the spirit’s influence was manifesting itself very satisfactorily except in one heart that seemed very stubborn. The proprietor of the horn approached this obdurate case and asked him how he felt. The poor sinner couldn’t feel his sins forgiven, and he knew there was no use in petitioning the throne of grace. He had committed an unpardonable sin he said.

“Ah,” said the preacher, “the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.”

“All, except the one I’ve committed,” said the sinner.

“What can it be, brother—is it murder, arson, rape, or adultery?”

“Worse than that,” sobbed the unconverted one.

The minister looked at his stony-hearted subject a moment, and then suiting the action to the word, said, “Will some brother hold my coat? Here’s the damned rascal that soaped my horn.” The preacher whipped the sinner, who soon after receiving the punishment became thoroughly converted.

What a satire on his own church, if the above be true, and whether true or not, what more defiling words could come from the lips of a pot-house politician, than those from one who ministers in holy things? How will his prayers and sermons sound to those who have heard the above? Will they not be at a loss to know whether the arts of the demagogue, or the labors of a minister of Christ are his true vocation?

Political questions often assume a moral aspect, that demand attention from the minister of the Gospel; but they should ever be discussed in a grave, dignified and earnest manner—a manner worthy of the preacher and his subject—but to descend to the low arts of the political arena, to outdo the political demagogue in his own sphere is unworthy of the servant of Christ, and against *such* political preaching we enter our humble protest.

OBSERVER.

QUERY.

When does an individual receive the Holy Spirit, and how can he know that he has received it? AN INQUIRER.

REPLY.

I. The miraculous or supernatural gift of the Holy Spirit, inspiring persons, empowering them to speak foreign languages, and perform other miracles, is not now conferred at all on any person. But the Holy Spirit, imparted and common to all Christians—the Spirit of adoption, by which they are enabled to cry Abba, Father—is conferred at the time when the person enters into Christ, or into the kingdom. It is promised with pardon, in Peter's reply to the three thousand on Pentecost.

II. How does a person *know* that he has received the Holy Spirit? We must take a little space first in telling how it is *not known*. It is not known by *feeling*. The presence or indwelling of the Spirit is not known by an *impression on the flesh*. The sense of feeling is in the flesh. We, therefore, never read of feeling the Spirit, of knowing the Spirit to be present by feeling, or knowing that we have the Spirit by feeling. Not an instance is mentioned, in Scripture, of any divinely authorized teacher ever directing any one to look to his feelings to

determine that he was a child of God, a Christian, or pardoned. Nor is there an account there of any one ever looking to any peculiar class of feelings as an evidence of having the Spirit. Thousands have been deluded, and are still being deluded, into the idea that some strange sensation in the flesh, or convulsion of animal feeling—some mere snock of feeling, sudden sensation in the flesh and blood—is an evidence of the reception of the Spirit. This is utterly without foundation in Scripture. Sudden changes of feeling, in some instances, arise from something unwholesome received into the stomach, breathing impure air, or enduring sudden changes of temperature; from sudden alarm, a shower-bath, or a shock from an electric battery. But these changes are mere results of adequate causes, and no evidence of spiritual influence. There is not, in our humble opinion, a more mischievous, dangerous and destructive delusion, in our time, than that which turns the mind of the people away from the divine testimonies of the Spirit of all light, and truth and revelation, recorded in the Bible, to the changeable, uncertain, and unreliable *feelings* in the flesh. The devil never desired a greater delusion than this. Joy arises from knowing that we are pardoned; but we do not know that we are pardoned by the joy we have. All the joy, peace and comfort of love the saints have, arise from their knowing that they are in Christ; but they do not know that they are in Christ by the joy, peace and comfort they have. The knowledge gives the joy; the joy does not give the knowledge. How, then, does a man know that he has the Spirit? He knows it by the following means:

1. *By the promise of God.* To him who believes in the Savior, repents and is immersed, the promise is, "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This promise has the veracity of God in it. The man who does not believe it, and will not rely on it, is a skeptic. Such a man cannot even come to God, because he who comes to God must believe. Without faith, it is impossible to please him.

2. He knows that he has the Spirit of God by the wonderful change wrought in him. A man *knows* whether he loves the teaching of the Spirit of God in the Bible. He *knows* whether he loves the children of God. He *knows* whether he loves God. He *knows* whether he delights in the law of God and doing the commandments of God. He knows whether he is in harmony with God, and his main purpose of life is to do the will of God. These are all matters which a man can know as certainly as he can know any thing. A man can know that he is at heart with God, and that the great aim of his life is to walk with God and please him. This, too, others can know, who are acquainted with him, by the visible life he lives. A man can know that the love of God is in him; that he is not under the power of the Spirit once controlling him, but under the power of a better Spirit, whether we can tell all about how he knows it or not. There are many things that we know well, but cannot tell *how* we know them. We know the face of the writer of the query at the head of these remarks from any other face, at a glance, but we could not readily tell how we know it. We saw a man once, running over a lot of Bank Bills, throw out one. We inquired what was the matter with that bill. He said, "It is a counterfeit." We inquired how he knew. He said he could not so readily answer that, but remarked that it was a *strange face*—that it *did not look like the genuine*. So a man can know that the Spirit dwelling in him is *not the same*—that it is *different* from the Spirit formerly dwelling in him, as well as he can know fresh from impure atmosphere, pure from filthy water, though it may be a little difficult to tell clearly *how* he knows it.

III. Many persons are misled and troubled by the erroneous views advocated round them, and persons are troubled by listening to marvelous experiences told to them by others. Some persons receive the truth gradually, and consequently never realize any sudden and wonderful change, though they are as really changed, and the change

as great, when properly considered, as in any other case. Others have the truth brought to their understanding suddenly and in an overwhelming manner, producing a change so impressive that the realization of it has a more vividly marked period than in the more gradual change, though the change, in itself, is no greater nor better. But the change, in either case, is produced by the Gospel, and is of no value if it does not result in turning the person from the power of Satan to God. When it does result in turning the sinner to the Lord, by his taking the steps laid down in the Gospel, and the person loves the Savior, walks in the commandments, delighting in them, that person has the Spirit, no matter whether he at any particular time experienced any wonderful change of feeling or not, or any sudden or *striking* change of any kind.—Persons may have sudden and striking changes of feeling and not have the Spirit at all, and they may have the Spirit and not have any sudden and striking change of feeling at all. Yet, when the entire change in this latter case is considered in all its extent, though it has been very gradual, it may be greater than in the former case. It is no evidence that any one did not receive the Spirit, that did not feel some wonderful and sudden sensation; but it is an evidence that any one has not the Spirit, if he does not love God and keep his commandments.

IV. Granting pardon and imparting the Spirit are the work of God, and never fail when we come to him according to the Gospel. If we have confidence in him, and in his gracious promise, we cannot doubt, when we come to him according to his will, that he has graciously pardoned us and imparted to us His Holy Spirit. If we do those things that are pleasing in His sight He will give us meekly all things to enjoy. "He who hears these sayings of mine," says the Lord, "and does them, I will liken him to a wise man." They who do his commandments, shall enter by the gates into the city and have a right to the tree of life. B. F.

DANCING.—No. 1.

BRO. FRANKLIN:—I propose, with your permission, to lay before the readers of the A. C. Review, a few short pieces on the subject indicated by the above caption.—The practice of *dancing*, I am sorry to say, is gradually gaining favor in many sections of the country, amongst those who profess to be disciples of the “Man Christ Jesus,” whose history is laconically summed up in these words: “HE WENT ABOUT DOING GOOD.” I am aware this topic has received some attention in the Review; yet it has not, in my humble opinion, received that amount of attention which it justly deserves. And whilst I do not claim *originality* for all I may say, still, I do claim that the facts and reasonings which I have to offer, are herein presented in a different light from anything I have yet seen.

I may be permitted to say, in this connection, that what may be said, during this investigation, is designed mainly and particularly for two classes of persons, viz.: 1st. Those professors of religion who are in the habit of attending places of amusement called *balls*; 2d. Those non-professors, who pretend to believe in, and have great reverence for that Book called the *Bible*—both of which classes, feeling conscious of their guilt, are ever and anon apologizing for their conduct, by appealing to the Scriptures of Truth. Hence, the avowed *infidel*, who professes not to believe in the Divine authenticity of the afore-mentioned Volume (if any such may chance to read this), may not consider himself addressed, in these papers, except an incidental remark, here and there, that will apply with equal force to such. I presume it would be a useless waste of time and space to dwell upon the subject on their behalf, since nearly all the skeptics admit that the Bible condemns such vain and useless—worse than useless practices. Indeed, it is urged by some of them as a reason why they

will not believe in and be governed by the precepts of the Bible, that it discountenances what they are pleased to call *innocent amusements*!

I presume that by far the greater portion of those for whom I write will be disposed to think that I attach too much importance to this theme; they will doubtless say that, after all, it is rather a trifling affair, and amounts to nothing more than a logomachy about the *modus operandi* of taking exercise! Howbeit, I beg leave to remark that I do not view the question in this light. I would say to those gay triflers, that there is no such thing as a trifle on earth. The most momentous results often flow from the most insignificant sources. In this world we have *little great* matters, as well as *great little* matters. By some the little colloquy that took place nearly six thousand years ago, between the father of lies and the mother of our race, may be deemed of an exceedingly trivial character; and yet I affirm it was the greatest controversy ever recorded in the annals of time. The difference between the parties on that occasion,—which consisted of only two persons—was in reference to a little word of only three letters,—*die*. God had said, touching the inhibited fruit, “In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” The happiness of the whole world, from Adam, our federal head, to the last *tick* in the clock of time, was suspended upon obedience to that injunction. The consequences arising from disobedience were beyond the ken of human computation. At this important juncture, the arch Deceiver, in the guise of a serpent, steps forward and proposes a trifling addition to the precept, consisting of another very small word, containing also only three letters—*not*—a *negative* term, “Thou shalt not surely die”—(very much like our dancing friends argue—it is *not wrong* to dance, they say,)—and because of this inconsiderable interpolation, one of the parties lost Paradise, and gained labor, sorrow, and death.

“The omission of an *h* in pronouncing a word became, providentially, the occasion

of the slaughter of forty-two thousand Ephraimites in one day; the conversion of an *o* into *i* divided the ecclesiastic Roman empire into two great parties, which disturbed its peace, fostered internal wars, and wasted its blood and treasure for a succession of several imperial reigns; and the eating of an apple brought sin and death into our world, and has already swept the earth clean of its inhabitants more than one hundred times. Let no one, therefore, regard anything in religion or morals as excessively minute, or unworthy the highest conscientious regard. A *yes* or a *no* has slain millions, while a thousand volumes have been written and read without any visible disaster to any human being."

To an omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent God, nothing is trifling or unimportant. To infinite space, an *atom* and a *mountain* bear the same proportions; in the presence of endless duration, a *moment* and an *age* are equal. The smallest animalcule that floats in the sunbeam affects the most distant world that rolls in space. If I wave my hand in the atmosphere, the impression is imperceptible to you, and yet it goes on and on, until every portion of the atmosphere feels its touch! Precisely so is it with our every word and action. However insignificant, no power can destroy it or stay it in its course. It is on, still on, and forever! Then think not anything small which may have a bearing on the kingdom of Christ, and on the future destiny of all mankind; yea, stretch forth into an illimitable eternity, and there will be the objects of praise or blame, thousands upon thousands of ages after this world and all its vanities shall have been wrapped in heaven's devouring flames!

With these preliminaries, I close for the present. In my next, I will enter upon the task lying more immediately before me.

Yours truly, C. J. KIMBAL.

SECOND COMING OF THE LORD.

Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so. Amen.—Rev. i: 7.

All Christendom admits the truth of this sublime statement: that he is coming at some time; not in *their* time, but in the far off future. Men now think thus, because the generations before them thought so. They think on all matters of Christianity and religion much as their fathers did; and it requires the strong energy of some independent mind, working patently, to turn the minds of the masses into new tracks of thought. We often see how hard it is for those who have been reared in the tenets of any particular sect, to lay all these tenets down, and take, in their stead, the pure word of God alone. And now, the thought that we, who are now living, shall, in all probability, see the Lord with our eyes, coming in the clouds of heaven—surely it cannot be; it must yet be a great way off. But that such *may* be the case—that we may indeed see him with these natural eyes, we hope to show most conclusively before we are done. The first question that comes up in the course of our inquiries is, May the people of God know with certainty, when the time is actually approaching? In this, as in all subsequent inquiries, let the word of God answer.—“But ye,” brethren, “are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night nor of darkness.” 1 Thess. v: 4, 5. To the world, Christ is coming as a thief; unexpectedly, unlooked for; but to his people he is coming as to one who is expecting and watching for him. “Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near: so ye, in like manner, when ye shall see these things come

to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the doors." Mark 13: 28, 29. The things here spoken of, are those enumerated in the 24th and 27th verses inclusive. "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Luke xxi: 28, 31. The things spoken of, are in the 25th and 27th inclusive. Notice the peculiar language in the 28th verse: "When these things *begin* to come to pass;" it is not necessary that the whole chain of events should be fulfilled, before we can recognize the things intended; we may recognize the *first* link, when they begin, and then link after link, as each circumstance is fulfilled in regular order. Does not Christ, in all this language, intimate that, as a matter of course, when the last precursors of his coming *begin* to come to pass, his people shall be able to recognize them at once? We certainly can come to no other conclusion.— But most professing Christians have an idea that before Christ comes, great moral changes must be wrought, vastly improving the condition of the world. That the gospel shall first spread its triumphs through all the nations of the earth, till every tribe and people become Christianized and prepared for the reception of Christ as their king. And because this state of things is so far from being accomplished, they infer that the time of his second coming is also in the distant future. But is this to be the state of the world when he comes?— Will the gospel be everywhere received and obeyed? Again: let the word of God answer: "This know also, that in the last days, perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves; covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers 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: from such turn away." 2 Tim. iii: 1-5. Look abroad over our land and the civilized world; examine society in all its aspects, religious and political, and see how everywhere may be met the different classes here mentioned. Look at the selfishness that everywhere exists, even in the so called benevolent actions of men; how few of these acts are prompted by the love of Christ, and done for his name's sake alone. See the grasping after the world; hear the boastings of our greatness, and wealth, and influence, and power; witness the pride that everywhere exalts itself; listen to the oaths and curses and imprecations that greet us at every turn; compare the dutifulness of children in the days of our childhood, with the almost total disregard of parental authority, and the disrespectfulness toward parents that now exist; witness the unbounded love of pleasure in every conceivable form that fruitful imaginations can invent; but above all, look at the vast multiplicity of organizations having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof; see how near they can come with their imitations to the true standard of the gospel of God, and yet reject one or more of its most imperious commands; how some of them can even hold to the form of the doctrine, and yet utterly deny its power, or that it forms any part of the plan of salvation. Is not the present state of the world, and especially our own country, a fearful counterpart of the picture drawn by the apostle? Again: "Nevertheless when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke xviii: 8. This question is of that kind that carries its own answer, and is the same as though he had declared that no faith should be found in the earth when he came. How little, indeed, is there of living faith in the world now. How very few that receive the word of God in simple faith, and act it out in their lives. How few that believe the word of Christ; "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" or that imperative command of the Spirit, "Repent, and be bap-

tized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." How few that have the faith that recognizes the fact that all things are in the hands of Christ; that it is he, the Prince of peace, who rules among the nations of the earth. Men, now, almost universally, speak of "trusting in Providence," but how few trust in the Lord. This state of things accords fully with the unexpectedness of his coming. As men have rejected him in the rejection of his words, so they are not looking for his second coming; at least, till their plans of earthly grandeur and glory are carried out. But as it was in the days of Noah, when they disbelieved the words of the Spirit, and in the full pursuit of earthly pleasure, knew not until the flood came and took them all away, so is it now. While men reject the words of Christ, and are in the mad pursuit of wealth and pleasure and honor, they dream not of the terrible end that is so swiftly coming upon them, and which "as a snare shall come upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." It also accords with the feeling which the world will exhibit when he appears—the mourning and wailing of all kindreds of the earth because of him; and that agonizing prayer sent up, not to God, but to rocks and mountains, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?"

But when then is the prophecy to be fulfilled, that "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea;" and when "all shall know him from the least to the greatest?" Let us not anticipate on this part of the subject, dear readers; we will come to it in due time. The earth is to be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and that beyond your grandest, most sanguine expectations. The brightest dreams that have risen before the imagination of the philanthropist and Christian, as yet, are nothing to the

glorious reality that the word of God reveals to us, but which very few have yet read. And, Christian brother and sister, almost hidden in the smoke and dust and gloom of, perhaps, the battle of the great day of God Almighty, you have not long to wait.

(To be continued.)

DELINQUENCIES OF PROFESSORS.

"The ways of Zion mourn because" so few "come to her solemn feasts." This language of the "weeping prophet" is upon the lips of many faithful pastors. Neglect of the ordinary means of grace is well-nigh universal. The great body of believers seem not to appreciate the obligations that are imposed upon them in this regard.—They conduct as if it were entirely a matter of choice whether the ordinances of religion are sustained by their presence. They forget the Divine command, "Neglect not the assembling of yourselves together, as the custom of some is."

The object of this chapter is not to exhibit the benefits of public worship, but to expose the *delinquencies* and discuss the *duties* of Christian professors in respect to attendance thereupon. The following remarks of an English divine, John Angell James, upon this subject, though penned with special reference to Christians residing in the city, I quote entire, for their interest and general application to the Church:—
"A general, regular, and punctual attendance upon all the means of grace is essential to the earnestness of a Christian Church. There is a wonderful difference in this respect in the various congregations of professing Christians. In some instances, you will see the hearers straggling along with a dull and careless look, as if they were going to an unwelcome service—drop-

ping into the place of worship long after the service has commenced—looking round with a vacant stare upon the congregation—undevout and listless, as if they were there they knew not nor cared for why; the seats half empty, and those that occupied them seemingly neither expecting nor desiring a blessing from above. There is no earnestness there. In other cases, how different! You will observe a stream of people, just *before* the hour of service, flowing into the place, with a serious, thoughtful, yet cheerful air, as if they knew what they were going for, and that it was a solemn, yet glad some occasion. They take their seats with a composed, collected, devout manner. A look of expectation is in their eye, which is first cast toward the pulpit, as if they waited for the preacher with his message from God, and then upward to that God who alone makes that message effectual. A stranger, coming in, is struck with the appearance of earnestness that pervades the congregation, and almost involuntarily exclaims, 'How dreadful is this place!—Surely this is the house of God and the gate of heaven!' Yes; and if he were to visit that place, time after time, he would see the same people, and the same devout manner.

"The earnest hearer is the constant hearer, the punctual hearer, the devout hearer. There is a spirit of indolence, self-indulgence, and mischievous negligence creeping over the churches, most fatal to fervent devotion, in reference even to the Lord's day attendance on Divine worship. Very many of the members of all religious communities go but once a week to the house of God; and this on Lord's day morning. All the rest of the holy day is spent in idleness—perhaps feasting and lounging over the wine through the afternoon—turning over the pages of a magazine, with little devotion and no profit, in the evening.

"If these persons were in their closets, studying the Word of God, engaged in self-examination and prayer, mortifying their corruptions and invigorating their graces, we should think less of it; but is this their

occupation? I fear this love of ease is eating out the piety of our churches.

"Modern tastes are sadly at war with modern piety. It seems as if many of the professing Christians of the day were trying with how little attendance upon the ordinances of public worship, how little of self-denial, and how little a public manifestation of their religion could satisfy their conscience; and alas! how very little that is!"

I surely need not spend a moment in proving that it is the *duty* of the members of our churches to attend upon the services of the sanctuary. The delinquencies of church-members are somewhat various.—All delinquents are not guilty of the same neglect. Some are negligent in one way, and some in another.

In order to show that the foregoing charges are not made without ample reasons, the reader's attention is called to the following classification of delinquents:

The Fair Weather Disciple.—That the church embraces members who seldom think of worshipping God publicly upon a stormy Lord's day is proved abundantly by empty pews. It is freely admitted that a storm may be a sufficient excuse for some professors to remain at home; but, after granting all the exceptions consistent with Christian propriety, many are guilty of limiting their attendance to fine Sundays. It is evident, in almost every church, that it does not require a very violent storm to detain some of its members at home. There is not that conscientious regard to Christian example, in this particular, which ought to distinguish those who are to be ensamples to the world.

The inconstant Disciple.—Those already named are inconstant; but we refer to those who, fair weather or foul, summer or winter, maintain no order, system or rule in their attendance. They may worship formally one half day, then be missing three. They do not appear to regard the public worship of God so much a duty as a *convenience*. Their conduct seems to say to the world, "The sanctuary is a very convenient place to visit when inclination favors."

The tardy Disciple.—He may not be many minutes too late, but late enough to disturb the devotions of the congregation. For a moment, at least, all eyes must be directed to him, or her, and a consequent sensation, if not noise, created through the house.—Such delinquents do well to remember the principle of a devoted Christian female, who replied to the inquiry, how she managed, amid so many domestic cares and duties, always to be punctual in attendance upon the service of the Lord's house, "It is a part of my religion not to disturb the religion of others."

The listless Disciple.—There is quite a difference in the attention which different hearers render in the sanctuary. It is delightful to preach to some, and a sore trial to preach to others. While many are eager to catch every word that falls from the preacher's lips, and listen with profoundest attention, here and there is one gazing about the house, tumbling the leaves of a hymn-book, now lounging in a corner of the pew, then sitting in restless uprightness, and, on the whole, apparently determined not to hear. Such demeanor in the house of God is unbecoming even in an unbeliever, and with professing Christians is highly censurable.

The sleeping Disciple.—Unavoidable cares and toils through the week, deprivation of nightly rest, age, and disease may excuse some from sleeping in the house of God; but there are professing Christians who indulge the inclination to sleep, without the shadow of an excuse. They offer no resistance to the somnolent spell; they place themselves in a position to invite the overpowering stupor; and lose the identity of hearers in that of sleepers. Such is a brief, imperfect view of the delinquencies of professors. Reference is made to the fact that slight indisposition is regarded an excuse for neglecting the means of grace. A physician of forty years' practice says, "I have always had more calls on the Lord's day;" and I may add, some professing physicians always make an excuse for neglect of worship on that day. Some Christians keep

about their work until Sunday, and then send for the Doctor. It is a downright desecration, because it is getting sick in their own time, and taking the Lord's for getting well.

"Sunday headaches" are remarkably prevalent among our churches. Many who give as an excuse for absence from the house of God, that they had a severe "headache." It is periodical; always, or generally, comes on Sunday. Mondays they are well.

Oh! what a shame to professing Christians! Reform, reform, and ask forgiveness.

The above is mostly abridged from a work styled, "*Spots on our Feasts of Charity.*" J. R. F.

Millersburg, O.

LOVE AND UNION.

Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! exclaimed the royal minstrel of Israel, when he beheld the tribes of the chosen people, from all nations of the earth, with eager haste, pressing to the city of God to worship before him in Jerusalem. It was, indeed, a glorious sight to behold the scattered sons of Jacob, leaving behind them all the cares of life, turning their faces to the holy city, and singing, as its towers met their gaze, the lofty songs of Zion. There was joy and exultation in the city, as the travellers from distant lands entered the gates, every face beamed with kindness, every door was thrown wide to receive the weary ones; a warm and cheering welcome was given them to their homes, and hearts; not because they had descended from one common stock; not simply because Abraham was their father; that Moses was their prophet, and David their king—no,—they were worshipers of the same God, believers in the same Law, and had come up to offer

solemn sacrifice, through the same High Priest, at one common shrine.

It is the evening preceding the great day of Atonement—the day on which the sins of the thousands of Israel are to be expiated; the evening sacrifice has been offered, the rites of hospitality tendered and enjoyed, Jehovah's blessing has been invoked, and stranger and citizen yield themselves to the influences of balmy sleep.— Day breaks in grandeur over the hills of Judea, and solemn songs usher in the holy day.

The whole city is astir, the Priests and Levites clad in their robes of office, prepare the holy things for the hallowed service, the smoke of the morning sacrifice in solemn wreaths ascends the sky, and the sweet notes of the silver trumpets call the whole assembly to worship. The court of the Tabernacle is densely thronged, and the High Priest arrayed in Mitre and breastplate on which is graven the names of the tribes; as Mediator confesses over the head of the victim, the sins of the whole assembly, and bearing in his hands the blood of the sacrifice he enters the holy place, illuminated by the golden candlestick, and perfumed by the fragrant cloud from the altar of incense; he draws aside the veil which separates the holy, and the most holy, it closes behind him, and in solemn darkness stands before the Mercy seat over which are bowed the overshadowing Cherubim; and now as near God as mortal may approach he sprinkles the blood which he bears, while the multitude without bow their heads in silent adoration; he reappears to the expectant people bearing the news of pardon and peace; they hail his return with joy and gladness; he lifts his hands, every voice is hushed and every head bowed in reverence, while he pronounces upon them the blessing of the Lord. Again the trumpets sound, and from the whole assembly rises the anthems of praise and thanksgiving; with gladness they seek their homes again rejoicing in the tender mercies of the God of Jacob. Such was the unity and love which prevailed among the Jews, in

the days of their pious kings, before the worship of Jehovah had been corrupted; but, alas! divisions arose; by many Mount Zion was deserted for Mount Gerizim—the names, Jew and Samaritan began to be known, and the bitterest hatred sprang up between those who had formerly worshiped at the same altar. The sayings of the fathers, and the traditions of the elders soon grew into importance, and the pure teachings of the Law were abandoned for the commandments of men. Pharisee and Sadducee, names hitherto unknown sprang into being, the first comprising the stoical, the self-righteous and the hypocritical, the second, embracing the materialist, and all the giddy wanderers in pleasure's flowery maze—and when the Saviour of men made his appearance in the world, nearly every vestige of pure religion had left the earth, and in its stead, there was to be found pride, hatred, impiety, idolatry and every evil work. God's Temple, instead of being the place of holy prayer, and pious instruction, was desecrated by covetousness, and became the scene of angry debates concerning profitless questions, and the Law of God was made void by their traditions.

The Jewish age has passed away, but its history should be to us a lesson of instruction. The Christian Church, like the Jewish, has had its age of union and purity. When first instituted, its members were of one heart and one mind; the same faith produced the same blessed fruits in the hearts and lives of all; and such was their love for, and care over, each other, that the Pagans, by whom they were surrounded, were compelled into admiration and forced to exclaim: Behold how these Christians love one another! The Gospel had the effect of binding them together—they had drunk deep into the spirit of the Master; the business of their lives was to imitate him, and to love one another as he had loved them. But alas! the gold has become dim, the fine gold has changed, the love which made the early Christians ready to lay down their lives for their brethren, is but little known, the spirit of barren specu-

lation and chilling bigotry has entered into many hearts, where love alone should dwell; and the feelings of professed followers of Christ, of different names, are no better than those entertained by the Pharisee for the Sadducee, or the Jew for the Samaritan. All true lovers of Christ must bitterly deplore this alienated state of feeling, which confessedly exists; but no method of breaking down the barriers, which man, and not God, has raised, has yet been put into successful operation.—The different bodies of professed Christians have, so to speak, no affinity for each other. The principles by which they are governed are like oil and water, they can not unite, another principle, then, not now operating, must be brought to bear upon these discordant elements, and that principle is not prejudice, suspicion or hatred, but love—that love which looks back with a compassionate glance upon the faults and errors of our neighbor, and which leads us, while remembering our own liability to error, to place the very best construction upon his words and conduct, and to talk over our unhappy differences, not in the spirit of angry debate, but in a spirit of kindness and mutual forbearance.

It is characteristic of love, to delight in resemblances; and this will lead us often to turn from points of difference to points of agreement; and there is no doubt, if this course be pursued, we shall be surprised to find in how many points we agree, when compared with the comparatively few in which we differ. Whenever we begin to think and act thus, we may rest assured that the Savior's prayer for the unity of his people, which our divisions have frustrated, will soon be fulfilled; and that the dawn of that day is not distant, when we shall unite in one song even here on earth, as we trust to unite around the throne in heaven.

OBSERVER.

DANCING.—No. 2.

In the first place, we will glance briefly at the word "dance," as it occurs in both the Old and in the New Testament. This word, in all its flexions, is found in the Bible twenty-five times—in the Old Testament twenty, and in the New, five times. Seven times it occurs as a *noun*—three times in the singular and four times in the plural number—eleven times as a *verb*—twice in the present, six times in the past, and three times in the future tense—and eight times as a *participle*. The following are the instances of its occurrence:

Ex. xxxii: 19; Judges xi: 34; Judges xxi: 21; Judges xxi: 23; I. Sam. xviii: 6; I. Sam. xxi: 11; I. Sam. xxix: 5; II. Sam. xxx: 16; II. Sam. vi: 14; II. Sam. vi: 16; I. Chron. xv: 29; Job xxi: 11; Psa. xxx: 11; Psa. cl: 4; Psa. cxlix: 3; Ecc. iii: 4; Isa. xlii: 21; Jer. xxxi: 21; Lam. v: 15; Jer. xxxi: 3; Matt. xi: 17; Matt. xiv: 6; Mark vi: 22; Luke vii: 32; Luke xv: 25.

Of course we cannot notice, separately and formally, all the passages cited above, for there are a great many of them that are not relevant to the subject under consideration; besides, to attempt to notice them all would require too much time and space, and render our investigation too prolix and irksome. We shall, therefore, animadvert upon a few of the most prominent and important, in as succinct and concise a manner as we know how. And, indeed, this is all that is necessary, or that can be required of me on any principle of logic known to me, since what I shall say in regard to the few can be applied with equal force to the whole.

First, then, let us examine the first passage referred to above—"And it came to pass, as soon as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf, and the dancing, and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables of stone out of his hand, and brake them beneath the Mount."—Ex.

xxxii: 19. Here we have an account of the first dancing that was ever recorded on the pages of history. And what are the associations connected with this affair recorded in the thirty-second chapter of Exodus? *Idolatry* runs through and permeates the whole transaction, and *treason* and *rebellion* were the results! Was Moses, the servant of God, pleased with this grand ball that "came off" nearly three thousand three hundred and sixty-three years ago, in honor of one Aaron, whose idolatrous and rebellious heart prompted him to say, "Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for, as for this man Moses, who brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him?" Nay, verily! As Moses and Joshua were returning from the summit of Mount Sinai, (with the history of which the reader is doubtless well acquainted,) they heard a strange, an unusual noise—a noise like unto "war in the camp." A queer procedure, this, for a religious people, who should have been engaged in worshiping Almighty God. But if we leave the mountain side, and approach nearer the camp of Israel, what shall we find, think you? A GOLDEN CALF, manufactured from the jewelry of the women, is erected in a conspicuous place, and the deluded, idolatrous multitude are hovering around this blind, deaf, dumb, lifeless calf, making music and dancing! How ridiculous! But if you will examine this whole chapter carefully, you will find another feature connected with this idolatrous ball, which modesty and decency forbid that I should mention. I again ask, did Moses and Joshua approve of this heathenish procedure! When the people "rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace offerings;" and when they "sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play," did Moses join with them? Read what follows: "And it came to pass, as he came nigh unto the camp, that he saw the calf and the dancing, and his anger waxed hot; and he cast the tables of stone out of his hand, and brake them beneath the Mount.

And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it." What a severe, what a withering, scathing rebuke to this wicked people! Then comes Moses' reprimand—"What did this people, that thou hast brought so great a sin upon them?" etc.; and thus briefly and ingloriously ends the first ball that ever took place on this terrestrial globe!

Now, gentle reader, imagine yourself in attendance at one of our modern cotillion parties, where the sensuous pleasure-seekers "sit down to eat and drink," as is customary, and then "rise up to play"—to make a "noise" similar to that of "war in the camp"—a "sound of revelry by night," as Byron has it; and you will find that meeting accurately portrayed in this thirty-second chapter of Exodus. But in addition to this, let your fiddler represent the calf—which, by the way, is no mean representative; though he may not be so valuable a one as a golden calf—and you have the picture complete!

The point which I would make by the foregoing remarks is, that all dancers are, in some sense, idolaters. And here I will make the assertion, without the fear of successful contradiction, that modern dancing, though changed and modified until it is now comparatively decent, is but a relic of heathenism. Indeed, some of the more wise and enlightened heathen philosophers, themselves, discountenanced the practice, as I shall show before I get through.

It will not be out of place for me to remark, just here, that Webster gives dancing as a definition of the word "play," found in the Scripture quoted above; and, inasmuch as Moses condemns the performance indicated by this term, it necessarily follows that dancing falls under the same condemnation.

C. J. KIMBAL.

QUALIFICATION OF PREACHERS.

This subject, it seems, was very amply discussed in the Ohio State Missionary meeting, for this year, held at Shelby. Its treatment in the hands of such experienced ministers as Bros. Errett and Hayden, it appears, was distasteful to several equally experienced ministers, who were present, and who, with becoming candor, have had the openness and manliness to say so, with their reasons attached. We were not among the honored men who participated in this meeting, and of course did not enjoy the privilege of hearing these discussions. In fact, we know but little of them, save so much as is revealed in the criticisms and comments of some who have published their objections. We look at the matter, therefore, only afar off, and through the showing of others; yet we seem to see exactly how the matter was, and take comfort in the impression that much of the apprehensions which these good brethren have expressed (I refer particularly of Bros. Franklin and Rogers) arises from a too close, and consequently a partial view of the case.

As a people, we say much about "the proper stand point." We have been accustomed to consider how much the appearance of a thing depends upon the position in which the beholder stands to it. Now if the limners, who upon this occasion drew the picture ministerial, intended to say, or did say, in word or substance, that no man should or ought to become a proclaimer of the gospel unless he be "highly cultivated, and well versed in the learning of the times," we at once set down the position as preposterous, and reject it with a repugnance strong and enduring as are the veneration and gratitude which we cherish for the labors and glorious achievements of the many brave and devoted pioneers, who, without scholarly culture, and without knowledge of the learning of the times, were mighty in word and doctrine, through knowledge of the Scriptures and culture of the heart, to the pulling down of Satan's strongholds, and the upbuilding of this growing and giant structure of Reformation, to the keeping of which some of us, who are younger, are left, and to which I trust we will ever be faithful and true.

Experience is a great teacher; and her lesson to us on this subject is the lesson which we learn from the history of the prim-

itive church. The great and learned Apostle, who of course did not wantonly or contemptuously disparage learning, has written the lesson for our instruction; and our experience corroborates it with a clearness that prevents all controversy. We may take his words, and address them to ourselves: "For you see, brethren, how God has called you; how few of you are wise in earthly wisdom, how few are powerful, how few are noble.— But what the world thinks folly, God has chosen to confound its wisdom; and what it holds for weakness, he has chosen to confound its strength; and what the world counts low and scorns as worthless, nay, what it deems to have no being, God has chosen to bring to nought the things that be; that no flesh should glory in his presence." (1 Cor. i. 25-30.) The power of our cause is in the gospel, and the success in which we should rejoice is that which springs from its true and honest proclamation. This is never to be forgotten. The "folly" that confounds is not real *folly*. It was only that a foolishly conceited world *called* it so. The wisdom that was confounded, was not true wisdom, for she ever sits at the gates of God, and from her serene and unclouded brow reflects the judgments of righteousness and truth; but it was the mock wisdom of minds groping in darkness, or dazzled by the phosphorence of their own corruptions.— Nor was the weakness of which Paul speaks, mental imbecility. Which of the apostles was a mental imbecile! Who amongst them was a man for his brethren to be ashamed of! We read the New Testament, but do we find anything of weakness, in the sense of mental imbecility? We analyze its language, but do we find any violation of the complex grammatical system of the Greek tongue!— Illiterate were these fishermen—grant it all. But see how they spoke, read how they wrote, despite of the educational difficulties of the times, and let us not, while rejoicing in their illiteracy and ignorance, so far forget their example as to despise the grammar of our grand and stately English! In Paul's accurate, energetic and antithetic style, *weak* is contrasted with *powerful*. He is not speaking of mental weakness, for the inspiration of the Holy Spirit did not allow of that, but he means political, social, worldly weakness. They were not men of position, of rank, of power and place in the public organization of society. Fishermen they were, for the most part; not emperors, generals, governors, procurators, high priests, nor nobles; weak, and not powerful, as the world holds things to be—yet truly stronger

than the might of the sneering world, and superior to its scorn. My veneration is shocked when I hear the apostles disparaged as mentally or morally weak. I sit at their feet, and as I hear it proclaimed from their lips, re-echoed the exclamation, "O the depth of the bounty, and the wisdom, and the knowledge of God: how unfathomable are his judgments, and how unsearchable his paths!" The men who carried upon their souls the burthen of this bounty, wisdom, and knowledge, and whom our blessed Savior delegated to preach them to the world, could not have been, in any real sense of the word, *weak men*! Wise, powerful, or noble; then, as the *world* holds things to be, we must concede that the *many* of the primitive Christians were not; yet it must not be forgotten that the apostle indirectly affirms that *some* of them did possess these advantages also. He says but *few* of them were thus favored, yet *there* were a *few*; and he himself we must rank amongst that *few*. And were his wisdom and learning any part of the power which, in him, as an apostle, the Holy Spirit used in establishing the argumentative foundations of the gospel? I say argumentative foundations, because the Christian church was triumphant over Judaism as much, if not more, by argument—argument bristling with learning of the law—than by miracles! Before the Gentiles, too, as at Athens, Paul reasoned as a philosopher, and showed, upon rational grounds, the absurdity of idolatry; and unquestionably we must concede that his great prominence, and the high and commanding position which he held as an apostle, were due to the superior gifts of mind and education. These qualifications, together with the high natural gifts of a burning zeal and a dauntless moral courage, were doubtless reasons with the Lord himself for selecting him as the apostle to the Gentiles.

It is a fashion with some people to disparage the powers of the apostles, in a way that totally perverts their true character. They were *weak*, it is assumed; and forthwith it is taken for granted that they were mentally imbeciles! They were destitute of wisdom; and straightway some one adopts the absurdity of thinking that they were ridiculous simpletons, whom cultivated people laughed at whenever they stood up to speak to the multitudes. They were not noble; and therefore we must conclude that they were mean and vulgar—without dignity, without high and sensitive honor, and almost, some would paint them, slippery sneaks, crawling about among men only in the lanes and pur-

lieus of life, and ashamed to stand up in the presence of kings, emperors, and nobles of the earth, to vindicate the cause of their Master. We think of them in no such light. High, heroic men were these apostles; of a dignity that stripes could not degrade, and a manly nobility that would not stoop under a false imputation, even to escape beneath the uplifted bar of the prosecutor's dungeon. What is nobler in human nature than the answer of Paul to the Philippian magistrates: "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now, do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." (Acts 16.37.) No wonder Christianity was respected ever afterwards in Philippi, and that men felt that Paul and Silas, in the damps of the inner prison, lacerated and bleeding from the scourge, and made fast in the stocks—neck, and arms and heels—like the vilest of the vile—yet that these two men were nobler than the magistrates of Philippi, and mightier than the corrupt executors of the law. The prisoners that listened to their "songs in the night," and felt the shock of the earthquake, and saw the prison bars broke, and the prison doors thrown open, and their own manacles cast off, no doubt, like the jailer himself, gazed upon these persecuted men as themselves divine, and were ready to fall at their feet and worship them. Let the advocates for an uncultivated and unlearned ministry still hold up the standard like this, and the best friends of the church will not object.

I am writing very generally about many things that are said and done by many people, and which in various ways and at sundry times have come to our knowledge, and would not be understood as expressing thoughts specially suggested to me by anything that the brethren above referred to have objected. Indeed, it is due to myself and to them to say, that I do not believe them capable of thinking so meanly of a Christian minister as to do or say anything with the intention of commending much that passes current in these high walks of labor amongst us and other people of the present day.

I said, that if the limners who drew the picture ministerial on the memorable occasion referred to, made high literary culture and scientific knowledge *essential* to all preachers, a qualification without which none should be recognized or encouraged as preachers, then I could by no means agree with them; but looking at the matter afar

off and through the eyes of others, we cannot gather that they took any such absurd position. I know these men well, and I think I know what they think on the subject of which they were treating. I am impressed with the conviction that they were drawing the *ideal* of a preacher,—not simply who may preach, but what, in the fullest, largest, and greatest sense of the divine calling, makes a man *thoroughly* furnished for his work. This is the proper “stand-point” from which to view and re-view their utterances; and under this aspect, *are they not right?* Is it not true, that literary culture, scientific knowledge and classical learning are all powerful adjuncts to the proclaimer of the gospel? Other things being equal, what is the effect of a *plus* or a *minus* between these and the other endowments of a preacher? Add them, and is he not greater—more able to contend with the gainsayers and to gain the ears of the people, amongst a generation largely and in a qualified sense, themselves educated? Can any one doubt this?

I know some one will be thinking of exceptions; but let us not judge hastily. We have studied the character and qualifications of some proclaimers who will be cited as examples of great power without the advantages in controversy; and there is a very shallow sophism lurking under the surface. Let us suppose a case: A is uncultivated, without knowledge of science, ignorant of classical learning, unread in the literature of his own tongue, and scarcely master of English syntax. But see how mighty he is in the Scriptures! how he debates! with what power he grapples the adversary! how he trips him up in his logic, corrects him in his learned arguments, and even confounds him in Greek criticism! Learning! logic! Greek! English even! What is the use of them, when a man can do all these things without them? This is the case, and these are the *admirational* deductions drawn, no doubt many think very logically, from the premises. But what is the solution? How is it that A does all this? Why, reader, let me tell you: *A has in his pocket Bro. C's learning on all these points.* In a sort of way, we may say, he has it in his head! Not truly indwelling or incorporate, but by spoonfuls, as he needs it or can use it, does he scoop it out of the ample but portable fountain, and lo! what a spring of power.—Now suppose Bro. C had not been, what would Bro. A have been in this case? A minus C, equal to what? We do not know, and will not conjecture; neither will we fool

ourselves as to how A plus C has become what he is. We are thankful for much that is good and effective in him, but cannot forget that the faucet is not the fountain; nor consent to ignore the fact that learning and science, no matter how got at or by whom applied, are still great powers in every great work, in these enlightened years of the nineteenth century.

We have much more that we hope to say in some form hereafter on this subject, but this must suffice for the present. We are gratified to see the men of large experience amongst us striving to elevate the standard of our ministerial labor. They are working in the right direction. When our Savior says, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect,” we do not understand him as ruling all who fall short of this standard out of the family of God, into the ranks of publicans; neither, when gifted and devoted brethren, longing for higher developments of power and usefulness in our preachers, draw for our aspiration a loftier ideal of the Christian minister, do we understand them as intimating that none who fall short of it shall preach at all, nor as expecting or thinking themselves that it would be better if it were so. We do not differ very much, if at all, brethren, on these subjects. Let us not be hasty to think so. Brothers Rogers and Franklin are both good friends of education. They love our colleges; have given their money and their encouragement to help endow them; and their hearts, I know, rejoice at the power that is going forth from them, in the heads and hearts of educated and cultivated preachers. They would not say to us at Bethany, Your labor is nought, and the training of your students vanity! But they will bid us God speed, and, as no doubt they do, so will we beseech them, without ceasing to continue to pray for us and the young men committed to us for these high purposes. W. K. P.

REMARKS.

We cheerfully lay the whole of the foregoing before our readers. It is a well-written article and in a good spirit. Still, we do not think it exactly reaches the difficulty. The *importance* of learning, and its precise *use in preaching the gospel*, are subjects demanding much thought and careful investigation. We think, too, that the present is an appropriate time to give these subjects some space in our columns.—Touching the *importance* of education, not

only on the part of preachers, but of the people at large, we have spoken so frequently and with such decisiveness, that we cannot be misunderstood. It appears to us indisputable, in the very nature of the case, that a man cannot preach, or teach, anything, profitably, which he does not know. It is equally clear, that no man knows anything which he has not learned. What a man knows, in any department, is his learning, in that department. No man knows the gospel who has not learned it, and no man can preach the gospel who does not know it. A man, then, must have *gospel learning* before he can preach the gospel. He may know the gospel and preach it to the salvation of sinners and have but little learning in the common literature of his time, or in the sciences. He may know the gospel of Christ and preach it to the salvation of men, and not understand the grammar of his mother tongue, the arithmetic now being taught to children a dozen years old, or the geography of his own State, to say nothing of geology, astronomy, philosophy, &c., &c. So a man may understand literature well, the arts and sciences and all the higher branches of learning, and not understand the gospel. He may, on the other hand, understand the gospel well, and know no more of geology, phrenology or astronomy than Paul or Silas did. Again; he may understand jurisprudence; the laws of States, of the general Government and of nations, and not understand the law of Christ, or even the gospel.

It is not to be assumed, then, that because a man is not versed in the law of his State, law of the nation, and the laws of nations; or because he does not understand English, Latin, Greek or Hebrew literature well; or because he does not understand botany, chemistry and philosophy; or because he does not understand phrenology, geology and physiology; or because he does not understand surveying, navigation and engineering, that he does understand the gospel. Nor may we assume because a man understands all these, that

he does understand the gospel. We do not undervalue all the arts and sciences, or anything that enters into what is properly called learning, in its place. Let there be a universal diffusion of it in all departments as far as possible. But when we are speaking of the qualifications for the ministry, let no man attach such a train of sciences, arts and philosophies as shall discourage and dishearten good and useful men, who are rendering good service, and thus make the profession appear beyond the reach of thousands of valuable men who would otherwise enter the ministry. We had better go to the New Testament and search there for the qualifications of the ministry. The qualifications found there, a man *must* have. He cannot be a profitable preacher without them.

The *power* to turn men to God and save them, is the *gospel*. Any learning that in any way contributes to the understanding of the gospel, and facilitates in bringing it to bear on the world, to the salvation of men, is profitable. The original Scriptures are in dead languages, the original Greek and Hebrew. They cannot be translated into the English language without learning—*profound learning*. This learning a man *must have* to qualify him to translate. But no man of understanding will say, this learning a man *must have* to qualify him to preach the gospel. A man with far less learning may understand the gospel, when it is faithfully translated into English, and preach it the salvation of sinners. If a man would deliver a series of lectures, harmonizing geology and the Bible, or write a book on that subject, as a qualification for *that work*, he must understand both the Bible and geology. But a man may preach the gospel successfully, as thousands did in the times of the apostles, and know nothing of geology. To write such a book, or deliver such lectures as mentioned, with intelligence, a man *must* understand geology. It is indispensable that he should understand it. The preacher *may* understand it, or *may not*. It might be of some advantage to him, as a preach-

er, to understand it, if he knew how to use it, but certainly not indispensable. This principle Bro. Pendleton admits. There is certain knowledge or learning indispensable in any department. A man must have the learning or knowledge, to enable him to do the work which he undertakes. He may do some good in that work with a small amount of learning, which is all he has been, or is now able to acquire. Then, let him work and do what he can, and let no man discourage and dishearten him, by arraying before him attainments which he can never reach. To all this, we think, Bro. Pendleton agrees. We certainly agree with him in reference to the importance of our colleges, and, indeed, universal education, as far as possible. We are and have been all the time for the highest order of education, in its most extended form. The only wonder with us is, that a man who has such a clear head and logical mind as Bro. Pendleton has, should have permitted himself to be drawn aside, in remarks suggested by the comments of Bro. Rogers and myself, on the discourses delivered in the Shelby meeting, from any premises assumed or implied in our remarks. True, he very justly apologizes for this, and claims to be speaking in *general terms*. Still, the impression is left, that there was some tendency in that direction in our remarks.— We think this is not the case. We suppose, however, that his purpose was to elicit something more definite and clear on the whole premises.

We do not desire now, after a half year has gone, to attempt to make a statement of the precise positions taken, in the objectionable portions of the speeches in question. This, we fear, we could not do in such a way as would be satisfactory to the brethren who delivered the addresses in question. But this much we distinctly remember: The discourses produced a general depression and discouragement among the preachers present, and that, too, on the minds of as good men as can be found anywhere. Nor is it likely that they misunderstood the main drift and bearing

of these addresses. The speakers were capable of expressing themselves with sufficient clearness and distinctness to be understood. The men who heard, were capable of understanding.

But aside from the addresses, what is the real matter demanding attention? It is not the question, whether education, *in general*, should be advocated and sustained. There is no question about the importance of endowing, sustaining and maintaining our Colleges, and many more, if we could, between us. Nor is there any question among us about the importance of educating young men for the ministry. We are all agreed about these matters. There are reasons entirely sufficient, then, and good reasons, for all this, as we have been well satisfied for many years. We can, then, give these good men, engaged in educating, every assurance that we appreciate their work; its great importance, and bid them hold on and persevere in their great and good work. We have no *education* and *anti-education* parties among us. We all want all the education possible disseminated throughout the world. But aside from all this, there are shades of difference. There are different kinds of education. We have *religious* education, and mere *secular* education. We have *Bible* education, and mere *scientific* education. The wild Indian has education of a certain kind. So the most illiterate, uncouth and awkward lad of fifteen years, in the backwoods, has an education of a certain kind, but certainly not the right kind for the ministry. So, we find many young men, who have gone through their collegiate course, and acquired *an education of a certain kind*. But what kind is it? They have become acquainted, to some extent, with several languages, the arts and sciences, and obtained a diploma. They have graduated with honor, it may be with first honors. They can now talk of natural and moral philosophy; of rhetoric, elocution and logic; of phrenology, geology and astronomy; of botany, chemistry, and many other important matters, all proper and right in their places, and even well enough

for the preacher to know; but certainly not important qualifications for the ministry. Or, to say the least of it, the man may have all such acquirements, and not be qualified for the ministry. To qualify a man for the ministry, he *must have a religious* education. He *must have a Bible* education. He *must specially have a New Testament* education. He *must have a Gospel* education. The Gospel is the power the preacher is to use, and the learning, no matter what it consists in, which enables him to understand the Gospel, and bring it to bear on the world, to the salvation of men, is the learning the preacher needs.

An important item in the qualifications for the ministry, is an understanding of human nature—an understanding of men and things. A man must have adaptation to the world, or he cannot succeed in the ministry. He must exercise good, old-fashioned common sense. Then, he must have the faith in the Gospel, that it is the power of God to salvation—the full confidence *in it*, as the means to turn man to God—which will hold him *to it*, impel him on in preaching it, and relying on it to save men. Compared with it, all science, philosophy and human wisdom, so far as saving man is concerned, sinks and dwindles into insignificance, emptiness and nothingness.

Many good preachers have come, and are still coming, from our Colleges, who know the Gospel, have confidence in it, and are rendering noble service. Indeed, the class we have described as not knowing the Gospel, may be considered the exceptional cases, and not the general rule. Still, it would be well for the principal men in our Colleges to remember that several young men have gone out from our Colleges, endorsed, that have been no credit to their preceptors; but, on the other hand, have greatly injured the Colleges. They have read bad books, imbibed false teaching and foolish philosophies. Some such come out of College, ignorant of the mighty principles inculcated so largely in this generation, by that mightiest and greatest of human spirits of our time, Pres't. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, and

even treat them with contempt, when they come in contact with them.

The ground we stand on has been tried. The principles have been tested. The matter is not to be treated as an experiment, specially by young men who have never yet comprehended it. We are not to be admonished, not to feel too confident, till we "see what our reformatory movement will amount to." We shall not stop to "see what it will amount to." We know it is right, and shall maintain it to the extent of our power, regardless of what it shall amount to. The churches planted by the apostles and first evangelists were crushed out by the wonderful current of sin and carnality which found way into their midst. There were not true men enough to hold them up. But that did not prove that they were not right. So our movement may fail. It may be crushed out. But if so, it will not be because the ground we occupy is not right, but *because we have not true men enough to maintain it.* But we do not believe this. We believe it will succeed grandly and gloriously. Every College, editor and preacher will succeed who is true to it. There must be no backing down from our high, strong and invulnerable ground. Bro. Pendleton has stood many years in this great movement, and done great service, and is still doing great service. No one delights to honor him more than we. Let us look at the fifty and more volumes which have gone forth from Bethany, all pointing us to the Book of all books, as the only revelation from God to man, and the divine authority in all things spiritual; to the elegant walls of Bethany College, with our other eight or ten Colleges, the two or three scores of high schools established, the three thousand or more preachers, and as many churches collected in the "one fold," under the "one Shepherd," and the vast number of souls being daily brought to God, *through the power of our great Gospel plea*, and maintain the ground already gained, and the Lord will be with us. Let us stand firm to the principles advocated in accomplishing all this,

neither being ashamed nor afraid to defend them; and let no young man think that he is educated for the ministry, or qualified, till he comprehends these principles, no matter how much literature and science he may have acquired.

We are not aiming to review Bro. Pendleton's excellent remarks, nor objecting to them, but simply commenting on the same subject.

B. F.

DANCING.—No. 3.

We will now notice a passage (Judges xi. 34,) which is sometimes—very seldom, however,—adduced by the advocates of dancing, in favor of their practice; though I frankly confess my inability to divine how it is that any one can be so obtuse as to believe that it really affords them any aid. Who can fail to see that the very reverse is true? For the following lamentation is evidently based upon this very thirty-fourth verse. Let us read the context: "And Jephthah came to Mizpeth, unto his house, and behold, his daughter came out to meet him, with timbrels and with dances; and she was his only child—beside her, he had neither son nor daughter."

Next, we will notice the two passages found in the sixth chapter of 2d Samuel.—"And David danced before the Lord with all his might,"—"And as the ark of the Lord came unto the city of David, Michal, Saul's daughter, looked through a window, and saw David leaping and dancing," etc. In reference to these passages of Scripture, I will remark that they are but two instances, among many others, of a *religious exercise*, in the ancient mode of worship, called *dancing*; which, however, bear no resemblance whatever to our fashionable balls. Indeed, I opine, none of the worshippers of

Terpsichore will have the presumption to claim for their dance, a *religious* aspect, in the Scripture sense of the term. This exercise was prevalent among the Jews; hence, we find such expressions as the following: "Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing,"—"Let them praise his name in the dance,"—"Praise him with the timbrels and dance;" also the two verses under consideration, and many others that might be mentioned, all of which has no relevancy whatever to the modern dance.

In the third place, Ecclesiastes, third chapter. "A time to dance." This Scripture, to the amount of *four words*, is harped upon, I believe, more than any other passage in the Bible, by the dancers and ballgoers. I have only a few remarks to make in reference to it. First, let us admit for argument's sake, (what no sane man will hazard his reputation either for honesty or intelligence by asserting,) that *dancing*, in the popular import of that term, is here alluded to. Where, now, I ask, is this clause found? Anywhere in the New Testament? Not at all. Of course, then; it must be in the Old Testament. Let it be remembered, then, and never let it be forgotten, that this celebrated text, upon which our opponents so confidently rely, is in a *repealed law*, that has no more force now, than the *Slave code* has at the present time in Ohio or Illinois.

Now, unless you can find this clause either *verbatim* or *substantially re-enacted* in the *Christian's law-book*, (the New Testament) it cannot logically be brought forward in this case as proof. And I affirm that it cannot be found in the New Testament; therefore, this clause in the old statute book (the repealed law,) is null and void.

But, suppose the old law to be still in force; (which is not true,) notice this passage simply says there is a *time* to dance, without specifying *any* time. I now ask, when is that time—when is the proper time to dance? If you are a dancer, friendly reader, it devolves upon you to answer this question. Is there anything in the text or in

the context, that will give you a clue to this matter? If there is anything in this whole chapter, or in the whole book of Ecclesiastes, that will afford any light on this point, I have been unable to find it. How do you know, then, but what every time you dance, you commit a heinous sin by dancing in the *wrong time*? You must admit that there are times in which it would be wrong to dance; for every affirmative has its negative, and the affirmation that there *is* a time to dance, implies that there is a time *not* to dance. You will readily admit, if you were standing on *ice*, upon the brow of a *precipice*, THAT would be no time for dancing! You will also admit, when any of your friends or relatives are sick, dying, or dead, *that* would be an improper time to dance, and many other times and places in which dancing would be inappropriate. And right here let me suggest that whatever may be our notions respecting the "time," spoken of in the text,—whenver that time may be,—the present time is most inopportune. I allude to our unhappy condition as a nation.

While disunion, upon the one hand, and of bigotry and fanaticism upon the other, flap their baleful wings over our tottering Republic—while the glorious old ship of state is menaced with an inglorious wreck beneath the surging billows of human passion and unholy ambition—while death, with grim visage and bloody hands, stalks abroad in the land—while thousands of Columbia's sons are perishing daily in defense of their country, and in behalf of their country's honor—while almost every house in the land is draped with mourning, and the heart-rending sob is heard from the widow and orphan, weeping over the new-made tomb of the loved and lost—I say, while such is the sad and doloriferous situation of our country, do we deport ourselves in a manner befitting the circumstances? The furthest from it possible! Amid the clangor of arms and the din of war, the ill-omened "sound of revelry by night" is heard clearly and distinctly above it all.

Reader, peep with me into yonder ball-

room, and behold those vain, giddy, deluded pleasure-seekers, their faces flushed with wine, as they

"Trip the light, fantastic toe,"

and cry out,

"On with the dance—let joy be unconfined!"

And the *ladies*—those beautiful, bright-eyed creatures—how nimbly they flit to-and-fro in the merry dance, to the sound of the harp and the viol! And who is it that "gather there?" Alas! that I must proclaim it—they are the brothers and sisters of those brave boys whose dying wails have pierced the heavens from the battle-plain of Murfreesboro, of Donelson, and of Shiloh! Is this the way we sympathize with our "bleeding country?" What could more forcibly remind us of the wicked Nero, who fiddled and danced while Rome was on fire? Our whole nation would better be resolved into a huge prayer meeting. But to return.

Now, unless you can point out the precise *time*, from the same authority in which you find that there *is* a time, I would advise you to cease dancing, lest haply you be found dancing in the wrong time!

"A time to dance." I do not understand by this, *a time when it is proper to dance*, any more than I would understand that there is a time when it would be right to *kill*, to *rend* and to *hate*, spoken of in the same connection. In this chapter, there is detailed a long list of antithetical crimes and virtues, with the statement, that there is a time to do all of them—*i. e.*, as I understand it, *a time in which they are done*.

But if we take into consideration the manifest truth, that *a mode of religious worship* is here alluded to, why, the whole difficulty is solved, and all idea of drawing an argument from this passage, in favor of dancing, vanishes at once.

We will now adduce a text from the New Testament. (See Mark, sixth chapter, and from the twenty-fourth to the twenty-eighth verse inclusive.) This passage is not, I believe, often adduced to prove the Scripturality of the very *innocent* practice of dancing! It is a plain, simple, unsophisti-

cated statement of a case that points with an unerring finger to the wicked and immoral tendencies and results of that idolatrous worship offered at the shrine of Terpsichore! It is for this purpose that I have brought forward this Scripture, and here I drop it, without making another remark upon it. Further comment is needless.

C. J. KIMBAL.

THE MATERIALISTIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

Travelers often speak of the freedom from care of the people of the East. From the time of Abraham the dwellers in tents have maintained, with but few changes, the customs of their fathers. There are now, as then, the easy journeys, the shepherd's long reveries as the flocks graze before him, and the solemn nights in the still desert, beneath a sky of such unparalleled transparency that the stars seem suspended like lamps in mid air. Men looking up with unclouded minds into those clear eastern heavens have seemed to God; for the Jewish Scriptures and the Arabian Koran were both penned there by children of Abraham.

But in our age and country, it is the very reverse. Men's minds seem never to escape from the din and dust of business. We have a new continent to be redeemed from the wilderness; and we are working as if every man wished to see it done before he died. We crowd the work of a thousand years into a century. It would seem that our men of business, to be pre-eminently successful, must be absolutely nothing else. Man has called machinery to his assistance, and boasts of reposing while his work is being done, but it would almost seem that with the introduction of machinery the man has become but a part of it himself.

Look, for example, at that great modern machine, a long railroad, with its heavy freight and passenger business. The superintendent of such an affair takes upon himself immense responsibilities. Poor Lamb tells us that he sat so long as clerk in the counting house of a great London firm, that the wood of his desk entered into his soul. The successful superintendent must equally identify himself with his road. His mind is a map of the entire line—it is more than a map, it is a panoramic painting upon which are depicted with astonishing minuteness and accuracy, every foot of iron, every structure, and every article of rolling stock belonging to the company. The road seems but body of his soul. The telegraphic wires which bring in and send out for him so many daily messages, are as nerves of sensation and volition; the iron ways, where pass and repass the full tides of commerce are like arteries and veins which circulate the blood. Is there an accident on the road?—the telegraphic nerves are all excited and quivering with the rapid passage to and fro of messages. Is it a serious one—are all the trains delayed, and are lives lost?—the heart almost stops beating. There is very little space in the choked heart of that man for sowing the seed of the bread of life. While the preacher is holding forth from the pulpit, and the man's eye is politely fixed upon him; the ear of his soul is filled with the heavy rumbling of hundreds of cars. If perchance a word or two of gospel truth finds lodgment in his mind, it is kept crowded down, just as would be a blade of wheat growing in the middle of the track.

There are thousands of Americans, who are just as thoroughly identified each with his own business as this railroad superintendent. Religion finds as little place in their hearts as in their ledgers. There are few who deliberately profess a system of materialism. They are too busy with material things themselves to be troubled about any abstract system whatever. But, unprofessed though it be, a materialistic

spirit is the distinguishing feature of our age. It is the world rather than the flesh and the devil, which is now the great temptation. The business of the world is now done by such complicated machinery, that though men's muscles are less taxed than during a former age of simpler civilization, yet their minds are vastly more occupied. It may be a question whether the cause of religion has not suffered by the change.—Against this spirit of mammon the only thing that is effective is the presentation of Christ crucified, for, more than anything else, the cross awakens our most powerful passions. For though Hobbs may maintain that what is not matter is not anything and Comte may endeavor to persuade men that religion is a useless study, in which we can discover no positive truths, and Buckle may attempt to prove that material prosperity is the only real prosperity, yet there is an immortal soul in man, there is a religious element in him, which, though asserting itself in monstrous forms of cruelty, in bloody human sacrifices, in most ingenious engines of persecution, still has asserted itself, and will assert itself whether in priest or in victim, whether in executioner or in martyr, as the most powerful principle in human nature. No such stubborn and bloody wars, no such fortitude exhibited as that inspired by faith, no enthusiasm that so kindles the soul to white heat, as pious enthusiasm.

And this very fact of the power of the religious element in our natures is one of the strongest arguments against materialism. But let the herald of the cross be all aglow with his theme, let him so feel the power of the death of Christ as to present Him as did Paul to the Galatians, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ was visibly set forth crucified among them," and he will need no formal argument to overthrow a system of materialism, for indeed, as we have seen, few men hold any distinct system, and the preaching of the cross is the great power of God to cast out the spirit of worldliness itself.

MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

There never has been a doubt among the brethren of the Reformation, about the propriety of what may be properly styled Missionary work. By this work I mean the sending of preachers of the Gospel to those who are unable or unwilling to support them in their labors. In this sense, there never was a more purely missionary people on earth than those who inaugurated this great movement. Like the apostles of old, they went forth into the field, accepting help when it was offered, and resorting to the farm or the shop or the schoolroom to supply their wardrobes and their larders when they became exhausted.

But there has been much doubt as to the propriety of organizations apart from the churches for the purpose of accomplishing this work. After much discussion, the mass of the brethren have settled down upon this conclusion,—that it is proper for churches to co-operate for the accomplishment of such necessary enterprises as cannot be accomplished by individual churches. There cannot be a doubt that any church may send out missionaries to any part of the world, when it has the means. The church at Antioch sent out the first two missionaries ever sent on a tour to the Gentile world. If every individual church could and would send into the field its one or more missionaries, there could be no excuse for the organization of a missionary society; for then the work would be going on in the most simple and effective method possible, and in a way expressly provided for in the New Testament. But the fact that individual churches either cannot or will not do the work, justifies them in clubbing together their contributions, and co-operating to discharge a common obligation.

From the very nature of the cause which justifies their existence, such co-operations are to be regarded not as permanent insti-

tutions, but as temporary expedients. All the permanent institutions of the gospel are provided for in the New Testament, but there is no intimation that the apostles ever thought of a Missionary Society. The only co-operation of churches known, was that which Paul inaugurated in Macedonia and Achaia to send a contribution to the poor in Judea; and this was temporary, being limited to that particular crisis, and not a permanent benevolent association. Now the fact that Missionary Societies are justified because that individual churches do not perform the missionary work, if the time should come, by the increased benevolence and ability of the churches, that they would do the work in their individual capacity, it would be our duty to dissolve all such organizations. Instead, therefore, of studying how we can perpetuate our societies, our study should be, how soon can we bring the churches up to that point of liberality by which we can dispense with them. At the recent anniversary in Cincinnati, a very talented brother exhibited the mighty work which could be accomplished if all the brethren were educated to even Jewish liberality, so as to give a tenth of their income to the Lord. I think his calculation was that the American Missionary Society, by receiving one-fourth of that amount, would have the disbursement of about one *million* of dollars per annum. The thought instinctively crossed my mind, what an immense source of corruption such a moneyed patronage in the hands of a few individuals, would present! But the other three millions would at the same time be in the hands of half a dozen state Missionary Boards.—While men continue to be men, such a source of temptation and corruption would ruin any religious community. We see an approach to it already, in the corruption and iniquity which abounds in all the established churches of the Old World, and in the Romish church of our own country. I asked myself, if the brethren could be educated to that liberality, what would we do with the money? and immediately it occurred to me, that we could then turn back to the

purely Scriptural method, and let each church send out its one, two, three, or half a dozen missionaries, who would run with the gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth. Who will deny, that in that case, every society should be disbanded?

While justifying ourselves on the ground above stated, in organizing Missionary Societies, the brethren have all along agreed that they are dangerous institutions. They are dangerous in two respects,—1st, That they may usurp authority to pronounce upon matters of faith and discipline, which belong exclusively to the churches. It is well known that all the usurpations of the papacy and of Protestant ecclesiasticism grew out of centralizing organizations which did not at first contemplate improper results. As long as human nature remains what it is, there will be danger of similar results under similar circumstances. The second point of danger is that the various conflicting elements brought together in such organizations may develop strife and division. This danger is great in proportion to extent of territory, and the number of local and sectional prejudices embraced in the organization. These conflicting elements will exist in any wide-spread religious community. They existed in the apostolic churches with such an intensity that the apostles had to divide their labors with reference thereto, and that Paul had reason to fear that even a gift for the poor sent by the Gentiles, would not be received by the Jews. Like the acid and the alkali, however, these conflicting elements cannot produce ebullition till they are brought into contact. While they remain isolated, their powers for evil are latent; but once bring them together and try to unite them in concerted action, and an explosion must inevitably follow.

In our own country, the widespread diversity of interests and prejudices, render anything like a national organization, peculiarly liable to this second species of danger. Not a single sectarian party which has a consolidated organization has been able to withstand its divisive influence; and

it is doubtless to the want of an ecclesiastical organization that we owe our own exemption from sectional division. It is hard to sectionally divide that which has not been nationally united. Our state organizations are not to the same extent liable to this danger, and hence they are safer than any national organization can be.

We have now before us premises sufficient to decide under what circumstances an existing missionary society should be dissolved. They are these: *First*, when their work can be accomplished by the individual churches, or by some less dangerous association of churches. *Second*, when a society begins to usurp authority to pronounce upon matters of faith and practice. *Third*, when it is found to be a source of strife and division. Under either of these circumstances the continued existence of any society would be improper.

If it be argued that these specifications are the abuse of a good thing; and that it must not be condemned because of its abuse; we answer, that some things are to be decided desirable or not, according to their liability to abuse. This is not true of institutions appointed by God, such as the church; for they must exist, whether abused or not. In reference to them we have no choice.—But in reference to all optionary institutions, their liability to abuse is one of the considerations which must help to determine whether or not they shall exist at all.

By the above standard I have judged the American Christian Missionary Society, and have decided for myself, that it should now cease to exist. All the work which it is now doing, can be done by the State organizations which are already organized, and which are safer institutions. This work consists in raising money, and in sending out missionaries. The State organizations can certainly send out missionaries as effectually and as far, if they have the means. That they can raise the money as effectually is evident, first, from the fact that they draw their resources from the same churches on which the General society depends, and *second*, from the fact that

the General society has just now determined to open correspondence with the State societies to induce them to give up to it a part of the funds which they have raised. This was ordered at the recent meeting, and thus that society confesses its dependence, in the matter of money, upon the State organizations. If they can raise the money, they can certainly expend it, and send missionaries not only within their own borders, but to California, Texas, Europe, Africa, or anywhere else that men can go with the gospel. The work of missions, therefore, need not suffer by the dissolution of that society,

In the second place, this society has, in the judgment of thousands of the brethren, already usurped a prerogative which belongs to the churches, by pronouncing on questions of duty about which there is a widespread difference of opinion, and which, so far as they come within the scope of scripture teaching, should be acted upon by the churches alone. We will not discuss the merits of this judgment, for discussion would at this time be unprofitable. It is sufficient that the judgment is passed and is irreversible.

In the third place, it is now manifest that the society cannot any longer harmonize the churches in the missionary work, and that it is to be, if it continues to exist, a source of untold trouble. This proposition is decided as confidently and as irreversibly as the other, and no argument upon it is desirable just now. The decision of these two questions by those who have made it, is a sufficient ground for their own individual action in the future, and brings us to the question, what should that action be?

If all the brethren were of this opinion, there would be no difficulty in the decision. But here we encounter another difficulty necessarily incident to the existence of even temporary organizations; that is, their love of life. No improper or perverted organization can be expected to die a voluntary death. The perversion always comes in under such disguise as to hide itself from

some eyes, and leave some honest people in favor of the continued existence of the institution. If all the organizations by which the corruptions of the papacy and of sectarianism were brought about, had voluntarily dissolved when they first began to be perverted, the world would have been saved much trouble; but there were good men who saw not the evil, and therefore perpetuated them till they acquired too much vitality to be easily put to death.—Some brethren will still cling to the Missionary Society. With them we must have no quarrel. We must not, for the sake of a difference about expediencies, break fellowship with them as brethren. This would be a sin and a shame. Neither must they, because we cannot longer co-operate with them in a way which all agree to be optional, have a quarrel against us. Mutual forbearance, and an agreement to disagree, must be the order of the hour.

Another evil must be guarded. We must not allow the missionary work to languish, nor our liberality to the cause to be diminished. We have State organizations in some of the States, which are entirely satisfactory to the brethren. Let us rally to them with liberality and zeal renewed, as we have less doubts of the availability and safety of our machinery. We have great reason in Kentucky, to congratulate ourselves that we have at this crisis a most happy and harmonious co-operation, which is just now endeavoring to take a rapid stride forward in its path of usefulness. It is entirely competent to the disbursement of all the liberality of the state, and to the sending of missionaries both to the home and the foreign field. Let the brethren of this State, instead of pausing to give vent to any irritation, determine that we will rally with might and main around our own institution, and enable it to do more good than any other society in the land. Let those brethren who wish to operate through the Society at Cincinnati, go on their way unmolested, and let us have a generous rivalry in doing good. We have the means and the liberality to rival any society in the

land, either state or general. Let us give a good account of ourselves.

If, in any of the states, the state societies are not satisfactory to the brethren of the state, let them either organize others of a more local kind, or act in the great work as individual congregations. And above all, let us all endeavor to educate ourselves to such a liberality, that ere long every church shall send out its own missionary, and all societies for the purpose may be dispensed with. There are hundreds of churches now in the country, who could most easily sustain two preachers, one to labor in its immediate vicinity, and the other to be a missionary abroad. Where is the church that will set the first example?

J. W. MCGARVEY.

THE GROUND OF PERSECUTION.

Why were the Apostles and first Christians persecuted? Why were they "every where spoken against?" Was it simply because they were presenting something new? Certainly not, for many then, as now, devoted themselves almost wholly to telling and hearing some new thing. They had no repugnance to anything merely because it was new. Was it because they were regarded as a new sect? Surely not, for there were so many new sects then, both among the Jews and Pagans, that the people had become accustomed to the rise of new sects, and had learned to excuse them and apologize for them almost as readily as they do now. But there was something peculiar about "this sect," causing it to be "every where spoken against." When we consider the vast number of gods there were among the pagans at that time, we may readily perceive that there was nothing so very repugnant to the views of

the people, even in introducing new gods, for they were accustomed to their frequent introduction. There were also as many classes of worshipers as there were gods, so that there was nothing exciting nor wonderful in the introduction of a new god, a new sect, or a new religion. It was not, therefore, the mere novelty of what was preached, or the idea of a new sect, that instigated the persecution. It was something peculiar in the teaching, and in the new order of people, that constituted the ground of persecution. We think the main ground of persecution was the following:

I. They declared the law, given by Moses, and honored by the whole nation of Israel, during the long cycles of fifteen centuries, abolished, dead and superceded by a better covenant on better promises, and that by the deeds of the law of Moses, no flesh could be justified in the sight of God. This, to a Jew, was speaking against Moses and against God, for the law was from God and given by Moses. Declaring this law null and void, and denying that any man could be saved by it, was a blow at that which was dearer than life to the Jew.

II. They declared all the pagan deities were vanities—not gods at all—not objects of worship—that they had no power to save, and, consequently, that all the pagan religions in the world were of no value—all nothing—and that the people should turn from them to serve the living God.

III. They at one dash, set aside all the religious organizations in the world as null and void, without any authority and unworthy of any regard.

IV. They set aside all the priests in the world, with all their official authority, as not to be regarded in their official capacity.

V. They openly declared that all the world was under sin—that God had concluded all in unbelief—that all the world was lost.

Such is a brief outline of their position negatively. Nor did they "let other people alone," nor their doctrines, but declar-

ed these negative positions and maintained them with a determination and pertinacity unequalled in the history of the world.— Their course amounted to a proposition to abolish all the religions on earth, as of no authority, with all the priests and religious functionaries, and thus, too, at one blow, strike down the flourishing business of an immense class of craftsmen, engaged in making shrines, with all the various articles of service and adorning for the pagan gods and temples. This course, we may rest assured, was by no means popular.— The more success they had in it, the more bitter and relentless their opponents became.

But now we come to look at their position affirmatively. What do they affirm? They lay down one grand and fundamental truth, as the foundation truth of all the truths they have for mankind, which is the affirmative proposition that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ the Son of the living God. This glorious and wonderful person, whom they style the Christ, or the Anointed, they declare to be the rock of offence, the stone of stumbling rejected by Jewish builders, but now made the head of the corner, and to this they add the exclusive declaration, that there is salvation in no other, for there is no other name given under heaven nor among men by which we can be saved. The Lord had laid down the same exclusive doctrine himself, in the words, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man comes to the Father but by me."— Again he says, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me." They declare that he is the head over all, and blessed for ever and ever. This one Lord, the Head of the one Church, which he calls "my Church," is the "one Shepherd" of the "one fold," the "King of kings and Lord of lords." His friends declare him to be "the only potentate," "the Alpha and Omega," "the beginning and the end," "the first and the last," "the bright and the morning star." They declare that He was before all things, and that by Him all things consist—that He is the express im-

age of the invisible God, and the brightness of the Father's glory—that in Him dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily—that he is the resurrection and the life—that the Infinite One has sworn by His own great name, that, to Him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God. They declare that God commanded all the angels to worship him. He told them, himself, that "all authority in heaven and on earth was given to him." In this one name they declare there is salvation for the world. Out of it, there is no salvation for one soul of our race.

The friends of Jesus declared that he authorized one religion, with which they aimed to supercede all the other religions on earth, and fill the whole world.

In the name of Jesus, they established one kingdom, one church, one building, one temple, one body, one family, one fold, or government, which they intended to supercede, set aside, and do away all other religious confederations on the entire face of the earth.

They introduce the New Covenant, or the New Testament, as the only divinely authorized religious law on earth; openly and boldly avow it to be their purpose, that it shall supercede all other religious laws, and make it the only supreme and absolute law, in religion, throughout the whole world. This was regarded as arrogant in the extreme.

They proselyted thousands on thousands from all sects of Jews and Pagans. This their opponents regarded as a most ungracious work, and by this they were excited no little. To see the people in such immense masses from all parties going over to one party, alarmed them in two ways. 1. They were alarmed and mortified to see their own ranks thinning. 2. To see such a rapidly rising and increasing party alarm them, for they feared it would swallow up every thing.

From these observations, we come to the conclusion that the main ground of all the persecution inflicted on the first Christians

was their *success and exclusiveness*. They thought they were right. Nay, more; they believed they were right. They positively *knew they were right*, and they were neither ashamed nor afraid to declare it, and that nothing else was right. There was no half-way ground with them. There was no compromising. They were emphatically illiberal and exclusive. With them, it was the Christ of the prophets and of the Bible, or no Savior. It was the religion of Christ or no religion; the law of Christ or no religious law; the church of Christ or no church; a Christian or nothing. They had not a good wish, a prayer, or a dollar, for anything under the name of religion, but the religion of Christ. For this narrowness, exclusiveness and illiberality, they were hated and persecuted by all parties throughout the world. They would not bow to a Pagan altar, image or god. They would not enter a Pagan temple, present a Pagan offering, or honor a Pagan god.—They did not stop to settle any little disputes touching the comparative merits of Pagan altars, images or gods; their offerings devotions or ceremonies. Nor did they stop to discuss the comparative merits of the worshipers, but openly declared their gods no Gods, and their worship null and void—all nothing. Nor did they stop to dispute about the comparative merits of the Jewish sects, their ceremonies or worship, but they unequivocally declared all, both Jews and Gentiles, under sin—in unbelief—that the whole world was guilty, condemned and lost, and could not be saved except through Christ. This brought down the ire of all parties on them, and united all in opposing them.

In our next we shall inquire what it is that unites all the popular parties in opposing the Reformers of the nineteenth century.

B. F.

SECOND COMING OF THE LORD.

NO. II.

In the pursuit of our subject, the question that next arises is, "How will he come?" This also the Bible answers.— "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." By comparing Dan. vii: 13, Matt. xxiv: 30, Mark xiii: 26, Luke xxi: 27, with Matt. xvi: 27, xxv: 32, Mark viii: 38, we can have no doubt but that wherever "clouds" are spoken of in connection with the coming of Christ, they are emblematical of the armies of angels who will attend him; the bright and glorious appearance often attributed to them, giving a body of them the appearance of a bright cloud. That his coming will be strictly of a personal nature, and not spiritual, as some suppose, this passage abundantly shows, as well as all others that speak of it.

We come now to notice the signs that immediately precede his coming. And first, the chain of events recorded in the 6th chapter of Revelation, commencing at the 12th verse. We will only quote as far as fulfilled. "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she was shaken of a mighty wind." See also Matt. xxiv: 39, Luke xxi: 25, 26, where Christ foretold the same things. "Sun," "moon," and "stars" are here used as emblems of

earthly flowers of different kinds and grades. We have a complete key to the interpretation of these words, in the first part of the 12th chapter of Rev. The "woman clothed with the sun," "the moon under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars upon her head," can represent nothing else than the Jewish nation. This was the nation that brought forth the "man-child," Jesus Christ, who was to "rule all nations with rod of iron," and who "was caught up unto God and to his throne." Let us explain a little. The sun is the center and source of light, and may thus be a fit emblem of a nation who, at any particular time, may be the center of religious and intellectual light among the nations of the earth. The Jewish nation was such a center of light among the surrounding and benighted Gentile nations. The moon shines, not with a light of its own, but with borrowed or delegated light; and may, therefore, be a fit emblem of a representative body exercising the same kind of power. The tribe of Lévi, among the Jews, was such a body. The power to govern, which heretofore had been held by the heads of families throughout the nation, was now given or delegated to this tribe. Stars are, in appearance, much smaller bodies than the sun, but like it, shine by their own light, and may thus represent smaller, distinct bodies. The twelve tribes were thus represented by twelve stars.— Thus we see the fitness of these emblems in the case of the Jewish nation. Our own country, the United States, is a nation which is, if possible, more perfectly represented by these symbols, sun, moon and stars. In noting the similarity, our remarks will have reference to the state of things before the rebellion, when peace everywhere reigned. This nation, of all the nations of the earth, stood highest as a source of light and knowledge. In every city, town, village, nook and corner were colleges, seminaries, printing presses and schools, from which issued streams of light that have reached to every other nation under heaven. No other nation would

boast of light, moral and intellectual, so universally diffused. What is it that draws the multiplied thousands from the shores of the old world, but the light that streams out from this land of liberty, inviting them to come and warm themselves in its genial rays, thereby receiving new life and energy? The sun is indeed a fit and striking emblem of our land. But there is a representative body in our midst, the Congress of the United States, that, like the moon, shines with borrowed or delegated light. The power to govern, possessed by the people, is lent by them to this body; and through the laws which it makes, the light is reflected, not only over our own land, but through intervening space to surrounding nations.

Each separate state may be, and actually is, represented by a star, and fitly too; as each possesses the power of sending forth light of itself, though but a small portion in comparison with that which emanates from the whole.

Let us now compare the events of the last three years with the sublime revelations of the 6th seal. Political revolutions, great and sudden upheavings and overturnings of social institutions, are represented, not only in the language of prophecy, but in modern usage, as earthquakes. In May, 1860, at the city of Charleston, S. C., was felt the first shock of an earthquake, the repeated and terrible vibrations of which, have shaken the whole land; the great masses of society have been torn up, and vast armies have been dashed against each other till many tens of thousands have been buried in the ruins. That gigantic institution, American slavery, is fast being thrown down by the violence of the shocks; in a word, "the powers that are in heaven,"—the separated States, have been shaken to an extent fearful in the extreme.—Men's hearts have failed them for fear, and for looking after the things that should come upon them. Then this land that had so long been radiant with light and happiness, was suddenly covered with the darkness of doubt and uncertainty; most in-

tense over the region of the Southern States. There it was, indeed, like the starless midnight. Schools were broken up, presses stopped and preaching almost ceased. Every day one could hear the exclamation, "how dark it is! we cannot see a single day before us." "I feel as though I were in the midst of a room totally dark, feeling about, not knowing which way to turn."

Such expressions as these were everywhere heard; the people were lost in perplexity with regard to what they should do, and what was to become of them. Even comic wit lent its aid to illustrate the darkening of the political sun.

In Harper's Illustrated Weekly, the rebel President was represented as standing upon the surface of a globe, and with a pair of muskets crossed in the form of huge shears, in the act of snuffing out the light that had so long shone only to gladden all who came within its influence.

The becoming of the moon as blood, is most evidently fulfilled by the declaration of war by Congress to put down rebellion. This declaration of this body, and all its subsequent action, have necessarily resulted in the shedding of rivers of blood; and the voice of the people, so recently expressed, is, "let there still be blood, blood, till this wicked rebellion is forever crushed."

The falling of stars is fulfilled in the secession of the Southern States. In Dec., 1860, the first star fell; and the rest followed in quick succession—not at long intervals, but precisely as "untimely figs" fall when the tree "is shaken of a mighty wind;" almost at once, did these "stars," shaken by that "great earthquake," fall from the blue sky of heaven to the earth, to be trampled by the feet of conquering armies.

When Louisiana seceded, an English journal begins an article, "Another star has fallen!" and such language was of frequent occurrence, in speaking of these States. In comparing the events of the past three years with the words of Christ,

and the opening of the sixth seal, who, with any degree of discernment, can fail to see the coincidence? How is it possible that any subsequent event can more exactly correspond? Dear reader, study the two pictures—the prophecy and these events; and the more you do so, the plainer will their resemblance be seen. What next after these things? “The sign of the Son of Man in heaven,” do you ask what it is? I cannot tell you now. Let us watch and pray, and wait a very little while, and we shall see. It may be but a few months; and then—Christ himself. Brethren and sisters, what joys and sorrows; what happy exultation and agonizing terror; what shouts of praise and groans of despair, will there mingle! *Are you ready?* your loins girded, and your lamps trimmed and burning? Watch and pray.

C. S. TOWN.

To be Continued.

THE GROUND OF OPPOSITION.

In a previous article, we endeavored to develop the ground of persecution, in the time of the first Christians, or the reason why they were “everywhere spoken against” and persecuted. We shall proceed, in the present article, to inquire into a subject more intimately connected with our own time. It is a matter of fact, that a man can profess nothing in our time which will call down on his head the same united and unmitigated persecution from all the surrounding religious parties, as the profession to be a Christian—*simply a Christian—no more, no less.* It has become unpopular to be simply a follower of Christ—a disciple of Christ—nothing more, nothing less. It is unintelligible to the good people of our time, for a man, when inquired of what he is, to say, a Christian—a disciple of Christ.

In the time of the apostles, for a man to say, “I am a Christian,” or “I am a disciple of Christ,” told what he was. Their opponents could understand it. When a man says, “I am a Lutheran,” “I am a Calvinist,” “I am a Wesleyan,” etc., etc., it is easily understood; but when he says, “I am a Christian,” it is incomprehensible! Not only so, but to be a Lutheran, calls forth no persecution, no united, determined and unmitigated opposition. In the same way, to be a Calvinist, a Wesleyan, etc., etc. calls down on a man no united, persistent and unabating persecution. A man may be a Roman Catholic, bow down to images, worship relics, the Virgin Mary, count beads, observe Lent, and all the other disgraceful mixtures of Judaism, Paganism and Christianity ever palmed on the credulity of mankind, and call down on him no serious opposition. A man may become a Swedenborgian, and swallow all the mythical, imaginative and dreamy vagaries of that worldly sect, and call down no serious opposition. But the day a man declares himself a Christian, nothing more, nothing less; declares that he receives the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Jesus; that he is simply a follower of Christ—his disciple, and nothing else, he is a subject of hostility for every partisan in the land.—The day a man declares himself a member of the Church of Christ, and nothing else, he is a subject for the gauntlet. Why is this? Why are those who profess simply to be Christians—disciples of Christ, and take the law of God as their only rule of faith and practice, opposed more than any other people in this country? Why do all others unite in opposing them? This is the question we now propose to answer.

I. They claim that there is but one Divinely authorized religion on earth—the religion of Christ, as set forth in the New Testament, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and that all the other religions in the world are spurious.

II. They maintain that there is but the one Savior, and that he has but one gospel, and has anathematized any man or angel

who shall preach any other, or even a perversion of this one.

III. They maintain that there is but one Church of Christ, and that all others are spurious, having no Divine authority.

IV. They maintain that the one Church of Christ should be designated in the same way now, or by the same terms, as in the time of the apostles—that all unscriptural names for the church, or the people of God, should be discarded.

V. They maintain that the law of Christ is the supreme authority in the Church—the absolute authority—and that all other laws for the Church are spurious, usurpations and sinful.

VI. They maintain that the conditions on which a person is to be received into the church are simply those set forth by the apostles and first evangelists, in their practice, in proselyting, founding churches, and taking care of them.

VII. They maintain that all the people of God should belong to the one body, and be united in it.

“I see nothing in that to call forth opposition,” replies some one; “all that appears almost self-evident.” It is not that this ground is not almost self-evidently right, that calls forth the opposition. Entirely different is the reason for opposition. The ground is almost self-evidently right, and success must attend righteous efforts to maintain and defend it. This, too, is one of the circumstances calling forth the opposition. If the claim were fallacious; if the ground were untenable; if the position were evidently false; if no success were attending; if the results of success affected no party around us, there would be no serious opposition. But here is the trouble. The ground is impregnable, so manifestly so that any one can be made to see it, possessing fairness and candor enough to be a Christian at all. Any man can see, at a glance, that there is but one Divinely authorized religion on earth; but one Savior, one gospel, one church, or “one fold,” and that it should be designated in the same way, or in the same terms now, as in the time of the

apostles; that there is but one law of Christ—that it is supreme—absolute; that persons should take precisely the same steps now to become members of the church they did in the time of the apostles, and that all the people of God should be in the “one fold,” under the “one Shepherd.” The people by thousands in all directions can be convinced of all this, and are becoming more and more convinced every day. They are, too, going over continually in vast numbers, and taking their stand on this invulnerable ground.

But the reader inquires again for the cause of opposition. Look at the consequences that must follow, if this ground succeeds. Look at the following list:

I. If there is but one Divinely authorized religion, then, all the other religions in the world are spurious, to be rejected and thrown aside. As soon as a man is brought to see this, if he is an honest man, and we cannot see how any one can fail to see it at a glance, he sets out in search of the *one religion*. He soon decides that the one religion is the religion of Christ. He does not want a *form* of that religion, or something like it, but he wants the religion of Christ itself. He says, I want that or nothing. This leads to the exclusion of everything else. With him, there can be no compromise. He can yield nothing. His religion is Divine. It came from God. All other religion is spurious. Here the ground of united opposition begins.

II. If a man takes the ground that there is but one gospel, as every candid man must, when he thinks about it, then, everything else, bearing the name gospel, must be repudiated and discarded. He does not want a man to preach his views of the gospel, or prove some doctrine by the gospel, or preach something like the gospel, but he wants a man to preach the gospel itself, and nothing else. This sets aside and abolishes all preaching of Romanism, Mormonism, Universalism, Unitarianism, Trinitarianism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Lutheranism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Baptistism, etc., etc. as spurious and wholly

unauthorized. Here again, is ground of opposition.

III. If a man takes the ground, as we certainly do, that there is but one Lord, the one head, and but one foundation for one church, one body, one fold, one building, and that there is but the one temple, or kingdom of God, and that any separate organization, or body, is spurious, it is equivalent to a proposition to abolish all the religious organizations in the world, but the one, disband them and set them aside. We cannot expect them to do this without a struggle. There are men in these side organizations that have spent the vigor of their lives in building them up, and they will not see them abolished without a hard fight.

IV. When we condemn all names, as religious designations for the people of God, except those applied to them in the Bible, and discard them, we virtually propose to abolish all the names of the popular establishments in this country, and set them all aside. Here is another ground of opposition. These names, by long use, have become dear to those who have adopted them and fought under them for many years.—They will not give them up without opposition.

V. When we assert that the law of Christ is supreme—absolute, and that all other laws are spurious, usurpations, and wholly unauthorized, we come in direct collision with a long list of most venerable creeds; and our proposition is nothing less than a proposal to abolish all these venerable creeds and do them away—to supersede the whole of them by the law of Christ. In this we cannot expect to succeed without opposition.

VI. When we come before the people with a proposition to unite all the Israel of God in one body, on the one foundation—the one rock, which is Christ—under the one law, the law of Christ, we virtually propose to abolish all the partisan religious organizations now in existence; to supersede and set them aside, as new confederacies, wholly unauthorized by King Jesus. This is the proposition we have now for all the

parties in the land. Whatever it is that constitutes that something called Calvinism, is an addition to the law of God, and we can not unite on it. Whatever it is that constitutes that something called Arminianism, is an addition to the law of Christ, and we cannot unite on it, but the law of Christ itself, we all admit to be right, and we can unite on it. We cannot unite on Luther, Calvin or Wesley, but we can unite on Christ. We cannot unite on Presbyterianism, for many of us do not believe it. We cannot unite on Methodism, for many of us do not believe it. We cannot unite on Baptistism, for many of us do not believe it.—But we can unite on Christianity, for we all believe it. We cannot unite on any sectarian name, if it were right to do so, for we cannot agree on any sectarian name; but we all are willing to be called Christians, Disciples of Christ, the people of God, Saints, and can agree to be called by scriptural designations.

Our mission is a plain one, and one in which there can be no compromise. We come to restore Jesus, our Lord and King, to the hearts of the people of this generation, and induce them to unite in him, as their only head and leader, under his name and law, in his body, the church, to be his and be governed by him. His authority we recognize and adore. His law we delight to honor. His church we desire to build up. His name we admire and extol above every other name. But every other leader we repudiate. Every other head is a usurper. Every other law proposed for the people of God is an imposition. Every other name proposed for the people of God is a deception. Every other organization than the one on the foundation laid by him, with another name, another law, an independent set of officers, and operating separately, is treason in the government of God. Our mission is to call the people back from all these side organizations to the ancient name, the first foundation, the religion of Christ itself; the gospel as it was at the beginning, to the one body, the one faith, one hope, one Spirit, one immersion, and in this we

have been abundantly blessed of the Lord. It is no longer a matter of theory. We are demonstrating the practicability of it. We are seeing them come from all parties, and gathering together under Him who has loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood. Never was there a people more united nor firmer settled in their great purpose than we are in the undertaking to restore primitive Christianity and unite all the people of God. Every man who is firm and has any faith in this great work, zeal and industry, is succeeding wonderfully.— But there can be no compromise. We must take the responsibility, and at all hazards carry the work forward.

B. F.

CHRISTIAN EARNESTNESS.

The grand essential to success in any of the varied pursuits of life is a concentration of faculties upon our business, to which all else must be subject. This will be readily endorsed by any business man in the land. *He*, indeed, practically illustrates his belief, by choosing and retaining in his employ only such assistants as give him their undivided services.

If true in its application to worldly objects, where weak man is the party interested, and the paltry things of time the object, with how infinitely greater solemnity does the truth appeal to us, in our dealings with the infinite and eternal God—where the issue at stake is everlasting life around His throne!

In fact, the Christian life is a business; where our Father furnishes us, as capital, that grain of faith small as a mustard-seed, and then in a measure leaves us to our own resources—never interposing to *force* prosperity upon us, but only when necessary to save from utter bankruptcy.

Just here many, many Christians make a mistake, fatal alike to substantial growth in

grace, and to spiritual enjoyment. They regard *faith in Jesus Christ* as something too tender and delicate for *every-day* use, and only resort to it upon great occasions.

Now, faith, though an exotic, is a hardy plant, and susceptible of culture in any climate, or in any soil. But *culture* it must have, or there will be no growth. True, there is required the gentle dew from the spirit of Christ; but it is peculiar to this Christian plant, that the dew falls most copiously where there has been the greatest cultivation.

It is this constant faith in our blessed Lord, in His promises and His love, extended to the most minute concerns of life, which constitutes the ground-work of Christian earnestness—as it enables us to devote our time, property, yea, life itself, to the service of the Most High God.

The Church of God should be “a peculiar people, zealous of good works.” Is it? Is there so palpable a difference between the outward seeming of a large portion of professing Christians and the world at large, as to excite the attention of the mere passer-by? Is there not *some* ground for the charge, that joining the Church often makes little *outward change* in us?

God has been pleased to select *us*, among the thousands naturally no worse than we, as distinguished objects of His sovereignty and infinite love. He demands from us in return—not a partial and occasional attention—but an *entire* and *complete* devotion to His service. And it is a perfect test of our love for Him; as it requires no more than that same vigilance and activity which we have ever before demonstrated in our worldly enterprises.

This devotion to God requires us to make His cause absolutely *first* in our affections and exertions. Business we may and must attend to; but always in entire subjection to our high calling. And *in* a legitimate business, there are a thousand little points of almost daily occurrence, that afford opportunity to evince our love of God and His commands.

Not long since, I was in the store of one

of your prominent business men, and overheard a conversation that left a profound impression upon my mind. The merchant had been selling goods to a customer (who was from a distance), and after finishing business matters satisfactorily, in the most delicate and courteous manner introduced the subject of religion, and closed the interview with practical and earnest remarks, that may bring forth fruit. This is but a single example of the variety of ways in which an earnest Christian may honor God.

Again, prayer is another form in which Christian earnestness may be evinced. Did you ever consider how little time the most of us devote to earnest, fervent prayer?—Why, the celebrated George Muller spends whole hours each day in private prayer,—and as a result, has reared eleven immense buildings, in which he supports 1,150 destitute orphans; all the means for which—over one million dollars—he has obtained by prayer alone!

John Knox, the Scottish reformer, prayed so incessantly, that it is said his knees became seriously deformed. So on with all the list of eminent saints—all, all were mighty in prayer.

The importance of this subject cannot be overrated. "The effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much."

We should never think of entering upon the duties of the day, until we have sought and found God's blessing. It is not enough to begin, but we must continue, until we find that peace which passeth understanding—until we prevail with God, like Israel of old. Then, and not till then, can we understand that "joy in believing," which might be the portion of all. Not till then, can we rapturously sing with the Psalmist, "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness."

W. O. H.

CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

"Let all the people praise Thee."—Bible.

"Let two men and three women praise Thee."—Modern Practice.

What can be done to promote congregational singing? This is a question of great practical moment to the friends of Zion. Singing the praises of God in public worship is admitted by all to be a duty. No one would think of omitting this part of divine service; and yet how is it too frequently performed? Instead of the whole congregation joining in this exercise, it is confined almost exclusively to the choir, often a very small and select band of singers, sitting by themselves in some elevated niche, and performing their music for the admiration of the audience, and not to please God. Some half a dozen voices thus discharge the whole duty of singing for the congregation. They sing new tunes, in which the people cannot join—many of them difficult pieces to perform, and utterly unfit for congregational singing. Then they sing so indistinctly, with such an operatic air and Italian manner, that it is impossible to tell whether they are singing in Latin or Greek, Choctaw or English. And this is called praising God in public worship! Many of the good old members of the church do not like it—their mouths are shut from this service, but they cannot help it. They mourn over it—they feel that it is not right—they do not enjoy this service at all, but suffer under it a kind of torture; yet they are told if they say anything, that they are "Old Foggy,"—"behind the age"—"not in harmony with the spirit of the times." Now this ought not so to be. These good old men and women are the very salt of the church; they are its chief pillars—its true lights—its vital force. They are God's "hidden ones," with whom is the "hiding of his power," and in whom his Spirit dwells. We cannot afford to wound their feelings, stifle their devotions, and crucify their religious sensibili-

ties in the house of God. Besides, are they not in the right? Are they more "Old Fogy" than David was, who, speaking by the Holy Ghost, said, "Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee." "Both young men and maidens; old men and children; let them praise the name of the Lord?"

This whole matter of public praise in the sanctuary has been given up too exclusively to the "young men and maidens," while the "old men and children" are left out. Instead of the divine command, "Let all the people praise Thee," it has been amended or "modified," like military orders, into, "Let two men and three women praise Thee."

Is this in accordance with the mind of the Spirit? Is it in accordance with the ancient usage of the church, both under the Old Testament dispensation and the New? Is it best adapted to edify the church, to advance believers in holiness, to convert sinners, and to glorify God?—I cannot think it is. There is wonderful power in music to move the soul. How the sound of the bugle or the trumpet inspires the cavalry for a deadly charge along the serried ranks of the enemy! How the drum and fife inspires a whole regiment with courage! How the spirit-stirring notes of a band will move a vast crowd as the trees of the forest are moved by the wind! But sacred music is adapted to produce effects far above any other kind.—Here we have "music married to immortal verse," and that, too, on the most sublime themes that ever engrossed the thoughts of mortals or of angels. Our lyric poetry is much of it of a very high order. It touches the tenderest chords in the human heart, merely to hear it read. How much more ought it to melt and move when it is sung! Yet often a Psalm or Hymn has far more effect by being *read well* from the pulpit, than when sung by the choir. Instead of this, the effect ought to be deepened and intensified by the singing. Dr. Isaac Watts said on this subject, more than a hundred years ago: "Of all our religious

solemnities, psalmody is the most unhappily managed. The very action which should elevate us to the most divine and delightful sensations, doth not only *flatten our devotions*, but too often *touches all the springs of uneasiness within us.*"

Some progress has no doubt been made in this heavenly art since this was written, but there remains much yet to be done.—We need to reform *backwards* in some particulars. We need to seek for the "old paths," and inquire for the good old ways. Music in the house of God certainly has not the power now that it had in the days of our fathers and mothers. There was something truly inspiring in listening to the full volume of sound rising from a vast congregation, and bearing up their united supplications, adorations, confessions, thanksgivings and praises, to the throne of Jehovah. They sung at least with the *spirit*, if not with the understanding, also. They *put their hearts* into their songs, and did not mock the Lord "with solemn words upon a thoughtless tongue." I have often heard the Methodists sing in this way in former years, when the effect was overpowering. But they, too, are following the fashions, and introducing choir singing, to the exclusion of the good old congregational way. I do not object to a choir if it is simply a *leader* of the congregation—the *servant* and not the *master* of the *body of worshipers*. In the present state of musical knowledge in most of our congregations, choirs are perhaps a necessity; but then they should not stop the mouths of God's people by singing all new tunes, and such as the congregation cannot join in.—An occasional new piece may be introduced and repeated so often that all will soon be able to sing it. Let them bring forth things *new* and *old* from the treasury of sacred music, but let not the new crowd out the old, for often "the old is better."

Then the congregation ought to meet one evening in a week to practice sacred music. They might take half an hour after the weekly lecture or prayer-meeting for this object, and they would catch the

air of a new tune that was *worth learning*, and be able to join in singing it in the public worship of the sanctuary. Children, too, ought to be instructed in sacred music and be able to unite in the praises of the house of God. We must begin with the children, and teach them music the same as any other branch of science, before we can expect to have good congregational singing.

P.

THE AGES.

Heb. xi : 3.

In the examination of this passage, we must attend to the force of the preposition *eis*. The latter clause, "*eis to me ek phainomenon ta blepomena gegonenai*," is dependent on the former, and is designed to express the result of the action expressed by the verb *katartizo*. The latter clause, as our English version has it, seems to express a conclusion drawn from the former. The two are thus made to hold the relation of premise and conclusion. We read thus : By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God. This is the premise. Then follows the conclusion : So that the things seen were not made of the things that do appear. If the word *framed* is taken in the sense of the word *made*, then the worlds were made by the word of God out of nothing.

But in considering the force of the preposition *eis*, we are not able to recall an instance in which it is ever made to express a conclusion as above ; but always a purpose or result. Take the following example : Matt. xx : 19, "And they shall deliver him to the Gentiles, *eis to empaixai*, to mock," &c. Here it is evident that *eis to empaixai* denotes the purpose for which the Savior was delivered to the Gentiles.

In Mark xiv : 55, "And the chief priests

and all the Sanhedrim sought testimony against Jesus, *eis to thanatosai*, to put him to death." Evidently it expresses purpose here.

In Luke xx : 20, "That they might take hold of his words, in order to deliver him," &c. *Eis to paradounai* here clearly expresses purpose.

In Romans i : 11, "That I may impart to you some spiritual gift, in order that you may be established, or strengthened," *eis to sterichthenai* expresses purpose.

In Romans xi : 11, *eis to parazelosai* expresses purpose. Salvation has come to the Gentiles in order to provoke them to jealousy.

In Heb. ii : 17, "That he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, in order to make expiation for the sins of the people," *Eis to hilaskesthai* denotes purpose here. I do not remember an instance in which *eis* with an affinitive expresses a conclusion. It expresses purpose, object, result. Again : do the words "So that," in our Common Version, express conclusion as from a premise ? We will again quote the sentence :

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Do not the words "so that" in this sentence, express a result ? That *eis*, with this latter clause, expresses either purpose or result, is clear, according to its usage.—The latter clause of this sentence expresses a result of that which was said to have been done in the former : that is, that things seen were not made things that appear, is a result of framing, or arranging the worlds by the word of God. This being so, the question arises, What are things seen ? They must be sun, moon, stars and earth. But sun, moon, stars and earth are the worlds. Then, the worlds—that is, sun, moon, stars and earth—were framed, or arranged, by the word of God ; and the purpose or result of this framing, or arranging, was, that things seen—that is, sun, moon, stars and earth—should not be

made of things that appear. Then, again: sun, moon, stars and earth were arranged by the word of God, and the arrangement was so made, that sun, moon, stars and earth were not made of things that appear. In other words, sun, moon, stars and earth were arranged before things were made.

Now if we make use of our English word "ages," in the place of "worlds," all difficulty vanishes. We translate:

By faith we understand that the ages were set in order by the word of God, so that things which are seen have not come into being from things that appear.

Here, the latter clause expresses clearly a result of that which is said to have been done in the former. The ages were set in motion by the word of God. These ages have been revolving, how long we know not. But things now seen are a result of the revolution of past ages; the ages having been so set in order that the things which we now see have not come into being from things which appear. In plain language, the present material things are not made of such as are now seen. The earth was not made of the earth; the stars were not made of stars; nor the sun of the sun; but they have come into being from that which does not appear to us.

Suppose we turn to the first chapter of Genesis, and listen to the Hebrew Law-giver:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was waste and desolate; and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

Here is fact declared:—In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.—Here we have a truth—creation had a beginning. But the things seen did not come into being from things that appear. The probability is that our earth was in process of formation for many ages. It certainly existed prior to the six days. The six days were days of putting the earth in a proper condition for the reception of man. Mark the words of Moses: "The earth was waste and desolate, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This was before time

began; in other words, before the first day. Yet creation had a beginning. This beginning of creation was not when God commanded the light to shine out of darkness, six thousand years ago. Let us hear the apostle John:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being by Him; and without Him, not one thing came into being which is now in being."

The "beginning" of which Moses speaks, is that of which John speaks. It is evidently the beginning of creation, not of putting the earth into the shape which it received during the six days. For, as we have seen from Moses, God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning; and this beginning antedates the first day. The earth was waste and desolate; or, without form and void; and while in this condition, the Spirit of God hovered over the face of the deep. This hovering over the deep, or incubation, antedates the first day; for God said, Let light be; and light was. The evening and the morning were the first day. The light came into being, and made the first morning. Now, it would puzzle the wisest heads to say what was the length of the first evening. For the first evening was evidently the darkness that antedated the coming of light. As the earth lay in the deep, and each was involved in the darkness of the first evening, we see that there is some force also in this—that things seen have not come into being from things that appear. Beyond the first morning lies, to us at least, an endless evening, or darkness. Moses presents us with an earth created in this darkness; but lying within the deep, waste and desolate, or without form, and void of inhabitants. The Spirit of God hovers over this deep; out of the darkened deep springs, at the command of God, light. From this moment the earth begins to assume form.

Speaking literally, did not the visible spring out of the invisible? Paul says, that God commanded the light to shine out

of darkness. Out of darkness light has come; out of the darkness of that first evening of untold duration, came our earth. Paul does not propose to tell us of what visible things are made. This question Scripture does not solve. But we are told that the *aionas*, ages, were set in order by the word of God, so that things that are seen, have not come into being from things that appear.

Now, from that beginning spoken of by Moses and by John, up to the period when God commanded light to shine out of darkness, there must have been ages on ages.—For, surely, no one can be so badly informed as to suppose that the whole universe was created just six thousand years ago. There are systems countless: systems composed of suns and attendant planets, floating in space. These heavens existed long before our earth assumed its present form. They were evolved from the primeval darkness that filled infinite space, ere God began to create. It required multitudinous ages for the evolution of the countless systems that fill the space we see.

Let us, by an effort of mind, go back into the eternity past, and take our stand at that point, called by Moses and John, The beginning. God, the Word, the Spirit were alone. Nothing had been created.—Throughout space, no sun, nor star was seen. By the will of God, what we call matter, came into being throughout space. The matter of which all visible things are made, came into being at one fiat of the Almighty's will. Then began the ages.—Then began that *protheeis aionon*, pre-arrangement of ages, which God made or established, *en Christo*, by Christ Jesus our Lord. This arrangement was made by Christ. Christ made the ages, set them in order from the beginning; and they have rolled on, developing the purposes of God, through the eternity that is past; and will roll on, through the eternity to come, developing the untold and unspeakable wisdom of Jehovah. The order of heaven, the will of the Eternal, is, that light shall spring out of darkness, the visible from

the invisible, things seen from things that do not appear; and all this, that his own infinite, manifold, and unspeakable wisdom shall unfold, and be developed before the created intelligence of the universe.

Again: are not formations constantly taking place in the vegetable world—formations from things unseen? Every shrub, every flower, every tree is formed, in part, of that which is, by us, unseen. The grass that feeds the cattle on a thousand hills—whence comes it? Its form is seen by us. But whence came the matter of which it is composed? The grass, and the flower of the grass, will teach us, if we consider the lessons that they give.

“By faith we understand that the ages were set in order by the word of God, so that the things are seen have not come into being from things that appear.”

The expression *kata prothesin aionon*, Ephesians iii: 11, may admit of two renderings: 1, According to the purpose of the ages; 2, According to the pre-arrangement of the ages. The common version has—according to the eternal purpose.—This would not differ from the first above—according to the purpose of the ages. For, a purpose existing for ages, may be called an eternal purpose. Nor will the second above differ materially from the first: for, taking the whole connection, we see that the leading thought is the same, which is this—That the manifold wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and the authorities in the heavenly regions, in accordance with the pre-arrangement of the ages which he made or established in or by Christ Jesus our Lord. The ages were so pre-arranged as to develop, to principalities and authorities in the heavenly regions, the manifold wisdom of God.—In whatever way we translate the passage, the leading thought is the same. There was a purpose of God. There was also an arrangement of ages, so made as to develop this purpose. Now, it is true, both of things seen and of the church, that the ages were so arranged as to develop them both. And it is true of the church, as it is of sun,

moon and stars, that what is seen, has not come into being from things that appear.—What then is the conclusion of the whole matter? It seems to me to be this: That God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, has concealed in darkness the manner in which the universe came into being; but has left us to understand by faith, that whatever we see, whether the material universe or the church, has not come into being from things that appear; in other words, that he has so set the ages in order, as to cause the visible to arise out of the invisible; and all this for the manifestation of his infinite wisdom, during the revolution of endless ages.

Before concluding this subject, I must say something more, as the case seems to require it. The word *aion* is a digammatized noun; that is, it was originally pronounced with the aid of the digamma, thus: *aifon*; or, *aivon*. Hence came the Latin *evum*, and our English *ever*. “Everlasting” is equal to “lasting for an age,” and its sense depends upon the context.—“Forever” is equal to “for an age,” whatever the age may be. The term “age” is indefinite, as to duration, and may express “the life of man,” or “endless duration.” I have not the word “everlasting” in my version, because of its indefiniteness. I have used the word “eternal,” as clearly expressing endless duration.

In that passage in which it is said, that the sin against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven, in this world nor in the world to come, the word is *aion*; and I have translated it by our English term *age*.—The sin against the Holy Spirit, which was committed by the Jews when they said that Jesus cast out demons by the prince of demons, thus, in effect, saying that the Holy Spirit was a demon, was pardonable by no sacrifice under the law, nor even by the sacrifice of Christ himself: hence, neither in the Jewish nor the Christian age.

An age, and ages, have an end; but the *kosmos*, world, has no end; that is, the *kosmos* of which Abraham is the heir, and which is under the direction of Christ.—

There is no such expression as “*sunteleia tou kosmou*, end of the world. The *kosmos* of Satan ends in making the kingdom *tou kosmos*, of the world, the Kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ, that he may reign forever and ever, or from age to age, which is the meaning of *eis tous aionous ton aionon*. The Jewish age, or ages, as they are sometimes called, ended at the overthrow of Jerusalem. The age of the Christ began at that time *in power*. It began in authority, on Pentecost.

There is, in 1 Cor. x: 11, an expression worthy of notice. Paul, in speaking of the things that befell the Israelites, on account of their sins, says, “Now all these things happened to them as an example; and they are written for the instruction of us, on whom the ends of the ages have come.” Common Version has, “ends of the world.” I remark that the words “ends of the ages” may mean the end of the Jewish and of the Christian age. For, as the Christ began, in authority, on Pentecost; and the Jewish age must continue till a sufficient time should elapse for the gathering up of the believers, it so happened, that the one age began before the other ended. The destruction of Jerusalem was the power put forth by Christ, rather, manifested by Christ; so that, in its destruction and overthrow, the kingdom of God came *in power*. As two divine institutions could not continue to stand at the same time, one must fall. The overthrow of the Jewish state was then as clearly a manifestation of divine power, as any deed performed by Christ for the establishment of his religion. The kingdom of God, or the age of Christ, then came *in power*. For, what but divine power could subvert, and utterly overthrow a divine institution? The ages then met together; one of them was overthrown; the other continues, and will continue through ages of ages; better English would be, from age to age. For ages must continue to rise, for the wisdom of God is infinite: and infinite wisdom must require an infinite number of ages for its development. To conclude, God is infinite:

there is infinite space in which he can operate: he has infinite power, by which he can do all things; infinite wisdom, by which his infinite knowledge and power are guided: and then, an infinite number of ages for the development of his infinite power, wisdom, greatness and goodness.—To him, through Jesus Christ, be glory from age to age. H. T. ANDERSON.

the pattern shown you in the Mount. Will some brother show us a pattern in the New Testament for such Societies, whether State or general Missionary Societies? All church history testifies that creed-making, or Resolutions, Councils, the exaltation of the clergy, and the ruin of Christianity, were born about the same time,—not much difference in their ages. We have started on the same road.

I argued some years ago that our people were made of the same flesh and blood and passions as other people, as a reason why we should not hold these clerical assemblies. I see that Brother McGarvey has made the same discovery, and I do not know how many more have made the same discovery since the last missionary meeting in Cincinnati. I say, in the language of Paul, that we have no such custom, nor the congregations of God, as those practiced in "Missionary Societies." There is more consistency in rejecting the Word of God altogether, than in selecting certain portions of it, and neglecting the others. I cannot see how a whole thing can be wrong and its parts right, as Bro. McGarvey argues respecting the General Missionary Society and the State Societies. If the whole is wrong, the parts of which it is composed are wrong also. The parts are as wrong as the whole—the State Societies are as wrong as the General Missionary Society. Muskets are made of the same material that cannons are, only they cannot do so much execution.

We discard the State and General Missionary Society because anti-Scriptural.—The first and original law on missions is found in Matt. x. and Luke x. The enforcement of one enactment in this law of our King would ruin most of our "efforts for evangelizing the world." It is this:—No previous provision was to be made for the support of those who engage in missionary work. This is positively and pointedly forbidden by the words, Provide neither gold nor silver nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the work man is worthy of his meat. This clause

BRO. MCGARVEY AND THE "MISSIONARY SOCIETIES."

BRO. FRANKLIN:—I have never attended a "Missionary Society" since I became a Christian but once, and then for special reasons, because I have believed them to be *anti-Scriptural*. Before Bro. McGarvey's piece appeared in the Review of Dec. 8, I had written and sent a piece to the Christian Pioneer, which I desire you, if you please, to copy into the Review.

In October last, when your Missionary Society was in session in Cincinnati, O., I was out on a missionary tour, and spoke of attending it, but on a second thought, declined it. My object in attending would have been to see our venerable Bro. Campbell and others, my early co-laborers, whom I feared I should never see again. But on consultation with other aged brethren, we concluded not to attend.

We have agreed, as a people, to speak of Bible things in Bible words. In what book, chapter and verse in the New Testament do we read of the "Missionary Societies" of the early Christians? We have agreed, as a people, to have a thus says the Lord for all our religious practices, or apostolic precept or example, which is the same thing. Our Great Father says by Moses and Paul, See that you make all things according to

puts the statute in jeopardy. The language is so definite and particular, that it is impossible for criticism to touch it. It is as impregnable as the authority that enacted it. To get rid of it, the whole must be thrown overboard. This is pure disinterestedness. Money is the cement of modern missions. Notice the definiteness of the language. Gold, silver, and if there had been any greenbacks, they would have been dealt with in the same way. Every species of money and provisions is positively forbidden. In what part of the Scriptures was any contribution ever made for either State or general missionary purposes? There is not one word in the New Testament about any contribution or expenditure for "missionary purposes?" Barnabas, of Cyprus, before he engaged in this work, sold his estates and gave the proceeds to the poor. Where is the text or sermon in the New Testament ever preached to raise money for missionary purposes? This conduct of the seventy and of Barnabas was "devotedness to the work," which is seldom imitated these days.

Some years ago, an epidemic fever prevailed among our people on the subject of educating young men "for the ministry," that has subsided. Now they are smitten with this missionary fever, and no man can be a Christian who has not this fever. I think some of us would do well to read over the New Testament and the early days of the Christian Baptist, before we pronounce so positively upon the Christianity of others. I will give apostolic example, or early Christian example on this subject, which is the same as precept. The prophets Isaiah and Micah said the Word of the Lord, or the Gospel, should go forth from Mt. Zion and Jerusalem—and it did so. Is. ii: 1-5; Micah iv: 1-3. Christ said the same. Luke 24. The mother congregation in Jerusalem was the fruitful source from whence the old Gospel spread throughout Judea, Samaria, or the Roman Empire. See Acts 1, 2, to 15 chapters. In Acts 8 and 4, it is said, Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere, preaching the word. Per-

secution had more to do in spreading the ancient Gospel than money had.

This church is our example, brethren—here is our corner-stone, our tree to start our lines from. A second apostolic example for our missionary operations is 1 Thess. i: 8, For from you sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place, your faith to Godward is spread abroad. The third example is in Acts xiii: is Antioch, the Queen of the East, on the Orontees; sent out Paul and Silas, two and two, according to the original law in Matt. x. For us, brethren, with these three apostolic examples before us for missions, to form Missionary Societies, is as bad as, is as guilty as, for sectarians to form churches after their own notions, instead of the pattern set in the Acts.

These modern Missionary Societies are counterfeits, not the genuine coin. Counterfeiting is a capital crime, when we have the original coin or government stamp. Let our young heroes from Colleges, instead of looking for big cities and fat salaries, go to some destitute territory and spread the old Gospel, as I did in Mississippi and Louisiana, in 1826-27 and '28, on my own charges—before we had any Missionary Societies or Churches—at the risk of my life and health, friendless and almost penniless, and then in Western and Eastern Virginia, and Tennessee, and Southern Kentucky in 1828, and at Bethany, even, and the neighborhood adjacent. I have preached the Gospel at my own charges from St. Paul city to the gulf of Mexico, in all the Southern and Western States, with many tears and prayers, as the trees, the people and God can witness. When I came to this part of Missouri, I came crying in the wilderness of Missouri, as my old teacher, the Immerser, did in the wilderness of Judea.

JACOB CREATH.

THE REFORMATION NEEDED.

There is certainly a vagueness in the minds of many, who are really in favor of reformation, in reference to the reformation needed. The matter, too, is certainly quite unintelligible to the masses of the people. There can be no point now introduced, explained and defended, of more importance to the cause of truth and righteousness than the kind of reformation needed. All should know what reformation is needed what reformation is proposed, and who is for it. We shall undertake the unwelcome task of setting forth, in these papers, a brief sketch of the reformation needed, and proposed. We may possibly find it profitable to take a negative view, and inquire what kind of reformation is not needed or proposed.

I. A new sect is not needed or proposed. As good men and wise as any we have, and men every way as competent, were engaged in planning, arranging and founding, the existing sects; and they are as wisely arranged, as well adapted to the end, and in every respect as good as any that would be likely to be invented now. If any man has no higher ambition than merely to belong to a sect, it is useless to invent a new one, for those existing are in all probability as good as any that will or can be inaugurated. No new sect is therefore needed or proposed. The variety in kind and number is certainly sufficient for all who desire merely to be sectarians. They certainly need no additional accommodations of that kind. Some of these, probably, are as good as could be invented.

II. A new creed is not needed nor proposed. So many efforts have been made at making, amending and improving creeds, and by such wise, great and good men, and such a variety of plans have been adopted, that a man would be arrogant and presumptive to think he could make a better creed than some of those existing.—

Some of them were made by as wise, great and good men as could be found in the first place, and then have been amended many times since, and he would be presumptive and arrogant in the extreme who would attempt to make one now that would supercede all the others and come into general use. The creeds we have are as good as any that will likely be made, and if a man wants a human creed, he had as well adopt some one already made, adopted and tried, as to make, adopt and try a new one. No new creed is, therefore, needed or proposed.

III. A new name is not needed nor proposed. Names enough, in all reason, have been tried. Names of men, countries and rivers have been adopted. The virtue of a sufficient variety in number and kind has been experimented on and tried. Nothing can be gained by the adoption of any new names.

IV. New and unauthorized expedients are not needed or proposed. These have been experimented on, in every imaginable form and variety. If virtue were in them, it would most likely have been found before now.

V. A new foundation is not needed nor proposed. Foundations without number have been adopted, experimented on, and tried till it is certainly useless to try any more. Some have tried the Congregational form of church government as a foundation; others the Episcopal form, and others the Presbyterian form; others have tried an ordinance, and some a method; some negative articles and others affirmative articles of religion. All varieties and kinds of foundations for churches have been tried. It is useless to adopt or try any others.

If reformation is not needed nor proposed in any of these respects, in what, then, is reformation needed and proposed? We answer, most unequivocally, in the following:

I. All sects should be regarded as unscriptural organizations, rejected, repudiated and abolished.

II. All creeds, of human origin, should be regarded as innovations, subverting and

defeating the design of the law of God, and should be repudiated, rejected and abolished.

III. All names not given to the people and church of God in the Bible, should be repudiated, rejected and abolished.

IV. All unscriptural expedients, experiments and schemes, should be repudiated, rejected and abolished.

V. All new and unscriptural foundations should be discarded and abandoned.

This is sufficient for negative ground. Now for affirmative ground. What shall we have in the place of all this? We must have the following:

I. We must be simply Christians, disciples of Christ, children of God—no more, no less—simply this, and nothing else.

II. We must have what Jesus calls "My Church," the Church of Christ, of God—no more, no less—simply this, and nothing else.

III. In this Church, or body, we must receive the one foundation—the one rock—on which it is built, which is Jesus the Christ, and no other foundation; for other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ. The man who will be received on this rock—this foundation—that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God—by making the confession which He has explicitly appointed, and taking the other steps He has laid down in his law, and nothing else—no more, no less—we must receive, and no other.

IV. We must take the law of God itself for our creed, and nothing else. Nothing must be added or taken away. The law of God—no more, no less—nothing else—must be the supreme authority.

V. We must maintain the original designations of the Church, as found in Scripture, and designate it in the same way now. In speaking or writing of the Church, style it "the Church of God," "the Church of Christ," or, in many instances, it is entirely sufficient to say, "the Church."

VI. We must speak of individuals in the Church in the same way, call them what they are, "Christians," "disciples," or "dis-

ciples of Christ," "brethren, or "the brethren," "saints," &c.

There is unquestionably but one religion from God on earth. All other religions are spurious, and the work of the genuine reformer is to separate that one out from all the others, describe it, advocate it, maintain, defend, propagate and perpetuate it to the extent of his ability. This is the work of the genuine reformer. There is but one Gospel of Christ. That must be kept distinct from everything else, and pure as it came from the immaculate hands of Jesus. The Lord now proposes to men to be nothing, religiously, but Christians, disciples of Christ. The Christian evangelist, or more properly the evangelist of Christ, labors to bring men to Christ, to draw all men to him, to Christianize them and to make them nothing but Christians. There is unequivocally but one fold, one Shepherd, one body, one Church. This one building is built on the one foundation, one rock. The laborers of the Lord are all employed on this one building. Building it up is their work. They have not a prayer or a day's work for any other building. All other buildings are unauthorized. The manner in which this work shall be done is explicitly laid down in the infallible directions the Lord, the proprietor of the building, has graciously given. In working on this building, we may not depart from the directions he has given, and put into it any other material, or the proper material prepared in any other manner than he has prescribed. In this one Church, we must have the one law—and no other—of the one King, the Head over all, blessed forever and ever. These are plain matters, long since well settled, with many of us. We have not lost confidence in the ground we occupy, have no notion of departing from it, backing down, modifying or changing nor have we the least idea of countenancing any innovations. We are settled and decided, living and dying. We know we are on the right ground. It is this or nothing. This ground can be maintained, defended and perpetuated to our children

and children's children. There is no other ground worth a prayer, or a farthing of our substance. God, in his great mercy, has restored us to this impregnable ground.—He has put it into our power to convince the people of our time that it is right; maintain and perpetuate it to the unborn millions yet to come. Shall we do it, or turn traitors to these fundamental, these invaluable, these all-important principles? There are three thousand preachers this day as decided and determined on maintaining these great principles, as they are trying for the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge will give in that day when he shall come to make up his jewels. The Lord will be with them and bless them. To his name be the honor, the glory and power everlasting.

B. F.

"AN EDUCATED MINISTRY."

"By their fruits you shall know them."—*Jesus.*

BRO. FRANKLIN—I wish to offer a few thoughts on the subject of what is commonly called "an educated ministry." I am not the advocate of either an educated or of an ignorant ministry. My position is, that a man should be a minister *first*, and then be either ignorant or wise, in the world's estimation, as the case may be, afterwards. I think a middle course between *ignorance* and a finished education, or a collegiate education, is the safest and best. I have no means of ascertaining correctly, but my impression is that Christianity has suffered more from *human learning* than from *ignorance*. I believe that every man who preaches the gospel ought first to be a converted man, a changed man in *heart* and *conduct*, before he attempts to preach, whether he be *ignorant* or *learned*. He ought to know the truth experimentally on his own heart, before he is fit to preach it to others. I received my first impressions on this subject from the old Virginia Baptists, and

they are indelible, and will not be easily eradicated.

I am *radically* opposed to educating men for the gospel ministry, as we educate men for the law, for medicine, for politics, and for agriculture. I enter my solemn protest against any man's preaching before he gives satisfactory evidence to the congregation of which he is a member, that he is a firm believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, and has been immersed into him, and gives evidence that he is a Christian, and that he desires to devote his life to Jesus Christ, by preaching his gospel to save his fellow-men. I have not abandoned the idea of a call to the gospel ministry yet. If a man does not solemnly, in the sight of God, the searcher of all hearts, desire this office, above all others, from pure love to God and man, and a willingness, like Moses, to suffer affliction with the people of God, rather than to enjoy all the honors and profits of this world, he should never engage in this work. Unless the love of God and man is deeply rooted in his soul, and he prefers this work above all others, he will find discouragements enough to drive him from it, if he lives long enough. If men should be proved before they are put into the deacon's office, how much more before they are put into the gospel ministry!

I believe that after a man is put into the gospel ministry by solemn ordination, and then gives it up for any other calling, or by apostasy, that he should never be permitted to return to it, as many do in modern times. After a man proves himself to be a Christian, and to have a desire to preach the gospel, and that he possesses the natural qualifications for a preacher, then for him to acquire all the information from every source he can, is his duty, and it should all be consecrated and devoted to the service of God. The *fact* that our Savior chose twelve men, of good sense, good natural parts, of integrity, firmness, zeal, benevolence, faith, and devotion to him—of ordinary education in the times in which they lived, and only one learned man for a particular purpose—is a fact of great moment and great significance

to us, and one which we should never forget. It is as twelve to one—twelve such men to one of human learning. Jesus Christ furnished them with the weapons of the gospel, and they used them; they fought the battles. The General commands, the soldiers do the fighting.

I would no more make human learning a qualification for preaching, than I would beauty or riches a qualification for marriage. The foundation for marriage is the substantial qualities of the parties and their affection for each other. If there are riches or beauty, well and good; or if they acquire riches afterward by industry and economy, well and good. But to say that none shall marry except the rich and beautiful, is a prostitution of the marriage institution—so, to say that none shall preach except learned men, is a profanation of that sacred office.

Another idea of we old Baptists is, that when God needs a learned man to defend his cause, he will call him to do it, as he did Paul in the first century, Waldo in the twelfth century, Wyckliff in the fourteenth century, Huss and Jerome of the fourteenth century, Tindale of the sixteenth century, Gill and Milton of the seventeenth century, and A. Campbell and B. W. Stone of the nineteenth century. The men who carried out the great Baptist Reformation in my old mother State, Virginia, before and about the time of the American Revolution, were such men as I have described the apostles to be—with the exception of their inspiration and miraculous powers. The men who dug up the New Testament from under the rubbish of the nineteenth century, and brought it to the Temple, crying grace, grace to it, were honest men, men of nerve, bone and sinew; faith, zeal, prudence, courage, common-sense; a good English education, piety, devotion, love to God and man. We do not need human learning now as much as we did before our magazines of learning were opened in the Christian Baptist, Harbinger, Debates, New Translations and periodicals. Each officer and soldier can now furnish himself from these stores.

I must now specify some of the evils which Christianity has suffered from human learning. The apostolic Fathers, Origen, Jerome, Austin, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and others, laid the foundation of the mighty superstructure of the temple of errors and corruptions in the Oriental and Occidental schisms in the Greek and Latin sects, deep, strong and almost immovable and indestructible. They are the originators, defenders, perpetuators of the Greek sect, Catholicism, Calvinism and Protestantism of this age, in opposition to the purity and simplicity of the New Institution. A learned man stands at the head of each corps or grand division of error—Martin Luther at the head of faith alone, which supersedes Christian immersion for remission of sins, the promise of the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. John De Corvin, the Frenchman, the retailer of Austin's errors, made out of Paul's argument with the Jews and Gentiles, stands at the head of Calvinism in modern times. A mighty bulwark against the four gospels or Christianity. The Patriarch of Constantinople and his staff at the head of the Greek Church, and the Czar of Russia, the Pope and his learned staff or Cabinet commands the Popish division. Ignatius Loyola commands Jesuitism, and is a dangerous band of guerillas. Mahomet and his hosts stand at the head of Mohammedanism.—Swedenborg commands Swedenborgianism. Wesley and his forces defends Methodism, Joe Smith defends Mormonism and his forces. These immense and formidable armaments of learned errorists have done more mischief and injury to Christianity than all the ignoramuses ever did. George Fox commands the Quaker division of error. Jesus Christ and the apostles, and the gospel believed and obeyed, and the holy lives of Christians, are an over-match for these terrific and fearful hordes of learned errorists. The Lord of hosts is with us—the God of Jacob is our refuge. If God be for us, who can be against us?

JACOB CREATH.

THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT.

The religion of Christ is a proselyting system. Its members are all gained by making converts. The Jewish religion was not a proselyting system. The children of Jews were in the church by virtue of a blood relation to their parents. The business of a Jew was not to proselyte to his religion, but to train his children in the religion of their parents, into which they were born. But the religion of Christ consists of two parts: 1. The proselyting, or missionary part. 2. Teaching and training the disciples. These two parts are both clearly set forth in the commission, as reported by Matthew. The first part of this commission, is to "Go, disciple all nations." The second part is, "Teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded." In the nature of the case, a church receiving continual accessions, without any conversions, or regeneration, in the children born in their families, would increase without any proselyting zeal, or missionary spirit. The main work in such a church is to train their children, brought into the church, not only without conversion, or regeneration, but without knowing that there is a God, and not let them hear any man preach, who might discover to them, that they are still simply resting on a blood relation, in an unconverted state, unregenerated. A religion of this sort now, since Christ has come, with the better covenant, on better promises, is one of the worst cheats imposed on the credulity of humanity, if not the very worst one, and the sooner it is exposed and repudiated, the better for the world.

There is nothing clearer, to a man who has read his Bible, than that there is no membership in Christ's kingdom without faith. "He who comes to God must believe." "Without faith it is impossible to please him." "We are all the children of God by faith in Christ." There is not a citizen in the kingdom of Christ without faith. There is

not one there properly who did not hear the gospel, repent and voluntarily turn to the Lord. There is not a citizen in the kingdom of Christ, who has not been visited by the gospel, in some form or other, in the writings of Christians, conversations with them, or the preaching of the gospel. The gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one who believes, and the preaching of the cross, to them who are saved, is the wisdom of God and the power of God. Disciples to Christ are made by the influence, labors, persuasions and righteous efforts of the people of God. The Almighty puts forth his power to save men, through Christ, through the Holy Spirit in inspired men, through the apostles, through the church and the word of the Lord. The means the Lord has ordained for turning the world to God and saving it, is missionary effort. The whole kingdom of God is, in the aggregate, a missionary society, and its mission is to convert and save the world. Every individual member of the church is a missionary, and his mission is to turn men to the Lord and save them. To be a Christian is to be a missionary, and to be a member of the Church of Christ is to belong to a missionary society, and the man claiming to be a Christian and a member of the church, who is not a missionary in spirit and life, is simply making a false pretense.

The primitive disciples were so full of the missionary spirit that when they were dispersed abroad by persecution, they went everywhere preaching the word. A man who has no zeal for the propagation of the Christian religion, gives no evidence that he understands or even believes it. No man ever was under the benign and hallowed influence of the religion of Christ, who did not find himself impelled by a burning zeal for the recovery of the world from the manacles of sin and death. The love of Christ constrains men and impels them onward in a life-struggle to save mankind. As God loved mankind when he gave his only begotten Son, full of grace and truth; and as Christ loved our race, when he left heaven

and came to the abodes of wretchedness, sorrow and woe and made the most stupendous, wonderful and amazing sacrifice ever known by mortal man, and thus made the most effectual appeal to the race of man possible to recover us from utter ruin, so the man under the influence of the love of God, will be roused, stirred up and impelled onward, in the most spirited, noble and manly efforts, as an instrument in the hand of God, to snatch men from the eternal burnings.

We spend much of our time, in talking of plans, waiting for plans and laying plans ourselves, when there are opportunities all round us and we should be at work. The heathen are at our doors. We are in the midst of people who know not the gospel, many of them kind and good people, enterprising and intelligent in everything but religion. There are people all round us who know not God. We are mingling with them every day, and shall we wait for an opportunity to do something in the missionary work? Shall we wait for a plan? Shall we wait for some powerful man? By no means; but go to work, talk to every man and woman of the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus, and thus diffuse the gospel through the whole community round you. Some members think they do much for the salvation of the world in paying ten or twenty dollars a year for the missionary work. This is well, but you should do this and not leave the other undone. What of that poor man who labors for you, or that poor girl in your kitchen, who knows not the Savior? What are you doing for persons of this description, with whom you come in contact every day?—You could have wonderful influence with those to turn them to the Lord and save them. Are you letting the opportunity pass, and doing nothing? We know some families where the children and all the persons employed about the premises become Christians. Other families make no favorable impression upon those in their employment. Why this difference? Evidently this difference is largely attributable to the

genuine missionary zeal in the one case, while there is none in the other.

There are three departments where we need our missionary zeal roused up, and where it must be roused up before any extended good can possibly result from these departments:

I. The preacher's department. Here is deficiency more than anywhere else, we are sorry to be compelled to say. How many go to the General Missionary Meeting, or to the State Missionary Meeting, display a little missionary zeal, or make a speech, developing some wise plan for raising money, and then never show any more missionary zeal for the next twelve months? Every preacher ought himself to be a missionary, not at missionary meetings simply, but all the time, and thus diffuse the missionary spirit all round him at home, and wherever he goes. It might serve a good purpose to get up a general missionary meeting for the sole purpose of converting preachers and making missionaries of them; living, active, energetic and effective missionaries, who will go out among the people, preach, exhort, pray, sing, persuade, reason and expostulate with them and turn them to the Lord. We want men of faith, faith in Christ, in the gospel, in preaching the gospel and the possibility of turning men to God and saving them—men impelled by the love of Christ—constrained by love to man—moved by a deep and ardent desire to save the world—men who will go and work for man's recovery from ruin. The support will be found for such men and will be given. But the work must be done, and evidence must be given that we are the men who do the work. Let the preacher go out and do the work, and the hearts of the people will open and the support will come.

II. The churches need being converted into missionary societies, living, effective, active and powerful missionary societies. Many of them have scarcely had a speck of missionary zeal, life or power for years. They need rousing from their slumbers and the breath of life breathed into them anew. This in many instances is more difficult than

to convert men of the world. They need a new edition of the gospel throughout, a new realization of it, everything shaken up from the foundation, and must have it before they will ever do any great good.

III. Every member of the church needs to be converted into a missionary and the family in which he lives turned into a missionary family. When this is done, the work will go on both at home and abroad. Let us make a mighty effort in the name of the Lord and demonstrate what can be done.

B. F.

A DISCOVERY.

A NON-EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

A few days ago, I found in one of the religious "Weeklies," published in our city, a very interesting account of the various churches in Cincinnati, the number of church edifices, average membership to each pastor, and a number of details which I should like to see republished in your paper. What struck me most forcibly, in this very elaborate article, prepared by a Committee of the Evangelical Ministerial Association, was the division of churches into evangelical and non-evangelical; there are said to be 71 of the former and 17 of the latter. The first thought that struck me was, upon what principle was this distinction made; did the Committee of the Evangelical Ministerial Association determine that they were right and all who differed from them were wrong; and did they thus conclude from the fact that they had the majority? If so, the Catholics, who in the same article are shown to have a larger membership than all the Evangelical Churches combined, might on the same principle assert that they, and they only, are Evangelical. But if the decision has been made by an appeal to a standard which they themselves have erected, and which the non-evangelicals do

not recognize, I see no good reason why the non-evangelicals should not in turn apply their standard to the evangelicals, and condemn them. But if the Bible is made the ground of appeal, the standard by which both are to be tried, then the battle must be fought over again, and the non-evangelicals convicted of departures from its plain and obvious teachings, before judgment be so summarily pronounced. I candidly confess, however, that I do not know even the names of the churches pronounced non-evangelical, but I think I have found one of them, and my reason for this suspicion is, that it, in very many respects, differs from the evangelicals. "But, my dear sir, do you not see, says the reader, that in the admission you have made above, that you have passed judgment on the non-evangelical Church; you admit that it differs widely from the evangelical, and the meaning of evangelical is, according to the Gospel—hence, your non-evangelical church is simply not according to the Gospel, hence if you meditate any defence of that church, you have lost your cause at the outset."

Gentle reader, I am not about to enter upon a studied defence of, nor am I about to pass judgment upon it. Nay; I am not absolutely certain that the church to which I have made allusion is one of the non-evangelicals. I shall simply show the points of difference, and let you make the decision. This much, however, I presume to say, that it may be non-evangelical, without, at the same time, being anti-scriptural. How can these things be? you are ready to exclaim—non-evangelical, and yet not anti-scriptural—What meanest thou? Simply this, kind reader, that the evangelicals have a standard called the "Basis of Union," those who subscribe to that basis are evangelical, those who do not, are non-evangelical. But to the differences. The church to which I allude, teaches that conversion is the same thing now that it was in the days of the Apostles, that it consists in a belief in and obedience to the Gospel, that the cases of conversion *then*, are the

models now—hence, they have no use for any of the appliances of modern revivals, such as the mourner's bench, anxious seat, or a Christian experience before conversion; they have no committee to decide whether a person be soundly converted or not, they let that remain between God and the soul, only requiring a public profession of faith in Christ, a hearty repentance, or turning away from sin, and baptism, or as they term it, immersion into Christ, and after thus being converted, they inculcate a patient continuance in well-doing, thus seeking for glory and immortality. In a word they believe that a man may be converted by reading and obeying the instructions of the Apostles, as found in the Acts of Apostles, and may gain eternal life by continuing faithful unto death.

Conversion, among the evangelicals, is quite a different affair, it is a supernatural matter, in a word, a miracle; the sinner cannot believe, repent or obey, only through the irresistible influence of the Spirit of God. And yet, if he fail to do these, he must be lost—hence, by many of them, on revival occasions, the Spirit is implored to descend, baptisms of the Holy Ghost and fire are sought, Pentecostal showers are prayed for, and if the sinner is not converted, the impression is left upon the bystander—and sometimes upon the mind of the sinner himself—that it is in consequence of the Spirit having failed in its accustomed work. Not only is a conversion different from that in the Bible taught—as may be seen by a comparison of a New Testament case with a modern one—but the modes of conversion, among evangelicals, differ as widely as the names they wear, and the systems of theology which they respectively embrace. Indeed, in systems as different as Arminianism and Calvinism—to say nothing of other conflicting theories—there must of necessity be different modes of conversion, different not only from each other, but differing from such conversions as those of the Eunuch, of Lydia, and the Phillipian jailor. To prove this, examine the conversion of a Methodist and an ultra-

Calvinist, both evangelical, and then compare both with the Corinthians of whom it is said that they hearing, believed and were baptized.

The terms of membership, moreover, in the non-evangelical church, are strangely similar to, if not identical, with those which constituted the primitive disciples members of the Church; while the terms of membership in the evangelical churches are unlike the primitive terms, and also are found to differ from each other, so much so, that the terms of membership in one, would not be regarded as sufficient in another, which gives rise to the following difficulty: How can they all be evangelical when the terms of admission are so very difficult? To illustrate, some of the evangelical churches admit infants to membership, while others absolutely refuse to do so. Some make immersion indispensable to membership, while others think that sprinkling or pouring will answer the same purpose—and some even will receive members without any baptism at all. Again, while the Catholic Church has seven sacraments, and the evangelical churches but two; the non-evangelical has none, and really, as far as the Bible is concerned, it would be as difficult to find the evangelical two, as the Catholic seven; for the non-evangelicals claim that neither the word sacrament nor its equivalent are found in the Bible. "Can it be possible," exclaims the reader, that a church exists without the Lord's Supper and Baptism being recognized among them? So far from the non-evangelical church denying the importance and necessity of those ordinances, they really attach to them more importance than the evangelicals, for they admit no one to membership without baptism, while it is not indispensable in all Evangelical Churches; they moreover observe the Lord's Supper weekly, while the evangelicals attend to it monthly or quarterly.—"You mean simply, then," says the reader, "when you assert that they have no sacraments, that they do not apply that name to the ordinances above mentioned?" Precisely so, and they urge as a reason, that it

is best to call Bible things by Bible names. Why, at that rate they are more evangelical than the evangelicals, for the names they employ are Scriptural, and if Scriptural, evangelical. I am not arguing the question, dear reader, I am only stating the facts, and unless you permit me to go on in my own way, I fear that I shall not be able to get the peculiarities of this church fairly before you. But, to proceed, they do not observe the Sabbath, they must be infidels, then? Stop, stop, I may be able to explain this, the Bible declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, but this people observe the first day of the week, sometimes called the Lord's Day, and though the evangelicals observe the same day, the non-evangelicals use the most evangelical term with reference to it.

But, perhaps, the most striking difference between the two is, that the evangelicals have each and all, either a creed, confession of faith, or summary of articles believed, separate and distinct from the Bible, while the non-evangelical church has nothing of the kind. This is by many made a serious ground of objection against them, as it is often urged, that they have no means of dealing with disorderly members, but they get out of the difficulty in a way perfectly satisfactory to themselves at least, by urging that they can meet all cases provided against in the New Testament, that they can exclude all whom the word of God excludes, quoting such passages as "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Indeed they assume the broad ground, that the church has no right to legislate where God has not done so, has no right to speak where he is silent.

Of course, it will be a matter of interest to know by what name this people are known, their very name is one of their marked peculiarities, for while the evangelicals are distinguished by a multitude of different names, some of them drawn from

their form of church government, as Presbyterian, and Episcopalian, others from their leaders, as Wesleyan, and Lutheran, from some peculiarity in doctrine, practice or government, as Old and New School Presbyterians, or from the locality in which the church had its origin, as German Reformed, and Cumberland Presbyterians; the non-evangelical church preferred to be known as the Church of Christ, without any human prefix, or suffix by way of explanation, and the members of this church thinking it consistent with neither truth nor true humanity, to be called by the name of any man, wish to wear only the name by which the primitive followers of Christ and the martyrs of the faith were designated, and which has a place on the sacred page, viz: Christians. Strange then as it may seem, those, whose names, ordinances, modes of conversion, creeds, confessions, and disciplines, are unscriptural and anti-scriptural, are evangelical; while those whose name, ordinances, mode of conversion, rule of faith and practice, are not merely Scriptural, but Scripture, are non-evangelical.—Why this is so, the reader must decide.

OBSERVER.

ENTERPRISE AND INDUSTRY IN THE MINISTRY.

There is much truth in the old adage, "Like priest, like people." Nothing is more certain than that if there is no enterprise and industry in the ministry, there will be none in the people under their influence. If penuriousness, selfishness and narrow feeling prevail in the ministry; they will characterize the communities under the influence of said ministry. If liberality, nobleness of heart and an expanded benevolence prevail in the ministry, they will be diffused and prevail among the private members. When we are thinking of human

agencies and instrumentalities for doing good, we see no direction in which more can be accomplished, by way of improvement, than by encouraging real manly industry and enterprise in the Christian ministry. There is no department on earth where enterprise and industry will tell more effectually than in the Christian ministry. The time was, when the father would say of his idle, indolent and slothful son, that he should have to educate him for the ministry, for he would never get a living by work. But our idea of it is that, by all means, he should be kept out of the ministry, and not be allowed to disgrace it with his indolence. We never could find any suitable place for a real lazy man. The benevolence and genius of the nineteenth century have not succeeded in inventing an asylum for the idle, indolent and slothful; nor yet a cure for the distemper; but one thing is settled, that wherever these unfortunates may be put, whether in the profession of law, medicine or politics, by all means and under all circumstances, keep them out of the ministry. The demand is for living, working and enterprising men, who can and will make their mark on the world; not men who are all the time looking for somebody to *take care of them*, but men who can *take care of themselves*, and a few others besides.

There are two things that we cannot expect as preachers of the gospel, as follow:

1. We cannot expect success, real, genuine success in the legitimate work of the ministry, without manly enterprise and industry.

2. We cannot expect, and do not deserve a liberal support, unless we are industrious and enterprising.

We care not what a man's acquirements may be, nor what his dignity and consequence, the people cannot and will not appreciate a man, as a great man, worthy of support and consideration, who *does nothing*. They will look at a man in the light of their own homely adage, "The workman is known by his chips." The people will look round and see who is doing the work,

and say, "the laborer is worthy of his wages." Men do not, without an effort, enter any of the professions, succeed and obtain a liberal support. Even with a manly effort and genuine merit, they do not reach a liberal support short of years of hard struggling and toiling. It requires time to demonstrate to the people a man's stability, reliability and merit, and the general rule is, that this must be done before a man can have success, and he must have success before he can reasonably reach a liberal support.—Success will not come to a man in idleness *happen* to come, or *chance* to come, and a good support will not, as a general rule, come to a man without success in some shape or other. We do not say that the success shall always be in addition to the church; but he must be successful *in some sense*, or in some department in the work of the Lord.

The work of saving men, spreading righteousness and carrying forward the cause in the world, or, in other words, real missionary work, is a department for the most manly and heroic enterprise inviting great and good men. There are Christian heroes in California, Oregon, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, new parts of Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, and other new districts and States in our broad country, —without a rich church or a Missionary Society to back them; making their way, with the love of God and of their race in their hearts, pioneer men, manifesting a zeal, perseverance and enterprise, which is truly a spectacle for the admiration of men and angels. The earth, the rocks and trees in the day of judgment will testify of their long, fatiguing jounries over mountains, across plains, through swamps; in the burning sun, the bleaching rains, piercing winds, the everlasting snows; their prayers, tears and faithful preaching of the gospel of Christ. They are making for themselves a record, laying up a good foundation against the time to come; building religious communities, that will remember and bless them in their declining years. They will be rewarded with friends, houses and lands in

this world, and a hundred-fold in the world to come. They are building themselves a monument, a place in the hearts and affections of the greatest and best people on earth, and a name in the Lamb's book of life, worth more than millions of gold.—They will gain a position, not by a mere fortuity, by wealth, or by the labors of others, but by their own enterprise and industry and the Lord's blessing. What vast fields are open for the industry, the manly efforts, the enterprise and energies of other young men, to go out, make themselves men, gain names, positions, and achieve victories for the Lord.

What vast fields are open in all the States all over the land, for talented, powerful and enterprising young men, in the Lord's army! Look at the rich and uncultivated regions of country, swarming with intelligent and enterprising people, who only need some one to show them the right way of the Lord. Who among the noble young men in the King's army, would not delight to enter these vast fields and build up churches, and establish the cause of righteousness, and thus make a name and gain a position of distinction and honor? Who would not delight to go to Columbus, Zanesville, Piqua, Sandusky, Marietta, Portsmouth, or Hamilton, in Ohio; or to Richmond, Fort Wayne, Michigan City, or Evansville, Ind.; or many other cities that might be named, and build up the cause? We have the men who can do these things, if they will try. Who will try? We imagine that we hear some one of our young brethren crying out lustily, hold! hold! you have forgotten an important item! Who will support us in this important work? We answer, the Lord, who supported the old preachers,—many of them dead, and some of them living,—who built the present churches, and support you better than he did them. Do you say, "How?" We answer, through the liberality of the people whom you shall turn to the Lord. Do you reply, that you are afraid to trust them? Then, you have not faith enough to be a preacher. By the blessing of the Lord, we have turned enough

people to God, in any one of the past ten years, to support one preacher well, without any heavy burden, as long as he would live. Any man of fair talents can go into any good section of country, and, in a short time, establish the cause and gather around him a people who will take care of his temporal wants. But then he will have to work, and, for a time, make some sacrifice.

Some young men are fearful that they cannot support themselves, even among the established congregations! How, then, did the brethren support themselves in founding these churches? Ask the old preachers, such as the following: John Smith, Samuel Rogers, John Longley, Jas. Challen, John O'Kane, T. M. Allen, Jno. Rogers, John B. New; or a younger class, such as D. S. Burnet, A. B. Green, A. S. Hayden, Harrison Jones, James G. Mitchell, Nathan Mitchell, A. Gardner, L. H. Jameson, Elijah Goodwin, Jas. M. Mathes, Jno. A. Gano, Geo. W. Elly, etc., etc., and they will explain the matter to you. Or, if you cannot see them, as we have had a considerable experience in the matter, the whole secret is in *doing the work*. Study nothing about the support, but *study how to do the work,—good work, manly and telling work for God and humanity,—and do the work*, and the Lord, through his friends, will do the balance, and do it better than you can do it yourself. But then, bear in mind, you must read, meditate, and work for God and for humanity; do good and manly work, and ask the Lord for *no security. He will pay.*

B. F.

EXPERIMENTAL RELIGION.

It is often preferred as a serious charge against the Disciples of Christ, that they deny "experimental religion." And this charge believed, causes a thrill of horror among the advocates of a something variously styled, "Holy Ghost," "heart-felt," "evangelical," or "experimental religion."—A glance at a concordance will be sufficient to discover that the word "religion" is not qualified by any such adjectives in the Bible.

"Holy Ghost religion," "heart-felt religion," etc., are only different terms to express the same thing. What, then, is that something called "experimental religion," esteemed so highly by those who style themselves "evangelical Christians?" "Ah! it is better felt than told!" But this is an evasion. "It is the love of God shed abroad in the heart by a feeling sense (?) of the Holy Ghost." This is ambiguous unless the words "feeling sense," be defined. The Bible declares that "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit." Rom. v: 5. The "feeling sense" is an addition to the language of the apostle. After considerable thought upon the subject, and effort to understand the ministers whom I have heard upon it, the following is submitted as a correct definition or description of what is meant.

Experimental religion denotes a change of the mind and feelings by the direct influence of the Holy Spirit upon the inner man. When a man humbly seeks the Lord in prayer, suddenly and mysteriously, but effectually, the Spirit, abstractly, and with an exercise of power with reference to each individual, changes the mind, the will, and the affections, and makes the change sensibly felt. The only condition of salvation is to call upon God to send down this converting power; and the only evidence of acceptance is to *feel* the change thus wrought in the soul. Thousands of persons have prayed and waited for this "operation

of the Spirit" at mourner's benches, anxious seats, and altars of prayer, and have there experienced a change or received an impression which they have supposed to be made by this direct influence of the Spirit. These impressions are matters of consciousness. A man feels badly when he is sick, feels better when he gets well, and, aided by his memory, is conscious of the change in his feelings. This is called *experience*. The man at the mourner's bench feels badly:—this is conviction. He experiences a change in his feelings and receives the impression that this is pardon. He then concludes that he has "experienced religion," and the religion he has experienced is called "experimental religion."

That such impressions are "experienced" does not admit of a doubt. But are those impressions made by the personal presence and special energy of the Holy Spirit?—Certainly not, for the following reasons:

I. Those impressions are matters of *experience*, upon that hypothesis, whereas we are justified *by faith*. Faith is not experience, in the Bible nor in the Dictionary.—Paul says, "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb. xi: 1. He illustrates this definition by saying, "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." From this it is evident that faith is that which enables us to acquire a knowledge of things of which we cannot be witnesses. It depends upon the testimony of God. It is not "experienced in the soul," but "comes of hearing." Rom. x: 17 This, which stands at the beginning of the work of becoming a Christian, is that by which we are justified. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God."—Rom. v: 1. We who are justified by faith, "glory in tribulations, also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope," etc.—From this it will be readily seen that experience is not faith, but comes after it. The experience of the Christian is made up of the events of his Christian life. His experience, before he became a Christian, was a

sinner's experience. We are neither justified *in* experience nor *by* experience, but *by faith*. The hypothesis that the Holy Spirit makes those impressions by a direct influence, must then be abandoned; because it does away with *faith* and substitutes *experience*.

Here *orthodoxy* falls to the ground. The charm that binds Presbyterians and Baptists, Methodists, and Quakers, "as evangelical Christians," is the notion that the love and grace of God are thus *experienced*. Because the disciples of Christ insist that men do not, and cannot experience the truth of the Gospel, they are denounced as heterodox, and it is said they "deny the operation of the Holy Ghost." Every Christian experiences the consolation that the belief of the Gospel affords; but the *truth* of the Gospel is only realized *by faith*.

II. A revelation to man by such an influence is not necessary, since the things of the Spirit are all revealed in words. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. Now, we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God; which things also we *speak*, not in *the words* which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." I Cor. ii; 11-13. Paul in this passage, refers to himself as the medium through which they had received the knowledge of the things of God, for the purpose of establishing his right to reprove them for their divisions. He says he spoke the things of the Spirit of God *in words* taught him by the Spirit. The result of his having spoken these things to them is described in Acts xviii; 8: "and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized." In the next chapter of the epistle referred to, he asks: "who then is Paul, and who is Appolos, but *ministers by whom ye believed?*" The ministers spoke the word, and the Corinthians "hearing, believed. "So, then, faith com-

eth by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. x: 17. Remembering that "through faith we understand," it is evident that the knowledge of the things of the Spirit, is communicated in the words of the Spirit, is received by faith, and is, therefore, not a matter of personal experience.

III. The entire work of conversion is attributed to the word of truth.

1. *Regeneration*. "Of his own will beget he us, with the word of truth." "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." "And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." James i: 18. I Peter i: 21.

2. *Justification*. "Therefore being justified by faith." Rom. v: 1. "We walk by faith and not by sight."

3. *Sanctification*. "Sanctify them through thy truth. Thy word is truth." "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." John xvii: 17. Eph. v: 25-26.

4. *Spiritual nourishment*. "Nourished up in the words of faith and good doctrine." "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "Receive the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby." I Tim. iv: 6. Matt. iv: 5. I Peter ii: 2.

5. *The warfare* is carried on "by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

This classification is not meant to indicate five successive steps in the process of conversion and salvation, but simply to show that the work is all attributed to the word of God, which the apostle Paul affirms, "is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two edged sword."

On the other side of the question, it must have been observed, that where a direct and mystical influence of the Spirit is plead for, innumerable sects have sprung up. This is not attributable to the Bible, but to the sowing of sectarian seed. "What a man soweth that shall he also reap." If he sows

Methodist seed, he reaps a Methodist crop. Of Presbyterian seed a Presbyterian crop. And so on, *ad lib.*

These considerations forever refute the theory of a mystical spiritual regeneration. To sum up:

1. The mystical influence plead for under the name of experimental religion would be a matter of experience, and would set aside faith. But we are justified by faith.

2. The revelation of the things of God is made through the medium of words taught by the Holy Spirit, and therefore not by a mystical influence of the Holy Spirit.

3. The entire work of conversion is attributed to the word of God, leaving nothing to be done by a mystical influence of the Spirit.

It is necessary now, to consider briefly, the use of the word "religion" in the Scriptures. It is not in the Old Testament at all, and occurs but five times in the New Testament, common version, as follows: Acts xxvi: 5; Gal. i: 13, 14; Jas. i: 26, 27. In Gal. i: 13, 14, it is a translation from *Judaisms*, and means *Judaism*. In the other places it is a translation from *theoleia*. This word occurs in Col. ii: 18, where it is translated "worshipping." By a reference to the passages cited above, it will be seen that in three places the Jewish religion is meant. The two remaining occurrences are Jas. i: 26, 27; which will now be noticed more particularly, "If any man among you seemeth to to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." This "vain religion" is not, of course, the "experimental religion" under consideration. There remains then but one chance for its being found in the Bible. The next verse reads: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." This is "pure and undefiled religion," but there is nothing mystical in it. A religion of which a mystical operation of the Holy Spirit is a part, is not pure, but

adulterated; and a religion wholly made up of experiencing such a change is essentially different from pure and undefiled religion!

There being no such influence in the plan of salvation, and religion being Scripturally defined to be what a man *does* and not what he *feels*, it follows as a matter of course that the impressions alluded to above, are not made by a mystical influence of the Spirit. If not, how are they made?

There is but another way in which the mind of man can be impressed. If it is not done in an extraordinary or mystical way it is, of course, through the operation of the natural powers. A man reads, understands and believes a letter telling him that a near relative is dead. His feelings are so moved that he is in a moment bathed in tears. All this can readily be understood, and is therefore not *mystical*. He who listens to and believes the story of the Savior's sufferings and triumph, and the promises of the gospel, will be more deeply moved thereby than by any other communication ever made to man.

It is a principle observable by every one, that the greater the intensity of the feelings, the less conscious is man of the operations of his own mind. This is the reason why the theological dogma of a mystical spiritual regeneration has been received so readily, even by intelligent persons.—The modern appliances, the mourner's bench, the anxious seat, the altar of prayer, with the exhortations, songs and prayers, based upon the belief in such a change, have a great influence in intensifying the feelings. The mourners, or seekers have been sought before hand in regard to the matter; and are, all unconscious of the fact, *reasoning* themselves through. In proof of this it need only be recollected that no such change takes place until persons have been instructed to expect it. The conviction that this is the real state of the case, will be strengthened by the fact that Methodist, Presbyterian or Baptist preaching, exhortation, prayer and singing, result in Methodist, Presbyterian or Baptist conversion.

Intense partisans, when confronted by this argument, object, that it reduces religion to a mere formality, by discarding all feeling. The objection, however, is so manifestly a mere subterfuge, that it is never urged but by a man determined to defend his mystical regeneration at all hazards. It has not been denied that the heart of man is impressed; but simply that the impression is produced by a mystical influence of the Spirit. The impression made upon the mind, the will, and the affections, is the result of the exercise of the natural powers of man. He "sees with his eyes, hears with his ears, understands with his heart, converts, (or turns) and Jesus heals him." Matt. xiii: 15.

JOSEPH FRANKLIN.

Anderson, Ind., Dec. 15, 1863.

FAIR PROPOSITIONS OR NO DISCUSSION.

We are for fair propositions or no discussion. We do not think that error deserves the advantage. We are perfectly aware that he who believes, maintains and defends the truth, can afford to be magnanimous; but he is under no obligation to give a man, whose entire mission it is to propagate error and assail the truth, one-third of the distance the start in the race, or any other kind of an advantage. The advocate of truth and righteousness should be fair, honorable and magnanimous, but not allow an advantage to be taken by the advocates of error. The advocate of truth should resort to no tricks, cavils or quibbles. His course should be straightforward, fair and manly. He needs no advantage, and should seek none. Not so the advocate of error; he cannot succeed without advantage. Error cannot be maintained in fairness, honor and uprightness. It can only be maintained by trick, sophistry and deception. Its ad-

vocate, to be successful, must, from the beginning, seek advantage, employ unfairness and treachery. There are some fair, honorable and high minded men advocating error, but they are few, and have not had a full opportunity to know and understand the truth. But in nine cases out of ten, when you meet an old advocate of error and assailant of the truth, you will find a dishonest, tricky and unprincipled man. From your first correspondence with him you will find him seeking the advantage, thus unintentionally evincing his consciousness that his position cannot be maintained in fairness and honor. If a man begins by seeking an advantage in stating questions for discussion, you may rest assured that he intends to use the advantage sought; and you will find the same want of honor, manliness and fairness running through his whole course in discussion.

We introduce this subject here to caution inexperienced brethren, who frequently propose propositions for discussion, sometimes expecting to discuss them themselves, or, in some instances, intending them for some brother whom they intend to invite to hold the discussion, not to give the enemies of the truth the advantage. In many instances, feeling the strength of truth, brethren have proposed, or agreed to propositions giving error a great advantage, thus enabling their opponents to make a considerable show in argument, when they were really doing nothing except practicing deception. The exact issue between the parties should be clearly stated. The party really occupying affirmative ground should be required to affirm. It is always giving an opponent the advantage when you permit him to induce you to affirm a negative proposition. Yet we have done this in many debates. Bro. A. Campbell himself has given his opponents great advantage in several instances, in two different ways: 1st, by overwhelmingly sweeping propositions, as in the discussion with Bishop Purcell. 2d, by affirming negative propositions, as in his discussion with Mr. N. L. Rice. Mr. Campbell might have failed in much that

he affirmed, in the debate with Purcell, and his argument have been ruinous to Romanism. Still, in debate, if he failed in a single point, the Bishop of Cincinnati claimed a victory, though enough had been proved to demolish Romanism forever. But as the propositions in the Lexington debate have been debated many times since, we propose the following objections:

I. In the discussion on the action of baptism, Mr. Campbell affirmed a negative proposition—that immersion only is baptism. What was the true issue between them on this subject? Mr. Campbell practiced immersion. Mr. Rice practiced sprinkling. Then, in honor and fairness, if Mr. Rice questioned the practice of Mr. Campbell—immersion—Mr. Campbell should have affirmed that immersion is baptism.—Mr. Rice should have denied it. But if Mr. Campbell questioned sprinkling, Mr. Rice should have affirmed that sprinkling is baptism. Mr. Campbell should have denied it. This would have placed the disputants on an equal footing, each man being required to prove his practice, or fail. The way the debate was conducted, Mr. Campbell was not only required to prove that *sprinkling was not baptism*, but that *nothing else was*. Nothing is clearer than that he who practices anything for baptism is bound to prove it to be baptism, or be defeated. No man is bound in argument to prove that anything is *not baptism*. If the champions of sprinkling or pouring will not affirm and try to prove, in fair and honorable discussion, that sprinkling or pouring is baptism, the people will soon understand the reason, and will put the significant question to them, *Why, then, do you practice it?* We practice what we can prove, and are ready to try to prove it.—They practice what they cannot prove, and what they are not generally willing to try to prove.

II. Mr. Campbell affirmed a negative proposition as the influence of the Spirit—that the Spirit in conversion and sanctification operates only through the truth. What was the precise issue between them

on this subject? Mr. Campbell maintained that the Spirit operated through the truth, on the sinner in turning him to God and setting him apart to his service. If Mr. Rice questioned this, then, Mr. Campbell should have been required to affirm it, and Mr. Rice should have denied it. If Mr. Campbell could not have proved that the Spirit does operate on the sinner, in turning him to God, and setting him apart to his service, through the word, he would have failed. But if Mr. Rice would not have denied this, as he evidently would not, then we turn to the other side. Mr. Rice maintained that the Spirit operates without the word, separate from the word, or immediately on the sinner, in turning him to God and setting him apart to his service. If Mr. Campbell questioned this, Mr. Rice should have affirmed it and proved it, or tried to do so. Mr. Campbell should have denied it. Thus each man would have been required to prove what he believed, in failing to do which, he would have been defeated whether any proof had been adduced in the negative or not.

III. On the creed question, Mr. Campbell appeared in the affirmative. This was requiring him to occupy wrong ground. Mr. Rice was the advocate of human creeds, and ought to have been required to maintain that they were scriptural, lawful and useful. This Mr. Campbell should have denied. This would have put the debate on the true ground.

The reader may inquire why the debate was not conducted on fair grounds. To this we reply, that the reason was the same as in many other cases, viz: That he could not get it on fair ground, and he had to accept it in that shape or have no debate. His opponent would not enter the contest unless he could have the advantage. Mr. Campbell believed, and rightly too, as the sequel proved, that the truth could gain a victory under disadvantage and that it was better to hold the discussion than not to hold it. We doubt not he was right in all this; but this by no means proved that we should give the same advantage to all

our antagonists. We must teach them fairness, honor and manliness, by refusing to recognize them as disputants, or honorable opponents at all till they will meet the issues between us fairly and squarely. Meeting them on unequal grounds has a demoralizing influence on them, leading them into habits of evasion, quibbling and cavilling—of deception. But holding them on fair, honorable and equal ground leads them into fair, straight forward and honorable habits of reasoning, as well as teaches them the all-important lesson, that nothing but pure, holy and heaven-born truth can all the time be confided in, relied on and trusted, as utterly impregnable, invulnerable and unailing, capable of being maintained, defended, advocated and perpetuated, in defiance of all opposition. It teaches them and ourselves not to rely on self, tricks, evasions, false issues, human cunning, cavilling, quibbling and sophistry; but to rely on truth, a clear forcible manifestation of the truth, unvarnished truth, as it came from heaven and the God of all truth and righteousness.

B. F.

ROM. VIII: 18-24.

My attention was drawn, in the Review of 17th December, to the above passage, and occasionally for some years past, it has been to me an interesting subject of study. The exposition could be made plainer by going more fully into the structure and reasoning of the preceding chapters; but for the present, notice can be taken only of the verses quoted. What the apostle meant for the highest comfort to the followers of Jesus are not to be given over as a paradox. An explanation is to be sought, which will be plain, natural and agreeable, both to the context and to the whole scope of New Testament Revelation. I submit the following:

I. As to the meaning of the term, *Ktisis*,

I believe Brother B. R. S. quite justified in considering this the key to the explanation of the whole passage. It is also highly necessary to keep in view the close connection of each verse with the one preceding it.

That *ktisis* means creature, or creation, the four times it is here used, is plain. But what kind of a creature? Is it a universe, a whole entity of some kind; or something material contrasted with a being or state of being, more spiritual?

I think the term denotes in each case here whatever is liable to suffering, pain, decay and death, in man. And when used in this passage in reference to the Christian, means his suffering and mortal body and nature in this world, contrasted with his future state of glory—of both body and spirit—when raised from the dead. It appears to teach that now, and in this world, the pained and death-stricken body of the saint is not in as honorable and safe a state as the spiritual life within him, and that the former is looking with intensest desire for that time when "this mortal shall put on immortality" at the resurrection of the just. 2 Cor. iv: 16, 17, and Do. v: 1-5, are illustrative of, and exactly parallel to the meaning of the *creature* in the passage now under consideration. In the first it has the same sense as the "outward man that perishes;" in the second quotation it is equal in meaning to the "earthly house of this tabernacle," which is hastening to dissolution, and in which believers are said to "groan," "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with their house which is from heaven." Let us, then, try how the above definition of *ktisis* will read in endeavoring to exhibit,

II. The meaning of Rom. viii: 18-24.—The 18th v. is the *foundation* of the whole passage; and with it are *mostly closely connected*, vs. 19, 20, 21. In the whole range from 18-24, there is only *one idea* stated and developed, and this is *illustrated* and *amplified* by vs. 22, 23.

I shall render the verses according to the meaning which I believe them to teach:

(18) "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared

with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Christians) when we are raised in the likeness of Christ.

(19) We show that we believe this—"For the earnest desire of our pained and mortal bodies looks for the revelation of the sons of God." That is, when the glory revealed in us, Christians, (v. 18) shall exhibit us before the whole universe, raised from the grave, freed from all suffering and pain, and made immortal.

(20) Each one of you Christians was freed from sin in turning to God, Rom. vi. 4, 17, 18. But the body ("the image of the earthy") is still in an abject and mortal state: for it "was made subject to vanity" (not willingly—since it happened long before any of you at Rome were born), "but by reason of him (God) who has subjected it

(21) in hope, that the mortal body, or creature part of each one of us shall also be delivered (as the spiritual part is already, v. 10) "from the bondage of a pained and perishing state into the glorious liberty of the children of God." That is, into the glory revealed in, and shared by us—Christians—v. 18, through and after the resurrection of the just. Rev. xx: 6.

(22) "Farther," to amplify and illustrate what I began to show in v. 18, and that you may mark how widely extended is this bondage of corruption among the heathen around you, "we know that every unconverted animal man groans and travails in pain together until now."

(23) "And it is not only so" with these, —to whom I can give no promise of deliverance and immortality, since they are not sons of God,—"but we, who are sons of God, and have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, namely, the redemption of our body" from corruption and the grave to eternal glory,—"waiting," as I stated at the commencement, "for the glory which shall be revealed in us."

I believe there is not even a plausible sophism in favor of Universalism in the whole six verses quoted. The first verse of the passage gives the promise of eternal

glory solely to Christians in a state of suffering. Vs. 19, 20, 21 explain these sufferings, and repeat, in varied language, the same promise of glory and freedom, but to those only who were the obedient followers of Jesus. None others are referred to or brought in. And so in verse 23d, none are introduced as sharing the full adoption of body and spirit but such as had already obeyed the gospel—Paul himself included, and hence possess the first fruits of the Spirit of God. And thus the whole theme before the apostle's mind is—The Christian's state in this world, and the Christian's glory in the world to come. This is proved both by the connected sense of the passage, as well as its connecting particles. (See Prof. Kyro in loc.)

But what of v. 22? The apostle brings it in simply to amplify and illustrate his subject. And if there really was any Universalism in the passage, this verse (22) would kill it. For if *ktisis* simply meant, in verse 21, all mankind, which were to be freed, delivered out of a state of corruption, etc., what need and what reason was there left for the far more comprehensive term, *pasa ktisis*, as here used?

But what is said of this *whole creation*? Why, just that they are groaning and travelling in pain together until now! Mark the force of the figure employed. There is for them not one promise, not one ray of hope; they are left in the throes of sin, darkness and unbelief, and after using their poor dying state as an illustration, Paul glides into his former subject, viz: to comfort and assure the children of God.

W. S. PATTERSON.

St. John, N. B., Dec. 28, '63.

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

the ... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

INDEX.

VOLUME I.

	Page		Page
A Plea for the Reformation, by the Ed., No. 1,	1	Conversion, by Jacob Creath,	279
Do do do	2, 11	Do do	304
Do do do	3, 15	Do do	312
Do do do	4, 69	Contrast between the True and False Church	
Do do do	5, 80	by J. Creath,	374
Do do do	6, 92	Colleges and Education, by the Editor,	376
Do do do	7, 97	Design of the Confession, by J. W. McGarvey,	252
Do do do	8, 113	Excommunication, by A. Raines,	62
Do do do	9, 145	Facts of Nature against Atheism, by G. L. Purdy, and Remarks on same, by Editor,	
Do do do	10, 177	Do do do	155
Do do do	11, 211	Farewell, by W. T. Moore,	91
Do do do	12, 239	Faith and Infidelity, by R. Milligan,	321
Do do do	13, 249	Do do do	330
Do do do	14, 276	Do do do	340
Do do do	15, 285	Do do do	350
Do do do	16, 289	Do do do	358
Do do do	17, 295	Do do do	369
Do do do	18, 337	Do do do	381
Do do do	19, 346	Do do do	163
A Dialogue between a Sceptic and a Christian,	13	How to Evangelize, by J. F. Rowe,	335
Do do do	18	I Am, Extract,	293
A Review of the Archbishop of Dublin, by W. T. Moore,	20	Letter to A. Campbell, by Dr. David King, and remarks by the Editor,	50
Annals of the English Bible,	84	Laudamus Domine,	167
Do do	102	Literary Character of the Bible,	206
Do do	117	Live and let live, by J. W. McGarvey, and Remarks by the Editor,	218
Do do	138	Little men with pet notions, by J. F. Rowe,	262
Do do	164	Man the image of God, by James Challen,	56
Do do	181	Mental Capabilities, by Mr. B.,	192
A Blessed Intimacy,	101	Modern Revivals, by the Editor,	229
Address, by J. W. McGarvey,	222	Metanoia, by Unios Andros,	327
An Argument on the design of Baptism, by A. C. N.,	366	Materialism, by the Editor,	363
Bible Translation,	271	Mighty in the Scriptures,	368
Contrast between the Spirit of the Friends and Enemies of Christ, by J. Rogers,	208	Now I lay me down to Sleep,	205
Creeds and Creed-denouncers and Remarks by Editor,	39	Opinionism, by a Raines,	76
Contrast between the Spirit of the Friends and Enemies of Christ, by J. Rogers,	242	Old Hundred,	201
		Pointed Thoughts, by A. Raines,	116

	Page		Page
Pointed Thoughts, by A. Raines,	143	The Bible, by A. Campbell,	3
Do do do	168	The Union of Christians, by Jacob Creath,	72
Do do do	174	Do do do	109
Do do do	190	Do do do	246
Paul's position as a Preacher, by J. F. Rowe,	299	Do do do	292
Pardon of Sin and God reconciled to Man, by J. Creath,	378	Do do do	317
Romanism; a Fragment, by F. W. Emmons,	60	The Childhood's Wish, by Fannie Faithful,	91
Review of Brethren Pendleton and Errett, by the Editor,	122	The Worth of Advantage,	112
Rise and Progress of Popery,	170	The Sanctity and Obligations of Oaths, by A. Raines,	124
Do do do	185	The Faith, by F. W. Emmons,	149
Do do do	197	Thoughts as they came Up, by A. Raines,	189
Revolution and Reformation, by J. F. Rowe,	193	Translation—Immersion,	190
Review of N. J. Mitchell's Sermon, by Allen Hickey,	226	The Mission of John the Immerser, by H. C.	233
Relation of Repentance and Faith, by the Editor,	214	The Mission of the Christian Preacher, by W. H. Taylor,	254
Do do do	260	The Puritan's description of Dr. Antichrist, by J. Creath,	344
Do do do	273	The Gospel a Grand Induction, by James Challen,	348
Do do do	282	Do do do	361
Do do do	315	The Flight of Time, by C. J. Kimbal,	354
Do do do	319	That Sermon, by J. S.,	367
Do do do	324	The Pauline Theology, by the Editor,	372
Do do do	332	Universal Salvation,	155
Review of the Archbishop of Dublin, by J. M. Henry,	306	Washing the Disciples' Feet,	109
Reflections at Midnight, by W. T. Moore,	353	Woman's Influence,	123
Sectarian Progressiveness, by J. W. McGar- vey,	267	What a Refuge,	176
		William Tyndale, by Jacob Creath,	285
		What is a Valid Immersion, by J. W. McGar- vey,	202

VOLUME II.

	Page.		Page
A Criticism on the English of the Bible U. Gospel,	1	Discussion on Universal Salvation, by G. L. Purdy,	209
A Popular Objection Answered, by J. W. Cox,	12	Do do do	248
A Sermon, by N. J. Mitchell,	138	Do do do	263
Agency of the Holy Spirit in Conversion, by N. J. Mitchell,	171	Do do M. N. Lord,	266
A Synopsis of the Faith and Practice of the Church in Detroit, by J. W. Cox,	232	Do do do	271
Do do do	258	Do do G. L. Purdy,	275
An Educated Ministry, by J. Creath,	364	Do do M. N. Lord,	285
A Discovery, by Observer,	368	Do do G. L. Purdy,	295
Bible Translation,	114	Do do M. N. Lord,	297
Bereavement, by J. P. Mitchell,	208	Do do do	316
Card-playing, Dancing, etc., by S. T. Meng,	85	Dr. Lillie a Disciple of Christ, by the Edi- tor,	116
Continuation of Miracles, by J. T. Stark, and Remarks by the Editor.	142	Do on Verbal Inspiration,	229
Controversy, by M.,	287	Dancing, by C. J. Kimbal,	324
Christian Earnestness, by W. O. H.,	353	Do do do	331
Congregational Singing, by P.,	354	Do do do	339
Dialogue about the Holy Spirit, by J. M. Hen- ry,	18	Delinquencies of Professor, by J. F. R.,	327
Do do do	41	Enterprise and Industry of the Ministry, by B. F.	370
		Experimental Religion, by Joseph Franklin,	373
		Fair Propositions or no Discussions, by B. F.,	376

	Page		Page
God's mode of Drawing Sinners, by C. J. Kimbal,	66	Reply to W. H. Wyckoff, by H. T. Anderson,	130
History and Teachings of Christ and the Apostles, by W. Pinkerton,	36	Do do do do	151
Do do do do	59	Do do do do	164
Do do do do	80	Do do do do	176
Do do do do	97	Do do do do	190
Do do do do	169	Do do do do	193
Do do do do	220	Do do do do	202
Do do do do	278	Do do do do	217
Do do do do	289	Do do do do	223
Do do do do	308	Do do do do	236
Hints on the Study of the Bible, by R. S. V.,	93	Do do do do	242
Hallucinations, by J. F. Rowe,	119	Do do do do	251
He leadeth Me,	192	Review of the Union Doctrinal Basis, by Timothy,	211
He died in a Military Hospital, by J. A. Meng,	272	Romans, 8th Chap., verse 18-24, by W. S. Patterson,	378
John Wesley, by David Walk,	253	Sacrifice, by H. C.,	179
J. W. McGarvey and the Missionary Societies, by J. Creath,	360	Spirits in Prison, by W. W. Clayton, and Remarks by Editor,	292
Letter from J. P. Dougherty and Remarks by the Editor,	225	Second coming of the Lord, by C. S. Town,	325
Love and Union, by Observer,	329	Do do do do	348
Modern Revivalism, by the Editor,	1	The Gospel an Induction, by James Challen,	7
Do do do do	46	Do do do do	26
Do do do do	64	The Pauline Theology, by the Editor,	16
Messiah's Reign, by W. Baker,	89	The Analogy between Ancient and Modern Sects, by J. Creath,	28
Miracles not continued, by the Editor,	100	Do do do do	144
Moral Depravity, by A. Philo, and Remarks by the Editor,	104	Truth, by W. Baker,	38
Musings, by Wm. Palmer,	166	The Gospel the Power of God, by N. J. Mitchell,	49
Melancthon,	196	The Way of Salvation, by Editor,	56
Missionary Societies, by J. W. McGarvey,	342	Do do do do	156
Nothing is Lost,	15	The Beauty of the Soul, by J. P. Mitchell,	110
Over the River, by Henrietta Leggett,	250	The Last Request, by W. T. Moore,	113
Preaching Hell, by T. Munnell,	9	The New Translation, by W. H. Wyckoff,	115
Do do do do	34	Do do do do	123
Do do do do	39	Do do do do	133
Do do do do	107	Do do do do	141
Do do do do	153	Do do do do	146
Propositions for Debate, and Remarks by the Editor,	34	Do do do do	159
Providence; an Essay, by David Walk,	42	Do do do do	167
Do do do do	61	Do do do do	174
Preaching to the Spirits in Prison, by the Editor,	78	Do do do do	188
Do do do by O. A. Burgess, and Remarks by the Editor,	125	Do do do do	201
Popular Christianity, by C. J. Kimbal,	206	The Altar, by H. C.,	263
Power of the Gospel, by W. Baker,	300	The Materialistic Spirit of the Age, by S.,	341
Questions by J. P. Daugherty, and answers by Editor,	245	The Ground of persecution, by the Editor,	345
Do do do do	303	Do do do do	350
Query by an Inquirer and Reply by the Editor,	322	The Ages, by H. T. Anderson,	356
Qualifications of Preachers, by W. K. P., and Remarks by the Editor,	333	The Reformation needed, by the Editor,	362
Roman Catholicism, by J. M. Henry,	44	The Missionary Spirit, by the Editor,	366
Do do do do	53	True and False Education,	238
Do do do do	75	The Work of the Apostacy, by the Editor,	135
Do do do do	82	The Gospel to the Poor, by G. B. Rogers,	197
Do do do do	101	The Political Preacher, by Observer,	320
Do do do do	111	Universalism, by G. L. Purdy, and reply by Editor,	366
Do do do do	148	Work of the Spirit, by C. R., and remarks by Editor,	281
Do do do do	161	What is Political Preaching,	276
Do do do do	185	Ye are fallen from Grace, by A. Philo, and Remarks by the Editor,	72
		Do do do do	311

Page	Subject	Page	Subject
311	Do	123	Do
310	Remarks by the King	122	Do
309	Year's work done by the King	121	Do
308	Wine in England's drinking	120	Do
307	Do	119	Do
306	Do	118	Do
305	Do	117	Do
304	Do	116	Do
303	Do	115	Do
302	Do	114	Do
301	Do	113	Do
300	Do	112	Do
299	Do	111	Do
298	Do	110	Do
297	Do	109	Do
296	Do	108	Do
295	Do	107	Do
294	Do	106	Do
293	Do	105	Do
292	Do	104	Do
291	Do	103	Do
290	Do	102	Do
289	Do	101	Do
288	Do	100	Do
287	Do	99	Do
286	Do	98	Do
285	Do	97	Do
284	Do	96	Do
283	Do	95	Do
282	Do	94	Do
281	Do	93	Do
280	Do	92	Do
279	Do	91	Do
278	Do	90	Do
277	Do	89	Do
276	Do	88	Do
275	Do	87	Do
274	Do	86	Do
273	Do	85	Do
272	Do	84	Do
271	Do	83	Do
270	Do	82	Do
269	Do	81	Do
268	Do	80	Do
267	Do	79	Do
266	Do	78	Do
265	Do	77	Do
264	Do	76	Do
263	Do	75	Do
262	Do	74	Do
261	Do	73	Do
260	Do	72	Do
259	Do	71	Do
258	Do	70	Do
257	Do	69	Do
256	Do	68	Do
255	Do	67	Do
254	Do	66	Do
253	Do	65	Do
252	Do	64	Do
251	Do	63	Do
250	Do	62	Do
249	Do	61	Do
248	Do	60	Do
247	Do	59	Do
246	Do	58	Do
245	Do	57	Do
244	Do	56	Do
243	Do	55	Do
242	Do	54	Do
241	Do	53	Do
240	Do	52	Do
239	Do	51	Do
238	Do	50	Do
237	Do	49	Do
236	Do	48	Do
235	Do	47	Do
234	Do	46	Do
233	Do	45	Do
232	Do	44	Do
231	Do	43	Do
230	Do	42	Do
229	Do	41	Do
228	Do	40	Do
227	Do	39	Do
226	Do	38	Do
225	Do	37	Do
224	Do	36	Do
223	Do	35	Do
222	Do	34	Do
221	Do	33	Do
220	Do	32	Do
219	Do	31	Do
218	Do	30	Do
217	Do	29	Do
216	Do	28	Do
215	Do	27	Do
214	Do	26	Do
213	Do	25	Do
212	Do	24	Do
211	Do	23	Do
210	Do	22	Do
209	Do	21	Do
208	Do	20	Do
207	Do	19	Do
206	Do	18	Do
205	Do	17	Do
204	Do	16	Do
203	Do	15	Do
202	Do	14	Do
201	Do	13	Do
200	Do	12	Do
199	Do	11	Do
198	Do	10	Do
197	Do	9	Do
196	Do	8	Do
195	Do	7	Do
194	Do	6	Do
193	Do	5	Do
192	Do	4	Do
191	Do	3	Do
190	Do	2	Do
189	Do	1	Do
188	Do	0	Do