

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

Christian Reformer

Stone-Campbell Movement Periodicals

1836

Christian Reformer, Volume 1, Numbers 1-11, January-November 1836

John R. Howard

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

Besworth Memorial Library
College of The Bible
Lexington, Kentucky

Howards

THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. JANUARY, 1836.

[NUMBER 1.

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Luke XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED; but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XIV. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS.—Jude, 3.

PROSPECTUS.

THE object to which it is intended to devote this work, shall be, as its name imports, *religious reformation*, in the evangelical and orthodox sense of that term; from error in faith and practice on the one hand, and vice, irreligion and infidelity on the other.

In his endeavors to aid in effecting this, the Editor intends to proceed upon the principle acknowledged by the members of all parties who profess the Christian Religion: that—"the Scriptures are the only and sufficient rule of the faith and practice of Christians."

To the BIBLE, therefore, as the only perfect standard of orthodoxy and test of truth, he will bring the doctrines and practices which claim its sanction and go under the name of religion; and *fearlessly and independently* advocate TRUTH and expose ERROR, wherever found and under whatever garb manifested.

Subservient to this design, the outlines of which are here sketched, the following subjects are the most prominent and will claim chief attention:—

1. The first and general principles of the Christian Religion, involving all that is necessary and requisite in doctrine and practice, will be advocated, illustrated and enjoined, as set forth and exhibited in the Living Oracles or New Testament.

2. The Design with which the different parts of the Bible were written by the individuals to whom they are attributed, the genuineness of authorship, with the analysis and outline, in whole and part, of the books of which it is composed, will be attended to.

3. The Evidences of the divine authenticity of Christianity will be exhibited and illustrated, and its claims upon the faith and obedience of all mankind, shown and urged; while the arguments of infidelity will be met and opposed, its system unveiled and its conduct laid open and exposed.

4. The fulfilment of Prophecy, as connected with the events in the history of the world and with Christian evidences, will also be shown; together with its office and design in influencing the actions and conduct of mankind.

5. The important bearing of Education, physical, mental, moral and religious, upon the present and future welfare, happiness and fate of the human race, shall receive deserving attention; while the errors and deficiencies of the different systems will be pointed out, and the proper remedies proposed and illustrated.

6. Notices and Reviews of such religious works and publications, as come within the sphere of the Editor's design.

09291

7. Notices of the success and progress of Christian reform, Religious news and intelligence, and Miscellanea of religious, moral and literary varieties, original and selected.

An apology may seem necessary in offering the Prospectus of a new religious periodical to the public for their patronage and support, while there are so many publishing already and others springing into existence. To assist in doing all the good he can, is the Editor's principal apology. Added to this, the misrepresentations, calumnies and slanders, constantly issuing from the press, pulpit and fireside, demand refutation and exposure; together with the repeated attempts persisted in to suppress truth and uphold and sustain error. Besides, Tennessee has no periodical devoted, in all respects, to the objects contemplated in this. To the brethren in this state he shall first look for aid in his undertaking, confident that they can sustain it if they will.

CONDITIONS.

1. Each number of this work shall contain 32 large octavo pages, printed on a super-royal or imperial sheet of fair fine paper, with a variety of good type, stitched, and in a good cover.

2. It shall be issued monthly, on the first Monday of the month, commencing with January, 1836.

3. The price, exclusive of postage, shall be *Two Dollars* in advance, or *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* if not paid within six months after subscribing.

4. All persons who obtain and pay for TEN subscribers, according to these terms, shall receive *one* copy gratis.

5. Post Masters and others who act as agents shall receive ten per cent on all monies collected and remitted.

6. All subscriptions to commence with the year, and none received for less than one year. And no person permitted to withdraw until all arrearages are paid, unless at the discretion of the Editor.

7. A failure to notify a discontinuance will be considered a new engagement, where such notification is not received at least a month before the expiration of the year.

All letters and communications to be addressed to the Editor, Paris, Henry Co. Tenn. (*post paid*) Letters containing *remittances* excepted, at the Editor's expense.

The Post-office of each subscriber should be carefully named. Persons procuring subscribers will please obtain none but such as are solvent and punctual. Those holding prospectuses will please return them in time to be received by the 1st day of January.

PREFATORY ADDRESS.

EIGHTEEN hundred years have rolled away through their centuries, since the Sun of RIGHTEOUSNESS arose "with healing in his wings," and shed his illuminating and vivifying beams upon a benighted and a dying world; and eighteen hundred times has our globe measured its annual circuit around the sun, the centre of our material and solar system, since the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, "vanquished death" by his resurrection from the grave, and "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." It was the bright unclouded morn of the Christian dispensation. Before his superior effulgence, the starlight of Gentile tradition and the moonlight of the Jewish economy reflected from its types and figures, faded away and disappeared.

But many, dark, and often of long duration have been the eclipses and obscurations of the Sun of Righteousness since. Clouds and vapours and mists have overspread the moral heavens, and intercepted his cheering light, and hid his genial rays from the faces of men.

Where are we to find the origination and how are we to account for the causes of these?—is the question which naturally arises and presents itself to us here. In this Sun himself, or in the moral world upon which he shines? In reply we may ask—Where are we to seek for the causes of the obscurations and eclipses of the sun of the material system? In that luminary, or in the globe which revolves around him? Not in the former, every intelligent individual must reply. Neither are we, to apply the analogy, any more to look for the causes of the clouds, obscurations and eclipses, and the darkness which they have occasioned in the moral and intellectual world, in the Sun which illuminates it, than we are all those which take place in our material world, in the Sun which enlightens that. Were there no sun, there could be no obscurations and eclipses in the material as in the moral system of the universe. The Sun of Righteousness, like the sun of the globe which we inhabit, has continued to beam ever since his rising with inexhaustible radiance and splendour; and all the moral darkness ever since has been in consequence of the interception and prevention of his light.

The speculations of the Pagan philosophy of the East, engrafted upon the Christian system and mingled with its principles and precepts; the cabalistic dogmas and unauthorized rites and ceremonies of Papal priestcraft and superstition; and the great mass of human tradition which came down accumulating from age to age; hid and obscured the truths of the Gospel, shut out its light from the minds of men, and covered the world with moral and intellectual darkness.

But this dark and gloomy period in the history of the world, which has been so aptly termed "THE DARK AGES," was not always to continue. The Reformation, effected by exertions of Luther and others, took place, when light broke in upon the world, and began to increase. But it was again dimmed and obscured. Christianity soon became corrupted and perverted; and the Bible was soon loaded and fettered again with human additions and appendages, and traditions raked out of the cells and cloisters where it had been so long shut up from the world, which paralyzed its efficiency and retarded its progress. But a time has come, long and anxiously looked for and desired by all its real admirers and advocates, when stripped of all these, and unmanacled, unfettered and disencumbered, it is marching forth in its primitive strength and majesty, and beginning to accomplish that mighty and universal triumph which its Author has destined it to achieve, and which is to result in the conversion of the whole world, not to any human system of theology, but to the divine system of the Christian Religion.

A revolution has commenced in the religious sentiments and affairs of Christendom, which we trust will be looked back upon by the generations of all future times and known as THE REFORMATION. A Reformation is in progress, and rapidly extending itself in a continually increasing ratio, which as far surpasses those of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and all similar reformations, as the light of the risen sun exceeds that of the dawn which precedes it. They, too generally, only new modified and perpetuated the corruptions which were the causes of bringing them into existence and which thus gave them birth; while this, taking the highest ground which ever has been or ever can be assumed among men in religion, has renounced all alliance with human creeds, systems, sects and names; and thus discarding all inventions, innovations and corruptions, has for its sole object, aim and purpose, the restoration and re-establishment of Christianity in its primitive simplicity, purity and uncorruptedness among the nations of the earth, and the amelioration and regeneration of all the human race through its instrumentality.

It must be sufficiently obvious to the most superficial observer of the religious affairs and proceedings of the times in which we live, that there is a vast amount of ERROR among the numerous systems which exist. That there are more systems than one, is evidence sufficient of this; since there is but *one* Bible, and of course, if that Bible be consistent with itself, (which all "professors" in all sects admit,) but *one* system which it contains. But instead of that one system, and "one body" as in the days of the Apostles, we have a thousand different bodies and a thousand differing systems. The "professors" of the Christian religion have been rent and split into a thousand sects with a thousand different creeds. Sects with their systems have arisen, flourished, changed

and decayed, leaving nothing to posterity but their systems and their names; until the pages of ecclesiastical history are covered with them, and have become a record of but little else. Let us look at our own times, and what do we see? Dissenting, hostile, antagonist sects every where! Some of these are as far apart in their points of difference as the antipodes, with every shade and variety between. Such a disagreement between the tenets of so many denominations, all professing to draw their religion from *one* and the *same* book, to take it as their only rule of faith and practice, and appealing to it for authority and support of their doctrines, is, we repeat, ample evidence that there is a mighty mass of error existing among them. Taking this then for granted, without adducing proofs from the discordancy and discrepancy of any or of all these variant systems with the one perfect, harmonious and faultless system, (and where there is so much difference among themselves, there must be much differing from the Bible,) is there not, we would ask, great need of REFORM? This will be still more apparent, if we compare the religion of modern times with the christianity contained in the New Testament. How few, too generally, the points of agreement, and how many and how great the dissimilarities! Compare the lives of the bulk of professors, as exhibited in their daily walk and conversation, in their deportment and conduct, with those examples and patterns which are held up to our view in that inspired and sacred volume, and with those rules and precepts laid down there, and what a contrast do we behold! How few are there to be found "walking in ALL the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless," and "standing perfect and complete in ALL the will of God!" How often and how generally does the morality of the "non-professing," shame the religion of the "professing" part of the world; and how few the landmarks left between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of Christ! Is there not also, we would ask with all due respect and deference, great necessity for a REFORM here? Errors in the doctrine of religion almost invariably lead to errors in the practice; and as long as either shall continue to exist in the world, reformation will be indispensable.

A great reform in the faith and practice of the "professors" of Christianity, is wanting; and how shall it be effected? We answer: By discarding and renouncing all human creeds and confessions of faith; all sectarian opinions, peculiarities, systems and names; all "the doctrines and commandments of men;" in short every thing incompatible with that system of religion embraced by the Bible, and which cannot be found there; and by taking that volume and that alone as our only guide and directory in all matters of religious faith and practice, submitting it to the established rules and laws of interpretation, and bowing to the authority of every commandment it contains. This is the only way in which, according to our views of religious matters and things, that all can be brought together and "built upon the one foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" and the only way in which a rational and scriptural union can be effected among all those of every sect and name who profess the Christian religion. To effect this great and most beneficent object our labours shall be unremittingly employed and unceasingly directed. Panoplied in the armour of faith, and with the two-edged sword of the Spirit in our hands, we have nothing to fear and we fear nothing, from all the powers, oppositions and influences, separate and combined, in the universe, which may be arrayed against us. It is able, and it can and will cut its way through all the ranks of aliens and hosts of opponents who shall be so presumptuous as to contend against it. It has been the instrument in achieving all the victories of the Captain of our salvation which have been won for him; and it shall continue to add conquest to conquest until He shall obtain a universal triumph; until the Man of Sin shall be finally and completely overthrown, "whom the Lord shall consume with the SPIRIT of his MOUTH, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming;" and until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord, and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." With "the SWORD of the Spirit which is the word of God" for our weapon of defence and conquest, we expect to enter into every contest in which we may engage for our King and to gain every victory which we may be instrumental in winning for him. Our arms are not

those of the bow or the steel—"the weapons of *our* warfare are not *carnal*, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of *strong holds*; casting down *imaginations*, [or *reasonings*,] and every *high thing* that *exalteth* ITSELF against the KNOWLEDGE of God, and bringing into captivity *every thought* to the OBEEDIENCE of Christ."

The Gospel has proved its power upon the world once, when promulged in its primitive purity before it became corrupted; and it is beginning to prove its power *now*, and *will* prove it again. "The Gospel of Christ," has been declared by the Holy Spirit, to be "the POWER of God unto SALVATION to *every* one who *believes*;" and not only his *power*, but "the WISDOM of God *and* the power of God. The combined wisdom and power of GOD are able to put down all resistance, and adequate to accomplish all His designs and purposes in the moral and intellectual empire of the Universe. In what the Gospel *has* done, we have the evidence of what it *can* do, and what it *will* do. God declared once by the prophet Isaiah, that the WORD which went out of His mouth should not return unto him *void*, but should *accomplish* what He pleased, and should *prosper* in the thing for which he sent it; and he has declared again by the apostles Paul and Peter, that it "is *quick* and *powerful* and *sharper* than any TWO-EDGED SWORD," and that it "*lives*, and *abides* and *endures* FOREVER." It is my means of the LIVING WORD, that the way for that perfect, blissful and glorious order of society is to be prepared, which is called the MILLENNIUM, dimly adumbrated and shadowed forth in those splendid descriptions of inspired Prophets and Apostles, which have exhausted all the strains of heaven taught melody, and which is to result in the consummation and perfection of "GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST, AND ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD WILL TOWARD MEN;" when, saith the Lord, "ALL SHALL KNOW ME FROM THE LEAST TO THE GREATEST," and "THE EARTH SHALL BE FULL OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LORD, AS THE WATERS COVER THE SEA."

The Editor aims not at being a *pioneer* in this reformation. The wilderness has already been explored, and the *ancient highway* cleared out by able, experienced and courageous adventurers; and the instruments and means furnished to all future times by which it can be kept opened. Supplied with and aided by their helps and those of others, his office will be an humbler, and perhaps less laborious, one; that of auxiliary and assistant, in keeping the way cleared out and open, and in persuading and inducing those out of it, who are wandering and straying in the erroneous *by-ways* of the world, to travel along it in the journey of life, that it may lead them to the New Jerusalem, that "city with foundations whose maker and builder is God." He will endeavour to aid still further in dissipating the mists and fogs of superstition, ignorance and error, which have filled the moral atmosphere of christendom, and in dispelling the darkness which they have caused; and in removing from the eyes of the "religious" community the films of prejudice and misconception which prevent them from seeing and apprehending Christian truth. He will also endeavor to aid still further in rescuing the sacred writings from the glosses, perplexities, false interpretations and misapplications, of commentators, annotators and system-makers, and in restoring them to their original purity and uncorruptedness; in still further developing the Christian institution, and clearing it of the useless appendages and additions which have clogged it and retarded it in its progress;—and in illustrating and enforcing its truths and urging its claims upon the faith and obedience of allmankind.

Notwithstanding we have had the publication of a periodical in contemplation almost ever since we enlisted under the banner of the King of saints, it was at last with a considerable degree of diffidence that we resolved to undertake it. Young in the cause in which we have engaged, and of course without a great deal of practical knowledge and experience, we are aware of the difficulties with which we shall have to meet and contend, and of the inabilities under which we must necessarily labour. But past experience, short as it is, and a consciousness of self-improvement, encourage us to proceed. We cannot promise our readers any thing *new* in the Christian religion. Since "old things have passed away and all things have become new," we can say with the preacher in Ecclesiasticus, "there is no new thing under the sun." We shall be

contented if we can place *old* truths in new lights, or in such as will make them take hold of the minds and affections of men. So much has already been said by our contemporaries upon the topics which we expect to discuss, and so perspicuously, forcibly and eloquently; that we shall be principally encouraged to proceed in our efforts by the consideration that every writer has his own peculiar style and arrangement, in which to express and exhibit his sentiments and views, in accordance with his own train of thinking and mode of expression. Convinced from trial and experience that we can do more with the *pen* than with the *tongue*, we expect to accomplish most of the good to be done by us, with the former. Though much has been performed in that way, yet much remains to be done. Particularly does the attention of the disciples require to be called more to the necessity and importance of practising the things which they have been taught. Without this, the Christian religion will be of no more benefit to *them*, than it will be to a Pagan, a Jew, or a Turk. This is a subject which we shall endeavor in all our editorial labors to keep continually in view.

We deem it necessary in the conclusion of this address, to make some remarks upon the course we intend pursuing. This paper is not pledged in any way whatever to support the tenets and practices of any religious sect in christendom; nor shall it ever be while under our management. Its object shall be, as stated in the Prospectus, the fearless and independent advocacy of truth and exposure of error, wherever found and however manifested.

"Seize upon TRUTH where'er 'tis found,
Amongst your friends, amongst your foes,
On Christian or on heathen ground;
The flower's divine where'er it grows;
Neglect the prickle and assume the rose."

The gospel is emphatically "THE WORD OF TRUTH." *Truth* alone is, has been, and ever will be valuable. It is great, and mighty above all things, and *will prevail*. It is destined to achieve a triumph over error in all its forms, as universal as it shall be complete. It is the only weapon which the Messiah, when arraigned before Pontius Pilate he witnessed the good confession, pointed out as that by which his kingdom was to be established, extended, and should triumph. Before its light, the mists and darkness of error shall vanish away forever. Truth only can make us FREE. "You shall know the TRUTH, and the TRUTH shall make you FREE," said the Messiah to the believing Jews. Error keeps its votaries in bondage, a slavery of all others the most to be deprecated.

We enter upon the task before us with a consciousness of our liability to *err* and to be led into error. "To err is human," has been well said or sung. That we are fallible and imperfect, we have not only been taught, but had confirmed by our own experience. It is the condition, not only of ourselves, but of all men; and would that all were equally conscious of it. Were they, their minds would be in a much better state than they generally are, to discriminate between truth and error and to distinguish and receive the truth; and we would have less obstinacy and stubbornness to contend with, and less supercilious and arrogant dogmatism. We hope to be ever open to conviction while we live; and we promise that when convinced of error, we shall forthwith abandon it. Error is always baneful—truth never. Any person who may at any time convince us of any error which we hold, or into which we may fall, shall receive our warmest thanks. And should we, during our editorial career, be guilty of publishing any errors, or inserting for fact that which is not so, we promise to give place to any decently and sufficiently well written statements or documents which may correct such errors or disprove such alleged facts. The cause of *Bible truth* needs not *error* or *falsehood* to sustain it; and has never been benefitted, but always injured by the contrary course. All such communications must, to be attended to, be accompanied by the author's *real* name.

The name of our periodical implies reformation; and we hope not only to reform others, but to be ever reforming ourselves, while there is room for it; not only from er-

ror to truth, but in our deportment, behaviour and conduct, as far as we shall find these need correcting.

That we shall have controversy, we fully expect. Truth has always had to contend with error; and as long as error and falsehood are in the world, controversy will be necessary. The lives of our Saviour and his apostles on earth, were one continued scene of controversy; with the corrupt and unbelieving Jews first, and with Jew and Gentile afterwards. Controversy is not in itself an evil. It is from the spirit, manner, temper, in which it is conducted, that the evils of it flow. Like all other *good* things, when perverted from its proper use it becomes as great an evil as before it was a good.

We intend as far as possible to pursue a strictly *impartial* course. A partial, one-sided course, which, while it presents the reader with the arguments and statements of but one side of a question—refuses to admit any thing on the other which opposes it, is always to be condemned. A good cause seeks, but never shuns, investigation; a bad one shuns and never seeks. We shall therefore always insert all decent, well written articles against, as well as for, the views for which we shall contend, when accompanied by the author's real name; reserving to ourself the right of making such remarks or replications as we shall think necessary. And we shall always thankfully receive and with pleasure publish all good communications written in support and defence of the religion of the Bible, and which may tend to elucidate and enforce its truths. The author's name, as before stated, must accompany all communications. In addition to our original matter, we intend to give good and appropriate extracts from various authors, which may be sent to us for publication, or which we may cull ourselves. We do not wish however, that our making an extract or extracts from any author, shall be taken as evidence that we commend all the writings of such author. We may sometimes extract from one part of an author's productions, for the very purpose of opposing some error which may be countenanced and supported by some other part, or have had from it its origin.

It has been objected to so many papers and so much writing, that human writings on religion have a tendency to turn away the attention from the study of the Bible. This is true in regard to those, and perhaps those only, which are of a *speculative* character. All human productions on religion are only valuable and beneficial as their tendency is to the reverse. We shall always endeavor ourselves, in all that we shall write or publish, to send the reader to the Bible and make him study it for himself.

It has been objected to the name of our paper, that it implies a reformation in Christianity. Let it be remembered, that the name of our paper is the "Christian Reformer," and not the "Reformed Christian." Christianity is a divine and perfect system, having God for its author, and cannot, therefore, be *reformed*. To reform man, not be reformed by him, is its object; and it is through its instrumentality that we design to make our periodical what its name imports—the *CHRISTIAN reformer*.

We have sketched out a large field in our Prospectus for our future exertions; but we hope and intend, if we shall receive sufficient patronage and support to warrant the continuance of our paper, to cultivate it all before we are done; to leave nothing untouched or undone, but to accomplish fully and completely all we have promised.

EDITOR.

It is almost as difficult to make a man unlearn his errors, as his knowledge. Mal-information is more hopeless than non-information; for error is always more busy than ignorance. Ignorance is a blank sheet, on which we may write; but error is a scribbled one, from which we must first erase. Ignorance is contented to *stand still* with her back to the truth; but error is more presumptuous, and *proceeds* in the same direction. Ignorance has no light, but error follows a false one. The consequence is, that error, when she retraces her footsteps, has farther to go, before she can arrive at the truth, than ignorance.—*Lacon*.

Divine Origin of Christianity.

The BIBLE is emphatically and definitively what its *name* imports—THE BOOK. * When considered as containing all the revelations which we have from God to man; it becomes invested with an importance ineffably surpassing that of any or indeed all books which have emanated from the human mind. They have men for their authors—this has God for its Author; and its authority and importance is just as far superior to theirs, as God Himself is to man whom he has created, and whom he upholds and sustains through the short period of his existence.

It furnishes answers to the most interesting and perplexing questions ever suggested to man by himself or propounded to him by his fellow beings; and it supplies him with that information which no other volume can impart. His origin—his present state—his destiny. Whence came he?—what is he?—where is he going? These are the three grand topics which it discusses, and the three great questions which it answers. In that volume alone, he reads the history of his own creation, of that of the universe in which he exists, and his fall from his primeval state; in that volume alone, he reads the character and purposes of God, the situation which he occupies in regard to him as his Creator and Preserver, and the relation in which he stands to his fellow man; and in that volume alone, he has recorded the plan of his redemption and the means of his salvation, and is informed of the destiny that awaits him;—that his existence is not bounded by the horizon of his present life and limited to this state of being, but that an endless existence awaits him beyond the tomb, where he shall either enjoy immortal felicity or be eternally miserable.

The Bible contains the Alpha and the Omega—the beginning and the end—of all the divine knowledge of which we know, that has been communicated to man. As between these two letters is contained all the Greek alphabet, the letters of which, put into various combinations, compose the Greek language, (the original language of

the New Testament,) so the Bible comprehends between its commencement and its close, the divine communications which constitute the language of Heaven. It opens with the creation of man and closes with his eternal destiny; and contains all the wisdom and all the knowledge, requisite and necessary for his happiness during every period of his existence here, from his entrance upon his present to that of his eternal life.

The Word of God is the only medium of communication with which we are acquainted, between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man. It is to reason, the eye of the mind, what light is to the eye of the body; and as the sun himself is the fountain of that light through the medium of which we behold him, so the spirit of God is the source of the light of *revelation* by which we discern Him. And as, if the eye be single, (clear, sound, free from disease and film,) the whole body will be enlightened, † so the mind that comes to the Bible, if not blinded by passion, prejudice or prepossession, will be illuminated and filled with the light of the Holy Spirit, beaming from the pages of inspiration and shedding its radiance upon the dark and benighted understanding.

The Sun of revelation is to the moral system of the universe, what the sun of the material creation is to the solar system and the globe which we inhabit. Let the sun be blotted out, intercept every ray which he sheds, quench all his beams, and banish from the world all the light which has emanated from him; and in what gross, universal and midnight darkness would our globe be enveloped! Thus would it be in the moral empire, were it deprived of all the light which has been shed upon it by the Sun of revelation. To this Sun are we indebted for all the light with which it has been irradiated. To this source the Heathen and Pagan world owe all the real knowledge which they have or have ever had of

† "The lamp of the body is the eye. If, therefore, thine eye be sound, thy whole body will be enlightened: but if thine eye be distempered, thy whole body will be dark." *Dr. Geo. Campbell's Translation of Matthew. vi. 22.*

* From the Greek *Biblos*, a Book.

God and religion. All the true light which they enjoy is the light of *tradition*. They walk in the *twilight* of revelation. To them the Sun of revelation is set, and they can only bask in the reflection of his beams. When the Sun of our material system has set, we can only walk by his twilight, which is all his light we then have. But let us be deprived of the sun himself, and not the reflection of a single ray of his twilight would be left! And just so would it be with the twilight of the Sun of revelation, had he never beamed upon the moral world. For the confirmation of these assertions we have the testimony of revelation itself. Paul, in his epistle to the church or congregation at Rome, says in reference to the Gentiles; "That which *may be known* of God is MANIFEST in [to] them; for God HATH SHEWED it unto them;" and; "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;" and further; "Who *changed* the TRUTH* of God into a LIE, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." The *light of nature*, of which infidels and natural religionists boast so much, as being sufficient to impart to us all the necessary knowledge of God and to instruct us in all our duty to him, is only the reflected light of the Sun of revelation. The light in which they walk is a *borrowed light*—the *moonlight* of revelation. The moon shines by reflection from the sun. Deprive her of *his* light, let her when beaming from her full orb suffer a total eclipse, and where is then her *natural* light? The "light of nature" is but the light of the Sun of revelation, reflected from the works of creation. Without the aid of the light of this Sun, man would be as unable to read the instructive and entertaining volume of creation, as he would all the volumes of writing, in the world, when deprived of material light. To him

creation with all its beauties, would present a universal blank! A blank as universal as that which the face of nature would present to the contemplation of the midnight wanderer! But when lighted up by the Sun of revelation, he sees design, order, harmony, throughout all the realms of creation; and can trace the finger of God in all its parts.

From the smallest spire of grass, through all the varieties of the vegetable kingdom, to the oak, the monarch of the forest; from the smallest fountain, to the largest river, rolling its mighty volume of waters in silent grandeur to the ocean; from the smallest hill, that scarce rears its humble head above the valley, to the majestic mountain, towering in awful sublimity and lifting to the skies its summit, clothed with perpetual snows; from the smallest pool, to the mighty ocean, bounding the horizon with its world of waters; from the smallest particle of animated nature, through all the gradations of being, up to man, the master-piece of the material creation, the connecting link between the worlds of matter and of mind, and the top-stone of creation's visible pyramid; from the nearest planet to the sun, to the most distant from it—

"From the far bourn

Of utmost Saturn, wheeling wide his round
Of thirty years, to Mercury, whose disk
Can scarce be caught by philosophic eye,
Lost in the near effulgence of thy blaze;"

From the Sun, the centre of the solar system, diffusing light and heat to the worlds that revolve around him, to the most distant fixed star, scarcely discernible by telescopic vision; all—all—all declare the being and existence of an omnipresent, an omniscient, an omnipotent and an infinite God!

It is thus, that rising upon the wing of contemplation, we seize the harp divine, and with the Psalmist raise the enraptured lay:

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament showeth his handy work.
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge.
There is no speech nor language,
Where their voice is not heard.
Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world."

* "Thy word is TRUTH."—John, xvii. 17.
"The word of the TRUTH of the GOSPEL."
Col. i. 5.

And cannot this Supreme and Eternal Being, the source of all life and existence, reveal himself, his character, purposes and designs, to man whom he has created?—Does He not possess in infinite perfection, all those faculties with which he has so richly endowed *him* whom He has created in His own likeness?—He who formed the eye of man, who so wisely constructed it for the purposes of sight, can He not *see*? Is there a single thing hid from His all-seeing eye, or is there a single motion which can escape His all-searching glance? He who formed the ear of man, who so wisely contrived it for the reception of sound, can He not *hear*? Can a single sound escape His all-hearing ear? He who created the human heart and the human head, can He not *perceive* and *understand*? Is there a single thought, emotion, desire or intention, which can be hid from His omniscience? He who made the organs of speech for man, and who so admirably constructed them for making sound the vehicle of communication from mind to mind, can He not *speak*?

And He *has* spoken to man. "GOD," says the apostle, "who at sundry times and in divers manners *spake* in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days *spoken* unto us by his SON." He was declared to be the Son of God by the *voice* of the Eternal himself, uttered from heaven. First, at his baptism in the Jordan, that sacred stream which divided the wilderness where the Israelites performed their pilgrimage of forty years under the guidance of their mediator Moses, from Canaan, the promised land of rest; the type of the dark stream of Death, which separates the wilderness of this world, the scene of the Christian's pilgrimage, from the heavenly Canaan of eternal rest; where, when He was buried beneath its wave and raised above it, emblematical of his future burial and resurrection when he should himself cross the Jordan of death; "lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." And again, at his transfiguration on the holy mountain, the type of his future exaltation, where in the presence of three of his disciples, he "was transfigured before them: and his face

did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light," emblematical of his future glory when he should sit down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty on high;—where Moses and Elias, the giver and the restorer of the law, appear and converse with him; "behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold, a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." Thus twice was He declared to be the Son of God by the immediate voice of God Himself, without the mediation of human lips or organs of speech.—Nor is this divine attestation all the evidence we have of his being the Messiah and Saviour of the world. He gave ample evidence of the reality of his claims and the divinity of his mission, by performing "such works as none other ever did."

At His command, the transparent and insipid water was changed into the coloured and spirit-imbued wine; at His command, the eyes of the blind were opened, and saw Him whom angels and prophets and patriarchs had desired to look upon; at His command, the ears of the deaf were unstopped, and heard the voice of Him who spake as "never man spake;" at His command, the sick were healed, and the lame were made whole; at His command, the raging tempest was hushed into a calm, and the rolling waves of the sea sank into smoothness and repose; and at His command the dead arose from the grave and sprang into life and being!

But notwithstanding these supernatural and astonishing proofs of the divinity of his character as the Son of God and these attestations of his mission as the Messiah and Saviour of the world, his claims were denied by the people among whom he appeared, and he himself rejected as an impostor and treated as a malefactor! "He came to his own, and his own received him not." The same prophet,* who has portrayed in such glowing colours and sang in strains so beautiful and sublime, the coming reign and triumphs of the Messiah and the glories of his kingdom, has described in language equally as strong and vivid, his rejection, his humiliation, his sufferings and his death. The Jews were expecting a Messiah, but

* Isaiah.

not such as the Saviour claimed and proved himself to be. In all their anticipations such a character never entered their conceptions. Long accustomed to a temporal Kingdom and Government founded upon divine authority, and long familiar with corresponding institutions and laws of Divine appointment, and habituated to look forward to the promised Kingdom of Heaven, through the medium of prophetic descriptions and illustrations, drawn from nature, society and civil and military affairs, their idea of it never rose higher than that of splendid and universal earthly dominion and power. As the promise had been made by the Lord to Abraham, that through his seed ("which is Christ") all the nations of the earth should be blessed, and as God had "sworn to David with an oath" that of his posterity, "the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;" the Jews expected their Messiah to take his seat upon the throne of Israel as David had done, to redeem them from under the Roman yoke, and to subjugate all nations and bring them under their sway. And hence we hear them telling him, when he once predicted his death before them, "we have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever;" and we hear his most prominent disciple* rebuking him when he had again, on another occasion, foretold that he should die. But He came not to establish a temporal Kingdom and to place it under an earthly Government; He came not to sit upon the throne of universal Monarchy, to wear the crown of universal Empire, and to wield the sceptre of universal Dominion; He came not to make his conquests by the sword and to extend his dominions by the force and power of arms. When unjustly accused by his own nation of attempting to make himself a King in opposition to Cæsar, and to establish a government of his own in opposition to the Roman, and arraigned upon the charge before Pilate, the Roman governor; in the language of the apostle, he "witnessed a good confession." In reply to the interrogation of Pilate; "what hast thou done? Jesus answered, 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 from hence, [not hence.] Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king, [thou sayest true; for I am a king.] To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the TRUTH. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Had His kingdom been of this world, then would his adherents have fought for him, as did the Jews under Moses; but as it was emphatically and really the "Kingdom or Reign of HEAVEN," TRUTH—the WORD of God—the SWORD of the SPIRIT—was the mighty and the only lawful weapon to be employed in its erection, extension and perpetuation. The Son of God came to establish a SPIRITUAL Kingdom; to enthrone Himself in the human mind and heart; to reign over and control the intellect and the affections; and thus by subduing and conquering the evil desires, passions and lusts of men, to subjugate to himself the outward world and bring it under the genial and blissful dominion of his pure, mild and salutiferous Government.

He combined in Himself a union of the Divine and human natures, mingling and harmonizing their attributes and perfections, as the different colours of the rainbow, constituting the only perfect and sinless character in human form, that ever walked the earth or sojourned among its human inhabitants. And we find all his teachings, actions, conduct, to be in accordance with such a character, and fitted to make him what in reality he is; a pattern and example to prepare us for the everlasting felicity and enjoyments of Heaven.

Though "all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things and by him all things consist," and "all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made," and "upholding all things by the word of his power," yet "He took not on him the nature of angels; but He took on him the seed of Abraham," and became so poor that he "had not where to lay his head." "Though he was rich," says Paul to the Corinthians "yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich;" not in the riches and possessions of the world,

* Peter.

but "rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." Though at his bidding legions of angels would have come to his assistance, and the armies of heaven have been marshalled in his defence; yet agreeable to prophetic annunciation, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgement was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth?"

He laid down his own life; for he "had power to lay it down and power to take it up." In submission to the will of Heaven, he suffered himself to be put to the most cruel and ignominious of all deaths—the death of the Roman cross. But the tomb could not hold him, and was not to be his prison house forever. He arose in triumph from the grave; and achieved a victory before which the most splendid human conquests fade away into insignificance and nothing! Where are now the victories of Alexander, of Cæsar, of Buonaparte?—Where are *they*? Dead—dead—dead, repeats the voice of history! They and their conquests live and will live will time endures, but upon its silent pages alone. They conquered their millions and triumphed over nations, but they were in their turn vanquished by that mighty and universal conqueror—DEATH; and had to resign their sceptres to his merciless grasp. But Jesus *conquered* Death; He vanquished him who had conquered *them*, and not only them, but all the human race; and the victory which he has obtained infinitely surpasses all human triumphs. He not only came off victorious over Death in Himself—He "abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." In his own resurrection he has given us a pledge of ours, which he will accomplish, and which he has shewn himself adequate to effect. He has extracted the sting of Death, and opened up a bright vista into the future world, and will give the victory to all his faithful and obedient followers. It was this glorious anticipation, which caused his disciple, who filled with expectations of earthly glory and emolument rebuked him for foretelling his own death, to break forth into the rapturous ex-

clamation: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a *lively* hope," not a hope of earthly dominion and reward such as he once entertained and which *died* with Jesus and was buried with him in his grave, "to an inheritance," not of earthly possessions which perish and fade away, "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved," not on earth, but "in heaven, for you, who are kept by the *power* of God *through faith* unto salvation ready to be revealed in the *last time*."

Jesus became a King—but not an earthly monarch. He took his seat upon a throne—but not the throne of Judea, as the Jews were fondly and vainly expecting. That was one of the thrones of the *world*, and too small and narrow for the exercise of his universal benevolence and philanthropy and the dominion of his wise and beneficent government. He took his seat upon a higher throne—but not the throne of imperial Rome. Large and august as that was, it was still but one of the thrones of the world, and too low and contracted for his mighty plan and purposes. He took his seat still higher. He took it upon the "glorious throne" of the Universe! And though eighteen hundred years have passed away since his grand exaltation, He still *LIVES* and He still *REIGNS*. "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet;" until "he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power;" until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—"God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: 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."

Such was and such is the Author and Founder of Christianity. None but such an Author is capable of originating such a system as the Christian. None but one perfectly acquainted with the human constitution and all the intellectual, moral and animal faculties of man, can make a sys-

tem of religion to suit man, and adapted to him in every stage of existence from his infancy to his tomb; and none but He by whom he was created is perfectly acquainted with his constitution and his animal, moral and intellectual endowments. "He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man for he knew what was in man." Man is as incapable of originating a system of religion to suit himself as he is to create himself. The stream can never rise higher than the fountain from which it flows. It required Him by whom man was created to redeem and save him from the dominion of sin in this life and its consequences in death. And hence we find the work and office of redemption and creation, in reference to the Saviour, sometimes connected together in the scriptures. God, says Paul in his letter to the Hebrews, "hath in these last days [of the Mosaic dispensation] spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of **ALL things**, BY WHOM also he MADE THE WORLDS; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and *upholding ALL things* by the word of his power, when he had BY HIMSELF PURGED OUR SINS, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high." And again in his epistle to the Colossians; "Who HATH DELIVERED US from the power of darkness, and HATH TRANSLATED US into the kingdom of his dear son; IN WHOM we have REDEMPTION THROUGH HIS BLOOD, even the FORGIVENESS OF SINS; Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: FOR BY HIM were ALL things CREATED, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him: And he is before all things and *by him ALL things* CONSIST; And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the *pre-eminence*." As He is the head of the *first* creation by virtue of having created all things of which it consists, so is He the head of the second or new creation by virtue of redeeming or new-creating those of which that is composed; having in all things the pre-eminence. As He had sufficient power to create the world

at first and preserve it ever since; He is as able now to raise man from the grave into existence as He was to call him into being at first; and to restore to him life as He was to breathe it into him.

The reader who would understand well the divine character of the Saviour and become acquainted with those miraculous and stupendous works performed by Him, and that beautiful harmonious and divine system of religion of which He is the author, and which is worthy of the admiration of every rank of created intelligences in the Universe and infinitely above any plan or scheme which they are capable of conceiving or originating,—must go to the New Testament, or Living Oracles themselves, & study them thoroughly for himself, in the best translation, or translations, to which he can gain access. We invite him to no commentaries upon them, or systems made out from them, but to them, and them alone, to obtain this knowledge which can make him "wise unto salvation." Let him turn his eyes from the dark and conflicting systems with which we every where meet, and direct them to these Oracles of Heaven, where Christianity breathes in all its vigour and freshness and beams in all its brightness.

We have already extended this essay beyond the limits we intended. We design resuming the subject of it again in our next, or a future number or nos., when we shall consider the "Divine Origin of Christianity" in reference to the Character and Office of the Apostles and the establishment or Setting up of the Messiah's Kingdom, in all which we shall aim at more brevity than in this. We shall also endeavor to be less declamatory than we have been here. It is difficult to avoid declamation when expatiating upon the sublime topics connected with the existence of God and the mission of his Son.

EDITOR.

NECESSITY OF THE MEDIUM OF REVELATION.

WE are indebted to God himself, for all the information which we possess in relation to either his nature or his operation. He furnishes the medium through which he is seen in the visible creation, in the arguments,

of providence, in the scheme of redemption; and all that we are able to comprehend of "life and immortality," is "brought to light by the gospel." The human mind requires a medium through which it may discern God, as the eye requires a medium through which it may see. As that medium to the eye is light, so is the medium of the spirit, illumination. It is in vain that creation subsists around me, except I have an organ of vision. To the blind man it is annihilated. The works of God exist, but not to him: he is insensible of their beauties, he never was permitted to admire their symmetry. And it is in vain that we possess an organ of vision, unless some *medium* be furnished through which it may operate. I ascend the mountain at midnight, and look from its summit.—The landscape around me is the same as at mid-day, and the organ of vision is the same; but light, the medium through which the eye sees; is wanting; and I look for the river, for the meadow, for the mansion, for the hill, for all the beauties of the scenery in vain—I am presented with "a universal blank."—It is in vain that, as an intelligent creature: I am surrounded by the works of God, and am furnished with reasoning powers, with a capacity formed to contemplate, to examine and to admire them, unless I am furnished also with some medium through which they may be seen. Revelation is that medium.—Were the eye of reason quenched in the spirit, the mind would be in that state of incapacity to discern the invisible God, as is the man born blind to examine his works. And, were the light of revelation extinguished, although the man were in full possession of his intellectual powers, he would resemble the person on the summit of the mountain at midnight, in vain attempting to explore the landscape; he would possess the *organ*, but be destitute of the *medium*; he would have the eye, but but not the *light*. And, for this reason, the apostle represents the heathens, as "feeling after, if haply they might find God, although he was not far from every one of them:"^s men involved in perfect darkness, although possessing the organ of vision, are compelled to *feel* for the object of their pursuit

even when that object is at their side, or before their face.

It will readily be acknowledged, that through the medium of revelation alone, we can form any conception of things which are "not as yet." We can know nothing, we can anticipate nothing of futurity, but as revealed religion removes the curtain, and unveils a portion of invisible objects. But we will venture to assert, that the invisible creation itself is not beheld to perfection but through the medium of revelation. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork:" but the man who has never received this divine medium, discerns not that glory. "Day unto day uttereth speech, night unto night showeth knowledge:" "There is no speech nor language, where the voice is not heard,"—but he understands not their testimony. For this reason many beheld their beauties, and have heard their voice, who have not acknowledged the existence of God; and, from these alone, none have understood his perfections. And, if revelation be necessary to the development of creation, how much more is it necessary to unfold the mysteries of providence!—*Collyer's Lectures.*

THE BIBLE.

"The scripture of the *Old and New Testament*," says John Wesley, "is a most solid and precious system of *divine truth*.—*Every part* thereof is worthy of GOD; and *all together* are one *entire* body, wherein there is no defect, no excess. It is the *FOUNTAIN* of *heavenly wisdom* which they who are able to taste, prefer to all writings of *men*, however wise, or learned, or holy." However much or widely we may differ with this renowned Father of Methodism, in other parts of his writings, we can subscribe to the sentiments contained in the above with all our heart. Were they universally held and acted upon, all speculation in religion would soon cease; and the Bible take its place in the mind where it ought, above every other book or writing, whether confession of faith, discipline, or body of divinity.

The Bible, like its Divine Author in re-

gard to other beings, stands alone with respect to all other books. None can share with it in its origin. It is the only original and perfect transcript of the Mind of God, partaking of His truth and holiness, wisdom and power, without any admixture of the opposites. It is independent of all other books for the knowledge that it contains and the information which it imparts. This is the production of the Divine Mind, while all others are the productions of the human mind; and like the sources from which they emanate, are indebted to others for much or all of what they contain; and partake more or less of the errors, imperfections and imbecilities of their authors. This should admonish us, that we cannot be too cautious how we receive what they say, and not to repose implicit trust and confidence in their representations on religion, a subject of all others the most important to man, as it involves his eternal all and destiny, and a mistake in it is of all others the most dangerous and fatal, as it is irremediable if not discovered and rectified before the termination of his present existence.

Every book is indebted to the Bible for all the true and correct knowledge which it contains on that subject. How much better then to go at once to this pure fountain of Heavenly knowledge and wisdom, to quench the thirst of the diseased, feverish and panting mind, by inhaling its healing and invigorating draughts, than to stoop to drink at those turbid streams of theology, where its waters have become dark, thick and putrid, by being mingled with human inventions, traditions and mysticism! None but those who themselves go to this fountain and partake, can enjoy good spiritual health. "If any man thirst," says the divine Author of Christianity, "let him come unto ME and DRINK." "This spake he," continues the apostle, "of the SPIRIT, which they that believe on him should receive." Where shall we go to find this fountain, to which all are invited? Shall we go to any human theory or system? As this Author has invited us to HIM, let us hear what HE says. "The words that I speak unto you," says he, "they are spirit and they are life." And where are we to find His words but in His book? We know then where to go, to learn how to obtain spiritual and eternal life. It is here that

the Holy Spirit, clothed with the language of inspiration, is inviting us to come. "The Holy Spirit SAETH, To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

The claims of the Bible to a divine origin have been fully attested. Its claims too upon all the human race have been as amply demonstrated. "If we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater." When we have once admitted it to be a revelation from God to all mankind, we are bound to receive unreservedly what it says, when suffered to speak to us through a faithful and correct translation, and to repose entire trust and confidence in all its representations. To distrust what the Bible says is to distrust what God says, because He is its Author; and is moreover offering an insult to his veracity. If we say that we believe the Bible, and do not receive what it says without reservation, we are guilty of falsehood, in asserting that we believe all it tells us, while, at the same time, we reject a part. And are we not also guilty in some degree of infidelity?—For what is infidelity but unbelief? And as he who offended in one point of the law was guilty of all, may not he who disbelieves one part of the Bible, be as much and in the same sense guilty of all? And would he not in one case be as much an infidel, as he would in the other a sinner? Not only is the testimony of God greater than that of man, but, he that believeth not God hath made him a LIAR; because he believeth not the record God gave of his Son."

That "the Scriptures are the only sufficient rule of faith and practice," is, we believe, admitted by all who profess the religion of the Bible. This admission should at once settle down upon us the obligation of their authority, to the exclusion of all other. To this rule then we are bound by our admission to bring every human opinion and system of divinity, and test them by it, and cast all their inconsistencies away from us. This would bring us at once upon the Bible, to the exclusion of all human opinions and systems. But is this always done? Is not the case reversed, and the Bible brought to the rule of human opinion, bent to suit it, and made to bow before it? Are not the scriptures rejected in part, or wrested to suit a theological system? Must

not this be case in regard to every erroneous system, and consequently every system but the one contained in the Bible? Thus it is that the wisdom of man is exalted above that of God, and the Creator made to bow before the created! Every theological system, let it assume what form it may, whether creed, confession of faith, discipline, articles of faith, or body of divinity, must, unless it embrace all the contents of the Bible, and neither more or less, and in the connexion exhibited there; reject or wrest a part, or, what is equally as culpable and condemnable, add to it. By thus *not embracing all*, they do in reality say, that they have no use for that which they do not contain; and by thus containing *what is not there*, say that the Bible is not sufficient. As in the one case, by rejecting their inconsistencies we would be brought to this Book, so in the other, by rejecting *them* we would have nothing but the Book left. The Bible permits no other book, principle, or system, to share with it in authority. As it has no equal it will bear no rival.

We commenced this essay with an extract from John Wesley, and we shall close it with another from him equally as good. The sentiments in the first, if universally received and acted upon, would result in the consequences which seem to be so earnestly desired in this last. "Would to God," says he, "that all the *party NAMES, unscriptural PHRASES and FORMS, which HAVE DIVIDED* the Christian world, *were FORGOT*: And that we might *ALL agree* to sit down *together*, as *humble loving DISCIPLES*, at the feet of our *common Master*, to hear *his word*, to imbibe *his SPIRIT*, and to transcribe *his LIFE* in *our OWN*."

EDITOR.

Confirmation and reception of the Word.

No *testimony*—no faith, is a maxim equally as important as it is true. If "*without FAITH* it is *impossible* to please God," then faith is an essential principle in all real religion, without which there can be no acceptable worship or obedience. Faith cannot exist without testimony. Without testimony we can no more believe, than we can see without light or hear without sound.

No *facts*—no testimony, is another maxim equally as true and important. Facts, testimony and faith are then three co-essential items in all true religion.

Facts are essential to the existence of all revealed religion, and constitute the basis upon which it rests. Without something spoken or acted there can be no facts; for the term fact implies something said or done. The words and works, the sayings and doings of man, are the facts of which he is the author. As man was formed in the image, or "made after the similitude of God," there is an analogy in this respect between them. The words and works, or the sayings and doings of God, constitute the facts of which He is the Author. In becoming acquainted with these we become acquainted with Him; and our acquaintance with him must always be in proportion to our acquaintance with these. In the Bible we have recorded the words and works of God, which constitute the facts, a belief of which are essential to the existence of faith. Without this Book, or what it contains, there can be no more faith in religion, than there can be without the facts upon which its revelations are founded. There is a difference as well as distinction between fact and *truth*. "All facts are truths, but all truths are not facts." That Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is a truth but not a fact; that he arose from the dead is both a fact and a truth. Had he never *performed* a single miracle, or been the Author of a single supernatural fact, He would have been God's Son as much as ever. His words and works demonstrated this truth to men, and are true because *real*, and thus both facts and truths. That Paul was the Apostle to the Gentiles, is a truth but not a fact; that he preached Christ to them and wrote his Epistles are both facts and truths. Truth has been well defined by one to be "*THAT WHICH IS*," and more laconically by another to be "*REALITY*."

Facts, knowledge, testimony, faith, constitute the order of belief, which is as universal as it is unchangeable. There must be something *said* or *done* before there can be facts; there must be *facts* before there can be any knowledge of them; there must be a *knowledge* of them before there can be any testimony; and the *testimony*

must be reported before it can be believed, or before faith can be produced. The effect is the same whether the testimony be oral or written, spoken or recorded. Testimony must be conveyed or reported in language; all language consists of words, which, clothed in *sounds* are addressed by the *speaker* to the *ear*, or, in *letters*, the representatives of sounds, are by the *writer* addressed to the *eye*. The mind is equally as much informed and convinced, whether through the ear or through the eye. The word of God being the record of what He has *said* and *done* for the redemption of man, and which make out these facts of which he is the Author, Paul could say with perfect propriety, that "Faith comes by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God."

If faith is what we have shown it to be, and comes as we have proven, then there can be no difference in its *nature*, or the *manner* of believing any thing. All faith is in this respect the *same*; the difference is in the *objects* and not in the *kind*.

Faith was bewildered much by men who meant To make it clear, so simple in itself,
A thought so rudimental and so plain,
That none by comment could it plainer make.
All faith was one. In object, not in kind,
The difference lay. The faith that saved a soul,
And that which in the common truth believed,
In essence, were the same. Hear, then,
what faith,
True Christian faith, which brought salvation, was:
Belief in all that God revealed to men,
Observe, in all that God revealed to men,
In all he promised, threatened, commanded,
said,
Without exception, and without a doubt.
POLLOK'S *Course of Time*.

A better definition of true, Christian, "saving" faith, could not have been given, than this one by the Scotch poet. The last line contains the sentiments expressed in a part of our Essay on "the Bible" in this No. but which were penned by us without remembering or noticing it. In the estimation of Pollok, true Christian faith, by which SALVATION comes, is to believe and observe ALL the revelations of God in all his promises, threatenings and commandments, "without EXCEPTION, and without a DOUBT." According to him a faith

which falls short of this is not a "saving" faith. If any of his Presbyterian brethren, or any of our "Reverends" or "Doctors of Divinity," can give a better definition than this, we will be thankful to any one who will show it to us. There is no difference then, as we have observed, in the nature of or "kind" of faith, or in the manner of believing any thing, whether human or divine; nor can there ever be while we possess all the faculties and endowments of mind and body which we now have. Nothing short of the creation of a new faculty can produce a change in the *manner* of believing. I believe upon the testimony of the French writers that Napoleon Buonaparte was Emperor of France and commanded the French army at the battle of Waterloo; and I believe upon the testimony of inspired Prophets and Apostles that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and arose from the dead. Now it must be evident to every individual of common sense, discernment, or observation, that the *nature* of my faith, or *manner of believing*, is in both cases the very same; and that the very same faculties are in both cases employed or put into action. But the *effects* upon me are by no means the same. They are just as different as the objects and facts; as between Buonaparte and Christ, the battle of Waterloo and the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The first will perhaps produce no effects, or have no influence, on my feelings, actions or conduct; the second will influence or govern all my feelings, actions and conduct, and inspire me with a hope as different from any the other could give, as light is from darkness or heaven from hell. But we drop this part of our subject here to resume it farther on.

The order of faith we have shown to be the same; but that we may be better understood we will illustrate it. B's mother writes to him and informs him that his father is dead. Relying upon the testimony of his mother as a credible witness, he believes it and is filled with sorrow. His mother saw his father die and was a witness of the *fact*; upon this *knowledge* of it she writes or sends her *testimony* to her son; and upon this testimony is founded his *faith* in it, or he believes it and is grieved. Here the order is, death or *fact*, *knowledge*, *testimony*, *faith* and grief. Reverse

it, and it is grief from *faith, testimony, knowledge, fact*, from death.

There is a difference also between *faith* and *knowledge*, as well as between fact and truth, which is not generally apprehended or attended to. That I am sitting by my table with this pen in my hand with which I am now writing, I do not *believe*, for I *know* it; but that C. was sitting by this table yesterday morning and writing with this pen in his hand, I *believe*, for he told me so and is a man of veracity. I do not *know* it because I did not *see* it. We *know* what we *see* or *witness* ourselves; we *believe* what is *reported* to us by others.

There is a difference too between *faith* and *opinion* as little apprehended and understood as either of the above, but more deserving of notice or attention, as a want of distinction sometimes involves matters of great moment and leads to consequences the most important. Faith, as we have already shown, is always dependent on *testimony* for its existence; opinion is founded upon, and deduced from, *inference*. I *believe* that the blood of Christ was shed when the soldier run the spear into his side, but I am not of *opinion* that it was; I am of *opinion* that it was also shed when his hands and feet were nailed to the cross, but I do not *believe* that it was. The apostle John saw the blood flow when his side was pierced by the spear, and was a witness of the *fact*; upon this *knowledge* he wrote his gospel or testimony, in which he says, "And he that *saw* it bear *record*, and his record is true; and he *knoweth* that he *saith* true, that ye might *believe*;" and upon this *testimony*, or *record*, I *believe* the fact, or have *faith* in it. There was a *resemblance* between our Saviour's body and those of all other men, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of *flesh* and *blood*, he also himself likewise took part of the *same*"—"and was made in the *likeness* of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto *death*, even the death of the *cross*;" from the *circumstance* of blood flowing from any part of the human body when pierced or cut, is drawn the *inference* of the bleeding of our Lord's hands and feet; and upon this inference is founded my *opinion*. To say that I *believed* it, would be an abuse of the term; for I have not the

testimony of a single Apostle or Evangelist to assure me of the *fact* and thus make it credible to me, so that I may be enabled to believe it. In opinion, we reason from resemblance to circumstance—from circumstance to inference—and from inference to opinion. We rise from opinion to inference—from inference to circumstance—and from circumstance to resemblance. In the first, the order is, *resemblance, circumstance, inference, opinion*; in the second, *opinion, inference, circumstance, resemblance*. That we may exhibit and contrast faith and opinion together, we will repeat the order of belief. In belief we reason from facts to knowledge—from knowledge to testimony—and from testimony to faith. We rise from faith to testimony—from testimony to knowledge—and from knowledge to facts. In the first the order is, *facts, knowledge, testimony, faith*; in the second, *faith, testimony, knowledge, facts*. The items in both belief and opinion are *four*. We have been thus particular here and guilty of repetition, because the distinction is one of importance, as we expect to show in the future Nos. of our paper.

Without law there can be no obedience, without testimony, no faith. Faith can no more transcend the testimony to be believed, than obedience can the law to be obeyed. The Messiah when he had taken his seat on the throne of the Universe, gave *laws* for the establishment and government of his Kingdom, in the form of *commands*, which constitute the divine code of the New Testament. He who submits to these laws, or in other words, *obeys* these commands, in the order laid down there, becomes a citizen of his Kingdom, and remains a loyal or good one, as long as he renders all the obedience required of him. He who does not obey, cannot either become a citizen or live a good one. To obey any of the laws or ordinances in religion instituted by men, is not to obey Jesus Christ; as obedience in the Christian religion cannot transcend the laws of Christ, and we are to obey him, and Him *alone*. Such an individual lives in a state of *rebellion* to the Messiah, as long as he submits to these institutions of men, in preference to those of the Lord. It is thus in respect to faith or belief. To believe any thing

else in religion but the truths and facts recorded in the Bible, is to believe the opinions and whims of men, and not God. And the "believer" of this character is, in his faith, under human and not divine influence.

The effects of faith as we have seen, do not flow from its nature, or the manner of believing, but from the nature of the *facts* believed. A belief in the facts recorded in the New Testament is, from the nature of these facts, calculated to have an influence over man, or to have effects upon him, which no other facts in the Universe are capable of producing, as we see exhibited in the lives of thousands, and have recorded on the pages of history. Ordinary or common facts, which we are in the habit of witnessing ourselves or hearing of from others, require but common or ordinary testimony to make us believe them. That the Ohio river was frozen over last winter at Cincinnati would require but good human testimony to convince me of, or render worthy of my credence, because such a fact would take place in accordance with a law of nature with which I am familiar; but it would require the strongest kind of human testimony, or testimony the best authenticated and confirmed, to convince an inhabitant of the torrid zone, who had been born and raised there and whose year is one unbroken summer. That a certain individual died at the age of 50, is a fact which requires but common or ordinary human testimony to render credible to me; but that another individual died aged 150 years, is another fact that would require the strongest or best confirmed human testimony.

As there are three different classes of facts, or facts differing in three peculiarities, ordinary, extraordinary and supernatural, so there are three different classes of testimony, or testimony distinguished by three different qualities or properties; ordinary, extraordinary and supernatural testimony. Ordinary or usual facts, such as the freezing over of a river in the winter or the death of a person at the ordinary term of human life, are facts which take place in accordance with laws of nature with which we are acquainted, and require only ordinary or common human testimony to support or establish them; extraordinary

or unusual facts, such as the death of an individual at an unusual age, require extraordinary testimony, or testimony strongly confirmed and corroborated, to cause us to believe them; *supernatural* facts demand supernatural testimony, or testimony supernaturally confirmed, to make them credible to us, or *enable* us to believe them. Ordinary and extraordinary facts, as distinguished and described above, occur in *agreement* with the laws and course of nature; but supernatural facts always imply a violation or suspension of those laws and interruption of that course. All real miracles which have ever been performed are of this character. All miracles are supernatural facts, and all supernatural facts are miracles. The changing of water into wine by our Saviour at the marriage in Cana of Galilee; the opening of the eyes of the man born blind, anointed with clay and washed in the pool of Siloam; the unstopping of the ears of the deaf man at the coast of Decapolis on the sea of Galilee; the sudden stillness of the winds and waves at His bidding; and the raising the dead Lazarus of Bethany into life and being; were all violations or suspensions of the laws, and interruptions of the course, of nature. A belief in the astounding and supernatural facts of the gospel recorded in the New Testament, such as the conception, resurrection and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ, facts so contrary and opposed to all human experience, demands testimony of the very strongest character, testimony confirmed by *similar* facts, and consequently *supernatural*. The immediate voice of God declaring Jesus Christ to be his Son and the Saviour's resurrection from the grave, not only required the testimony of those who heard this voice and saw our Lord after he arose, to convince those who did not hear and see themselves, and to whom the testimony was *spoken* or *orally* communicated, but also like or *supernatural* facts performed before them; and to those who did not see or have not seen these *witnesses*, the *record* of these facts, or *their* testimony communicated in *writing*, and themselves of the most unquestionable character in regard to capacity, honesty, impartiality, &c. to confirm it to them or make it credible and thus enable them to believe it. An

important inquiry suggests itself to us here, and which we will mention. How did the idea or notion of miracles ever get into the world, seeing that they are so entirely contrary and opposed to the laws and course of nature as far as known to man, if no *miracle* had ever been performed? If not real they must have been false; and there can be nothing *false* without the pre-existence of something *true* or *real*. Without the existence of truth or reality, we never would have known what falsehood was; as without *genuine* coin or notes we never would have had *counterfeit*.

We now come to the concluding part of this essay, and that which most deserves attention; the scriptural illustrations or the confirmation and reception of the word or testimony. In order to understand properly this, as well as other subjects connected with the Christian religion, and to apprehend the full import of all the terms and phrases employed in them, we must attend well to that record which has been left us by the holy Apostles, the Ambassadors of Heaven and plenipotentiary Ministers of the New Testament. We have been thus particular, repetitious and prolix, in what we have said, that the mind of the reader might be well prepared to appreciate fully what we farther have to offer.

The phrase, "reception of the word," is but another expression for the belief of confirmed testimony; and "to receive the word" of the Lord is, in the import of scripture, to believe that word, confirmed, or rendered credible, by supernatural facts. In the New Testament the faith of persons is sometimes mentioned before their baptism and sometimes afterwards; before, when the writer attends strictly to the *order* of the Gospel, and after, in reference to the *effects* of faith, in obedience and change of state. When Philip went down from Jerusalem to Samaria, after Pentecost, and "preached Christ unto them," Luke, the historian of the Acts of Apostles, informs us, that "when they *believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they *were baptized*, both men and women;" and speaking of the reception of the gospel among the Corinthians when preached by Paul, he tells us, that "many of the Corinthians hearing, *believed*, and

were baptized." In both these instances, faith is placed or named before baptism, in the scriptural or gospel order. But speaking of the effects, or "obedience of faith," as in the case of the Jailor and his family, Luke, after mentioning that Paul and Silas "*spoke* unto him the word of the Lord, and to *ALL* that were in his house," says, that he "*was baptized*, he and all his straightway,"—"and rejoiced, *believing* in God with all his house." We also frequently find the term "believed" used in reference to the change in the state of persons, effected by the "obedience of faith" in baptism, when they were inducted from the alien into the Christian state. Luke, speaking of the discourse of Peter on Pentecost to the Jews, after mentioning that "they that gladly received his word were baptized," says in reference to them; "all that *believed* were together, and had all things common;" and again, after recording the conversion of five thousand by another discourse from Peter; "the multitude of them that *believed* were of one heart and of one soul." Paul tells the Corinthian Christians to whom he addressed his two Epistles, that he declared to them the gospel which he had preached unto them, and "by which ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I have preached unto you: unless ye *have believed* in vain;" and the Ephesian Christians; "in whom [Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also *after* that ye *believed* ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise;" and in his epistle to Titus he tells him,—"these things [of which he had been speaking] I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which *have believed* in God might be careful to maintain good works." None are spoken of or addressed as *believers*, in the *New Testament*, after Pentecost, in reference to the Christian Institution, but the *baptized* or immersed; as "*faith only*" or alone, is nowhere there counted for righteousness,—nothing short of the "*obedience of faith*." Both these assertions are made by us with a full knowledge of what is maintained by others on the contrary; and we are prepared when called upon or they are opposed, to sustain them by *scriptural* proofs and evidences, more numerous, stronger, and more to the point,

than any that can be brought up against them.

The phrase "received the word" is generally used in the New Testament in reference to the gospel; and when connected with baptism, in the same manner that the term "believed" is, as they are synonymous in their signification. Luke, narrating the effects of Peter's discourse on Pentecost, observes that, "they that gladly *received his word* were baptized." Here he places the "receiving the word" before "baptism," in the order of the Christian Institution, as he and the Apostles elsewhere "belief" or faith, as we have just illustrated. But in recording the conversion of the Samaritans, after mentioning that they who believed "*were baptized*, both men and women," he remarks: "Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had *received the word of God*, they sent unto them Peter and John." And after relating the conversion of Cornelius and his house, where he tells us that Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord," he directly observes: "And the Apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also *received the word of God*." It is in reference to thus "receiving the word," that Paul in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians addresses them as follows: "And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, *having received the word* in much affliction, and joy of the Holy Spirit;" and in another part of the same epistle;—"when ye *received the word of God* which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, THE WORD OF GOD, which effectually *worketh* also in you that BELIEVE."

The "confirmation of the testimony" is the "confirmation of the word," as the word is but another term for the testimony, which by that word is made known in order to be believed and obeyed, or "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Without this confirmation by supernatural or miraculous facts, for which we have been contending, the word of God could never have been received as such, and the testimony of the Apostles never accredited or believed. Without performing miracles the Apostles might have proclaimed during their lives without ef-

fecting a single thing. They would have been continually met by objections which they could not answer, arguments which they could not refute, and difficulties which they could not surmount. Professing to be the ambassadors of Heaven and ministers of a divine covenant, and to be witnesses of miraculous facts, and fraught with communications from God they would have been constantly called upon to exhibit supernatural proofs of their mission and miraculous evidences of their testimony. Without these their words would have been as powerless as the babblings of an idiot or a lunatic; with them—"the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Such then was the importance and necessity of these miraculous gifts and supernatural facts, that the Lord in giving the commission to his disciples gave the promise of them along with it. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs [miraculous] 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." The same writer who has recorded this, immediately adds: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth and *preached* every where, the Lord *working* with them, and CONFIRMING THE WORD with signs following." In the epistle to Hebrews we find Paul asserting the same, only in somewhat different language. "Therefore we should give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if THE WORD spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation! which at first began to be SPOKEN by the Lord, and WAS CONFIRMED unto us by them that heard him;

God also *bearing them* witness both with *signs and wonders*, and *divers miracles*, and *gifts* of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will." In both these quotations from Mark & Paul, we find the term "confirmed" used in the very sense and for the very purpose for which we have been contending, and the gifts, miracles and supernatural facts introduced in proof and illustration. Paul is still more explicit and particular, if any thing, in his first letter to the Corinthians, than he is here, to the Hebrews. After thanking God on their behalf for His grace or favor which had been bestowed on them by Jesus Christ, he reminds them; "that in every thing ye are enriched by him, in *all utterance*, and *all knowledge*; even as the TESTIMONY of Christ WAS CONFIRMED in [or among] you: so that ye come behind in *no gift*." "To one is *given* by the Spirit the *word of wisdom*; to another, the *word of knowledge*, by the same Spirit; to another, *faith*, by the same Spirit; to another, the *working of miracles*; to another, *prophecy*; to another, *discerning of spirits*; to another, *divers kinds of tongues*; to another, *interpretation of tongues*: but all these, worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." We have here enumerated, all these different gifts bestowed for the confirmation of the testimony or word of God. Paul is referring to these works or gifts of the Holy Spirit, when, in this same epistle he affirms, that his preaching was "in *demonstration of the Spirit* and of power." These are properly & emphatically the *demonstrations* of the Holy Spirit.

It was these gifts and the works or facts for the performance of which they were given, that rendered the word of God so powerful and efficient under the ministry of the apostles, in the conviction and conversion of the thousands and multitudes, mentioned in the Acts of Apostles. It was by these that the testimony of Peter was confirmed on the day of Pentecost. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come," says Luke in Acts, "they [the disciples] were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a *sound* from heaven as of a *rushing mighty wind*, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them

cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to *speak with other tongues* as the Spirit, gave them utterance." The multitude which the report of this had assembled together, convinced by these *miracles* and *gifts* which they both *saw* and *heard*, that Peter and the eleven Apostles who stood up with him were the messengers and ministers of God, believed his testimony, or were "cut to the heart" by his words which they heard, and eagerly inquired what they should do? Peter replies; "Repent, [or reform] and be baptised [or immersed] every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for [or in order to] the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And what was the consequence? They can now believe, or receive, his word, and obey his command. "Then they that *gladly RECEIVED HIS WORD* were baptised: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."

The conversion of the Samaritans is the next most important in the order of time, as our Saviour said to his apostles, during the interval between his resurrection and ascension; "ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in *Samaria*, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." We will hear Luke, the writer of Acts, narrate the principal events attending this. Philip, an evangelist, is the preacher. "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and *preached* Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed unto *those things* which Philip *spoke*, *hearing* and *seeing* the *miracles* which he did. For *unclean spirits*, crying with a loud voice, *came out* of many that were *possessed* with them: and many taken with *palsies*, and that were *lame*, were *healed*." The testimony of Philip being thus confirmed and his mission corroborated by these miracles which he performed, the Samaritans receive and obey the word. "When they *believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women." It is soon added: "Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had *RECEIVED THE WORD* of God, they sent unto them Peter and John."

The circumstances attending the conversion of the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, were similar to those respecting that of the Jews on Pentecost. Peter as he was there, is again the preacher here. During his discourse and while he is speaking, "the Holy Spirit," says the writer of Acts, "fell on all them that HEARD THE WORD. And they of the circumcision, [the Jews,]" continues he, "which believed, were astonished, as many as come with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy spirit. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." And what is the result here? They receive and obey the word, confirmed and rendered credible by the miracles thus wrought. "Then answered Peter, can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. * * * And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also RECEIVED THE WORD of God."

With these *three* cases of the "confirmation and reception of the word," among the Jews first, then the Samaritans, and lastly the Gentiles, we shall close this article.— We have selected these three, as the most important recorded by the historian of the Acts, and where we might expect to find more particularity in the narration of the attendant circumstances and in the use of the terms and phraseology employed by the inspired writers in describing real conversions to Christianity. We have more to add to what we have said here and several cases more to adduce confirmatory of our remarks, but deem it best to defer them for another number.

We think that we have sufficiently shown and proven, that without supernatural confirmations the first converts to the Christian religion could not have received or believed the testimony of the apostles. The miracles in the New Testament are recorded there for the very same purpose for which they were performed. "Many other signs [miracles] truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are written in this book," says John to those for whom he wrote his testimony, "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." Without an acquaintance with these facts, no one "can give an account of the hope that is in him." It is impossible for any one to have faith in Christ, who is not convinced by these miracles there recorded.— He may say that he believes, but it is nothing but a bare assertion without proof; and if he *thinks* so, he is under the influence of a deceptive and dangerous illusion!

EDITOR.

First Principles of the Christian Religion.

EVERY science has its axioms or *first principles*, an acquaintance with, and attention to, which, are actually necessary in order to make any proficiency and advancement in it, and to arrive at that degree of perfection to which it is capable of carrying the student. This will hold equally true with all, from the sublimest and most intricate to the most ordinary and simple. If these principles are not properly and correctly understood and reduced to practice, but little if any proficiency can be made, labour becomes almost or entirely useless, and no perfection can be attained.

He who is ignorant of the first principles of Geography and the meaning of the terms used in those principles, is not prepared to understand the boundaries of countries, their physical features, and their various climates and productions. The student who attempts to study Grammar, without being acquainted with the nature of nouns, verbs, adverbs, &c. and the rules by which they govern and are governed, will never learn to parse or compose a sentence correctly. Without an acquaintance with the nature and power of numbers, and addition, multiplication and subtraction, a knowledge of the higher branches of Arithmetic can never be attained. And as with these primary, so with all other sciences.

These terms and principles have to be constantly used and applied, in every step which is taken, in every variation which is made, from the first to the last link in all science; and have to be well understood, constantly remembered, and habitual-

ly referred to.—In prosecuting the study of any science, or in making a practical application of its principles, if these are correctly understood and properly applied, the same results will flow and the same consequences follow in the case of every individual, wherever placed and however circumstanced. Thus all men will work alike by a given rule; and if the rule always be the same, their results or work, when brought together, though may never have seen, known or heard of each other will harmonize and agree. It was by thus constructing the materials, that the Temple of Solomon was reared into that beautiful splendid and magnificent structure which excited the admiration of every beholder: without the stroke of a hammer. It is by working with different rules, that different and discordant results are produced. The necessity of first principles, and of order and arrangement in their application, grow out of the nature and constitution of things in that vast and complicated Universe in which we are placed, reared and sustained by the hands of an infinitely wise and powerful Architect.

And is Christianity without first principles and terms to express them? While such order and arrangement exist in all His other works, did its divine Author construct and leave it, a chaotic and discordant affair," without form and void," like the Universe at its first creation,—without system, agreement or harmony in its parts? But Christianity has its first principles. "When for the time ye ought to be teachers," says Paul to the Hebrews, "ye have need that one teach you *again* which be the **FIRST PRINCIPLES** of the Oracles of God; and are become such as have need of *milk*, and not *strong meat*. For every one that useth milk is *unskilful* in the word of **RIGHTEOUSNESS**: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, [or perfect] even those who

by reason of use [or habit] have their *senses exercised to discern both good and evil*. Therefore leaving the **PRINCIPLES** of the **DOCTRINE** of **CHRIST**, let us *go on unto perfection*; not laying again the foundation of **REPENTANCE** [reformation] from *dead works*, and **FAITH** toward God, of the **DOCTRINE** of **BAPTISMS**, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." These "first principles" were the "principles of the doctrine of Christ," and this "doctrine" was the "doctrine of baptism," &c. As we have no baptism of the Holy Spirit now, which consisted in the gift of tongues, or miraculous gifts, bestowed through the laying on of hands of the Apostles, we have but one baptism left, the baptism in *water*. Faith, repentance or reformation, and baptism or immersion, are *three* items in the *first principles* of the gospel or "doctrine of Christ," which are necessary to constitute a man a scholar, disciple or learner in the school of Christ; and agree in one as much as the Spirit, the Water and the Blood. Unless these principles are observed and attended to in the order of Heaven, no advancement can be made in the divine science of Christianity. We cannot, "*leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ go on unto perfection.*" We cannot, in religion, *leave principles which we have not observed or put into practice*, any more than we can leave a road which we have never travelled for another way.

When the Ark of the New Covenant, planned by the Founder of Christianity and reared his Apostles under the direction and guidance of the Holy Spirit, was launched forth upon the broad river of time, it was perfectly constructed and completely finished. All its parts exactly fitted, and no where in it could be found a single defect. It has been floating on the same ever since, under the guidance of the same Spirit, sent to be its Pilot to the end of the world, receiving into its capacious bosom the redeemed of all nations, with infinite room for

more; and shall at last land safe in the haven of the heavenly Canaan, with its immense and precious freight, where they shall enjoy eternal deliverance and repose. All thearks which men in their wisdom have constructed in imitation of this divine Ark, and which, with the freight of each sect, continue to float along, can never impair it in the least. Their weather beaten hulls become old and worm-eaten; but this is constructed of materials that can never wear or decay, let the tempests of infidelity and the artillery of all others beat upon it as they may. "THE WORD OF THE LORD lives and abides forever."

The very term *system* implies both terms and principles, without which no system can exist, not even in imagination. The divine science of Christianity has then its terms and first principles, without an understanding and practical application of which, no one can make any progress in that divine life which it requires, and which is the result of its combined influences. But its principles, like those of every other science, must be reduced to *practice*, before its beneficent effects can be *felt* and enjoyed. "Principles *without* practice," beautiful and charming as they may appear in *theory*, will not avail the speculatist any thing here. As we see the fountain in the stream and the cause in the effect, so we behold the principles in the *practice* of the Christian Religion.

As in science, where all work by the *same rule* all obtain the *same results*, so in Christianity, where the analogy will hold equally well. Would men abandon their speculations and *human* systems, & divest themselves of their long cherished errors and prejudices, which have divided and kept them apart; and take the Bible as their "*only rule of faith and practice*," yielding a hearty obedience to all its commands and "*laying apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save their souls*," all would be accordance and harmony in action and result. But until this be the case, there can be no more agreement and union in the views and actions of the "professors" of Christianity, than among the professors and doctors of science. A return to these *first principles* is one of the principal things

wanting to set men right in religion, and to produce that universal harmony in sentiment and co-operation in action, so desirable in effecting the conversion of the world. As long as men have different views of these first principles of the Christian Religion, no harmonious action or result can be effected; for in every thing sincere and honest men act in accordance with their views and principles, whether true or erroneous, right or wrong. Without a correct notion and understanding of these principles, we might as well, and could with as much success, make practical and perfect Christians of men, as we could make a good Geometrician out of a student, who knew nothing about lines, angles and curves.

In our attempts then to effect the conversion of the world who are lying in sin and error, to the pure gospel of Jesus Christ, these first principles merit and claim our particular attention. No pains should be spared in imparting correct notions of them; no labor in illustrating them, and in setting them in that light which their great importance deserves and demands, and which will induce all men to yield to Christ "THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH."

EDITOR.

RELIGIOUS NEWSPAPERS.

The majority of papers called religious, are as much political, commercial and factitious as they are religious. The Luminaries, Stars, Suns, Registers, Recorders, Secretaries, &c. &c. in one column tell us the way to heaven, & in the next how to engraft trees, make canals, raise revenue: and some advertise strayed or stolen horses, hogs, and negroes. In the same column I lately saw the way to escape the wrath to come, and to clean black silk, separated by a single line. In another, a direction to devotion followed by a direction to find the residence of the barber. A famous conversion is, in another, followed by a broker's list of the rates of exchange. The necessity of humility and temperance is argued in one paragraph—fancy goods, gowgaws and sweet meats announced in the next!—*Preface to Christian Baptist, 1825.*

Jamestown, O. Jan. 15th. 1836.

BRO. HOWARD,

Yours of the 9th. ult. is now before me; and I am glad that you have determined to publish a Periodical in Tennessee, for the restoration of the Gospel as preached by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And as it respects contributing my mite towards filling the columns of the REFORMER," I will with pleasure do any thing that I have the ability to perform, to forward the cause of my master," because I am not my own, having been bought "not with silver and gold" but with the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

If your readers can be entertained by a common sense-man and one who writes hastily, and carelessly,—and one who pays no regard to style, but just blunders along, having more regard to the expression of truth than to the manner of expressing it, I shall be as happy to appear before them, as Paul was to appear before AGRIPPA; and like him I shall try to show that we have been wrongfully accused by this generation, because of their misapplication of Scripture. Permit me to begin then by saying

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

No. 1.

The first common error that I shall notice, is the application of Scripture belonging to one dispensation to the people of another dispensation. Thus that which was delivered to the Patriarchs as their rule, was no guide to Moses, and the people under him; they had to obey the law or rule delivered to them. And the law or rule delivered to Moses and the people under him, is not the proper guide or rule to govern Christians, who are not under law, but under favor. It is of much importance then, that we distinguish the different dispensations which God has appointed upon the earth. This may be aptly illustrated by the different climates and soils which God has been pleased to fix upon the earth. Each climate and soil have laws adapted to the vegetation and other appurtenances thereunto belonging. But suppose men were to pay no regard to the distinctions which God had made, and were to begin to plant Sugar, Cotton, and Rice, in the climate and soil adapted to

Wheat, Oats, and Barley, and *vice versa*, what would be the result? Why they would not grow to do any good, and men would become sceptical as to the design of the earth, or the visible creation. They would begin to say: we supposed the Earth, Sun, Clouds, &c. &c. were designed to produce vegetation for the benefit of men and animals; but not so, for we have planted and sowed, but nothing has been produced; therefore we conclude that nature, or the visible creation contradicts itself. It is apparently designed to produce food for man but it will not do it. Here then we have a set of sceptics, and why? Just because they paid no regard to the different climates, and the laws suited to them.

Now my friends, suppose I were to tell you, that a large number of the sceptics in regard to the Revelations of God have been made in the same way, i. e. by a misapplication of the laws suited by God, to one age or dispensation, to that of another? Nothing is more common than to apply the law of Moses, to the disciples of Christ; and again nothing is more common than to bring Abraham and Moses under the Gospel dispensation. It is pretty generally supposed that the words *Righteousness* and *Justification*, as applied to Abraham, by Moses, and by Paul, meant the forgiveness of his past, or alien sins—and that he was then as it were adopted into the family of God. Upon this misunderstanding, and misapplication of the matter is built that *do nothing system* "OF FAITH ALONE." Whereas all the D. D's in Christendom cannot sustain the position that Abraham was guilty of any sin or sins at the time, nor for 24 years before the time, that he is said to have been justified by faith. Paul says that Abraham was a man of faith at the time God called him out of UR; and Josephus says that he was then 75 years old, and that the promise of the numerous seed was made to him when 99 years old. So that Abraham was a man of faith 24 years before he received the remission of his sins, else the term *Justification* when applied to him did not mean the remission of his sins, as all our "faith alone" men have supposed. Therefore when Paul speaks of the Gentiles as standing in the same relation to God that Abraham did, the word *Justification* as applied to them does not mean the remission of

their *past* or *alien* sins, but that as *Saints*, without the law of Moses, they were *Righteous* or *Justified* by the faith which they then had, or by believing the promises of God as Abraham did.

The term *Righteous* cannot be applied to any one until after their sins have been remitted. To speak of the *righteous ungodly* would be a paradox.

Yours in the Lord,
M. WINANS.

Description and Advantages of the Common School System.

We make the following extract from "An Address on Education," by Lucian Minor, Esq. of Louisa County, Va. published in the Decr. no. of the "Southern Literary Messenger." There is a feature in this system which has been found necessary for its success wherever it has been tried: the admission of all children, rich and poor, alike without charge; or where there is any charge, let it be equally borne. How much better off would we be in every respect, religious, literary, and political, if the surplus wealth in this country, and the money squandered in extravagancies, dissipation, and unnecessary luxury and useless expenditures, were devoted to this most useful and benevolent object!

Ed. C. R.

The *Common-School* system of New York, which has been in operation since 1816, is in substance this: The counties having been already laid off into tracts of five or six miles square, called *townships*,—each of these, upon raising one half the sum needed there for teachers' wages, is entitled to have the other half furnished from the state treasury: and each *neighborhood* in the township, before it can receive any part of this joint sum, must organize itself as a *school district*, build and furnish a school house, and cause a school to be taught there for at least three months, by a teacher who has been examined and found duly qualified, by a standing committee, appointed for that purpose. To the schools thus established, all children, rich and poor alike, are admitted without charge. Mark the fruits of this system. In 1832,

there were in the State 508,578 children; of whom 494,959 were *regular pupils at the common-schools*: leaving fewer than 14,000 for private or other instruction, and reducing the number who are unschooled to an inappreciable point. In Massachusetts, the townships are compelled by law to defray nearly the whole expense of their schools; and the organization is in other respects less perfect than in New York. In each, however, about *ONE-FOURTH* of the whole population is receiving instruction for a considerable part of the year; and in Massachusetts, in 1832, there were *but TEN persons between the ages of 14 and 21, who could not read and write.*

Connecticut, with a school fund yielding 180,000 dollars annually, and with common schools established by law in every township, finds their efficacy in a great degree marred by a single error in her plan. This error is, that *the whole expense is defrayed by the state.* In consequence of this, the people take little interest in the schools; and the children are sent so irregularly, as to derive a very insignificant amount of public instruction: so clearly is it shewn, that a *gratuity* or *what seems to be one, is but lightly valued.* The statesmen of Connecticut, convinced that the only method of rousing the people from their indifference, is to make them contribute something for the schools in their own immediate neighborhood, and so become solicitous to *get the worth of their money*, are meditating the adoption of a plan like that of New York,

Even in Europe, we may find admirable, nay wonderful examples for our imitation.

Prussia has a system, strikingly analogous to that of New York; and in some respects, superior to it. As in New York, the superintendence of popular education is intrusted to a distinct branch of the government; to a gradation of salaried officers, whose whole time is employed in regulating the course of study, compiling or selecting books, examining teachers, and inspecting the schools. At suitable intervals, are schools expressly *for the instruction of teach-*

erc: of which, in 1831, there existed thirty-three—supplying a stock of instructors, accomplished; in all the various knowledge taught in the Prussian schools. In no country on earth—little as we might imagine it—is there probably so well taught a population as in Prussia. Witness the fact, that in 1831, out of 2,043,000 children in the kingdom, 2,021,000 regularly attended the common schools: leaving but 22,000 to be taught at their homes or in private academies. France, in 1833, adopted the Prussian plans with effects already visible in the habits and employments of her people; and similar systems have long existed in Germany, and, even in Ausiria. The schools for training teachers (called, in France and Germany, *normal schools*) pervade all these countries.

In England, government has yet done little towards educating the common people: but Scotland has long enjoyed *parish schools* equalled only by those of Prussia, Germany, and some of our own states, in creating a virtuous and intelligent yeomanry. Throughout Great Britain, voluntary associations for the diffusion of useful knowledge, in which are enrolled some of the most illustrious minds not only of the British empire but of this age, have been for years in active and salutary operation; and, by publishing cheap and simple tracts upon useful and entertaining subjects, and by sending over the country competent persons to deliver plain and popular lectures, illustrated by suitable apparatus, they have, as the *North American Review* expresses it, “poured floods of intellectual light upon the lower ranks of society.”

ONLY GROUND OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.

It is not often that we have, in our miscellaneous reading, met with an article on unity in religion, better than the preface to the translation of “*Grotius on the Truth of the Christian Religion*,” by John Clark, D. D. written about 120 years since. We publish all this preface, in which will be found Grotius’ method of defending Christianity, in his excellent work on its evi-

dences just referred to. Like Clark we would affirm, that it is the *facts*, and they only, of the Christian Religion, that form the ground or foundation of union among its disciples.

E. D. C. R.

THE general acceptation this piece of Grotius has met with in the world encouraged this translation of it, together with the notes, which, being a collection of the ancient testimonies, upon whose authority and truth the genuineness of the books of Holy Scripture depends, are very useful in order to the convincing any one of the truth of the Christian religion. These notes are for the most part Grotius’ own, except some few of Mr. Le Clerc’s which I have, therefore, translated also, because I have followed his edition, as the most correct.

The design of the book is to show the reasonableness of believing and embracing the Christian religion above any other; which our author does, by laying before us all the evidence that can be brought, both internal and external, and declaring the sufficiency of it; by enumerating all the genuineness of any books, & applying them to the sacred writings; and by making appear the deficiency of all other institutions of religion, whether Pagan, Jewish, or Mahometan. So that the substance of the whole is briefly this: That as certain as is the truth of natural principles, and that the mind can judge of what is agreeable to them; as certain as is the evidence of men’s bodily senses, in the most plain and obvious matters of fact; and as certainly as men’s integrity and sincerity may be discovered, and their accounts delivered down to posterity faithfully; so certain are we of the truth of Christian religion; and that, if it be not true, there is no such thing as true religion in the world; neither was there ever, or can there ever be, any revelation proved to be from heaven.

This is the author’s design, to prove the truth of Christian religion in general, against Atheists, Deists, Jews, or Mahometans; and he does not enter into any of the disputes which Christians have among themselves, but confines himself wholly to the other.—Now, as the state of Christianity at present

is, were a heathen or Mahometan convinced of the Christian religion in general, he would yet be exceedingly at a loss to know what society of Christians to join himself with; so miserably divided are they amongst themselves, and separated into so many sects and parties which differ almost as widely from each other as heathens from Christians, and who are so zealous and contentious for their own particular opinions, and bear so much hatred and ill-will towards those that differ from them, that there is very little of the true spirit of charity, which is the bond of peace, to be found in any of them: this is a very great scandal to the professors of Christianity, and has been exceedingly disserviceable to the Christian religion: insomuch that great numbers have been hindered from embracing the gospel, and many tempted to cast it off because they saw the professors of it in general agree so little amongst themselves: this consideration induced Mr. Le Clerc to add a seventh book to those of Grotius: wherein he treats of this matter, and shows what it becomes every honest man to do in such a case: and I have translated it for the same reason. All that I shall here add, shall be only briefly to inquire into the cause of so much division in the church of Christ, and to show what seems to me the only remedy to heal it.— First, to examine into the cause why the church of Christ is so much divided: A man needs but a little knowledge of the state of the Christian church, to see that there is just reason for the same complaint St. Paul made in the primitive times of the church of Corinth: that some were for Paul, some for Apollos, and some for Cephas: so very early did the spirit of faction creep into the church of God, and disturb the peace of it, by setting its members at variance with each other, who ought to have been all of the same common faith into which they were baptized; and I wish it could not be said that the same spirit has too much remained amongst Christians ever since. It is evident that the foundation of the division in the church of Corinth was their forsaking their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, into whose name alone they were baptized, and uniting themselves, some

under one eminent Apostle or teacher, and some under another, by whom they had been instructed in the doctrine of Christ, whereby they were distinguished into different sects under their several denominations: this St. Paul complains of as a thing itself very bad, and of pernicious consequences; for hereby the body of Christ, that is, the Christian church, the doctrine of which is one and the same at all times and in all places, is rent and divided into several parts, that clash and interfere with each other; which is the only method, if permitted to have its natural effect, that can overthrow and destroy it— And from the same cause have arisen all the divisions that are or have been in the church ever since. Had Christians been contented to own but one Lord, even Jesus Christ, and made the doctrine delivered by him the sole rule of faith, without any fictions or inventions of men, it had been impossible but that the church of Christ must have been one universal, regular, uniform thing, and not such a mixture as we now behold it. But when Christians once began to establish doctrines of their own, and to impose them upon others by human authority, as rules of faith (which is the foundation of Antichrist,) then there began to be as many schemes of religion as there was parties of men who had different judgements, and got the power into their hands. A very little acquaintance with ecclesiastical history does but too sadly confirm the truth of this, by giving us an account of the several doctrines in fashion in the several ages of the Christian church, according to the present humor. And if it be not now, how comes it pass that the generality of Christians are so zealous for that scheme of religion which is received by that particular church of which they profess themselves members? How is it that the generality of Christians in one country are zealous for Calvinism, and in another country as zealous for Arminianism? It is not because men have any natural disposition more to one than the other, or perhaps that one has much more foundation to support it from Scripture than the other; but the reason is plain, viz. because they are the established doctrines of

the places they live in; they are by authority made the standard of religion, and men are taught them from the beginning: by this means they are so deeply fixed and rooted in their minds that they become prejudiced in favor of them, and have so strong a relish of them, that they cannot read a chapter in the Bible, but it appears exactly agreeable to the received notions of them both, though perhaps those notions are directly contradictory to each other; thus, instead of making the Scripture the only rule of faith, men make rules of faith of their own, and interpret Scripture according to them; which being an easy way of coming to the knowledge of what they esteem the truth, the generality of Christians sit down very well satisfied with it. But whoever is, indeed, convinced of the truth of the gospel, and has any regard for the honor of it, cannot but be deeply concerned to see sacred truths thus prostituted to the power and interests of men; and think it his duty to do the utmost he is able to take it out of their hands, and fix it on its own immovable bottom. In order to contribute to which, I shall, in the second place, show what seems to be the only remedy that can heal these divisions amongst Christians; and that is in one word, making the Scripture the only rule of faith. Whatever is necessary for a Christian to believe, in order to everlasting salvation, is there declared, in such a way and manner as the wisdom of God, who best knows the circumstances and conditions of mankind, has thought fit. This God himself has made the standard for all ranks or orders, for all capacities and abilities; and to set up any other above, or upon the level with it, is dishonoring God, and abusing of men. All the authority in the world cannot make any thing an article of faith, but what God has made so; neither can any power establish or impose upon men, more or less, or otherwise than what the Scripture commands. God has given every man proportionable faculties and abilities of mind, some stronger and some weaker; and he has by his own authority made the Scripture the rule of religion to them all: it is there-

fore, their indispensable duty to examine diligently and study attentively this rule, to instruct themselves in the knowledge of religious truths from hence, and to form the best judgement they can of the nature of them. The Scripture will extend or contract itself according to the capacities of men; the strongest and largest understanding will there find enough to fill and improve it, and the narrowest and meanest capacity will fully acquiesce in what is there required of it. Thus all men are obliged to form a judgement of religion for themselves, and to be continually rectifying and improving it: they may be very helpful and assisting to each other in the means of coming to this divine knowledge, but no one can finally determine for another; every man must judge for himself and for the sincerity of his judgement he is accountable to God only, who knows the secrets of all hearts, which are beyond the reach of human power: this must be left till the final day of account, when every man shall be acquitted or condemned according as he has acted by the dictates of his conscience or no. Were all the Christians to go upon this principle, we should soon see an end of all the fierce controversies and unhappy divisions which now rend and confound the church of Christ, were every man allowed to take the Scripture for his only guide in matters of faith, and, after all the means of knowledge and instruction used, all the ways of assurance and conviction tried, permitted quietly to enjoy his own opinion, the foundation of all divisions would be taken away at once: and, till Christians do arrive at this temper of mind, let them not boast that they are endued with that excellent virtue of charity, which is the distinguishing mark of their profession; for, if what Paul says be true, that charity is greater than faith, it is evident that no Christian ought to be guilty of the breach of a greater duty upon account of a lesser; they ought not to disturb that peace and unity which ought to be amongst all Christians, for the sake of any matters of faith, any differences of opinion; because it is contrary to

the known law of charity: and how the far greatest part of Christians will clear themselves of transgressing this plain law, I know not. Wherefore, if ever we expect to have our petitions answered, when we pray that God would make us one flock under one Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, Jesus Christ, we must cease to make needless fences of our own, and to divide ourselves into small separate flocks, and distinguish them by that whereby Christ has not distinguished them. When this spirit of love and unity, of forbearing one another in meekness, once becomes the prevailing principle amongst Christians, then and not till then, will the kingdom of Christ in its highest perfection and purity flourish upon the earth, and all the powers of darkness fall before it.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

The first No. of our periodical is now issued and before the reading public. The matter both original and selected, must speak for itself and let others speak for it. We can ourselves speak for the paper and typography, and say that in quality and execution we believe it to be surpassed by few, if any, at least of those called "religious," which are published in the land. Having laid in an extensive supply of very fine and excellent printing paper of a size larger than we expected and intended, we have, partly in consequence, increased the size of our pages and with them the price of our periodical. We regret this, in consequence of the size and terms expressed in the "conditions" of our prospectus, as first published. But we see no reason for our subscribers to object to it, as they will now, with an increase of only *one fourth* in the price, receive *one third* more of matter, the difference between a third and a fourth more than an equivalent, with no increase in the postage, that being the *same* as before. The *Christian Reformer* will now contain 32 pages, large or royal octavo, in double columns, at *Two Dollars*, payable in advance, and *Two Dollars* and *Fifty Cents*, if not paid within six months from the time of subscribing. The type being generally the same in size with that of the *Millennial Harbinger* and the pages about a third larger, the 32 pages of the

Reformer will generally contain as much as the 48 pages of the *Harbinger*, while the terms and postage are the same.—We intend to use all the efforts we can to make it valuable, and interesting, and subservient of the great cause to which it shall be devoted. Although we have already received some valuable assistance and expect more, we have ample means ourselves to sustain it at what it has began; and, as we hope, to render it more and more interesting, useful, and worthy of patronage. It is now left principally with our brethren, particularly those in the West, whether it shall be sustained or not. The better it is supported and the more extensively it is circulated, the more ample will be our means of making it what we wish and what it ought to be, the more time and attention we can bestow upon it, and the more enlarged will be the sphere of its influence. As the edition for this year will not be a large one, those who intend subscribing for it should send us their names in time to obtain it before the edition is exhausted. All letters, those containing *remittances* excepted, must in order to receive attention be *post paid*; and addressed to the Editor, Paris Henry County, Tenn. All persons who obtain and pay for *ten* subscribers, according to the terms of the paper, shall be entitled to *one* copy *gratis*. Where this is not done, it will be to the advantage both of our subscribers and ourselves for them, where residing convenient to each other, to *unite* in making their remittances. *Five* or *ten* or some other number, could do this where they wish to pay in advance; and *two* where payment is neglected until the expiration of six months. We shall not send the *Reformer* to any but those who send us their names, except such agents as we may appoint.

JNO. R. HOWARD.

Paris Tenn.

You different sects, who all declare,
Lo! CHRIST is here, and CHRIST is there;
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the CHRISTIANS live.

John Wesley.

THE PROSPECT BEFORE US.

It is of the *editorial* prospect before us, that we wish to speak a little, to apprise our readers of what we have in store for them.

The outlines of our future course were so well marked and defined in our Prospectus, that it might be deemed unnecessary; but that was not the place for what we here have to say.

One of the most important things we design, is a series of essays on the "Three Kingdoms,"—the kingdom of Nature—the kingdom of Grace or Favor—and the kingdom of Glory. Next to this, will be a series on "Conformity to Christ,"—conformity to Christ in becoming a Christian—and conformity to Christ in living as a Christian; and a series on the "Three Covenants,"—the Noahitic—the Mosaic—and the Christian. The design of the Scriptures, particularly those of the New Testament, will engage our particular and early attention. In the course of the next volume, and perhaps before we finish this, we intend taking up the subject of "Christian Baptism,"—its Action or Mode—its Subjects—and its Design. We wish to be well prepared before we enter upon this, as so much has been said upon it and it is so much misunderstood and misrepresented; and accordingly are procuring all the works on it we can, both critical and explanatory. We also have a rich treat in store for our readers, in a series of discourses on the "Use and Intent of Prophecy," from the pen of one of the ablest and soundest old English writers. Pitts' "Book on Baptism" we have long designed reviewing, but must defer it until we have more time and are better prepared, as "it demands a strict and severe exposition," to use the words of one of the ablest writers of this age in a letter to us. There are also some other *Tennessee* productions of this character, issued from the press during the last year or two, which we intend noticing, reviewing and exposing. All these things we design attending to, if permitted and the Lord will, in the order which, and at the time when, we may be best prepared for them, and which, in our judgment, may best suit the times and be most conducive to the edification of our readers.

We now *launch* our editorial bark upon the *great deep* of the human mind, having *planned* and *constructed* it according to the best models we could get, with such *improvements* as we could devise, and having *manned* it as well as we could, and given it the best *outfit* we were able. Our *compass* is the best that ever such *mariner* steered by—*THE WORD* OF GOD; and, with our station at the *helm* as *pilot* and conductor, we intend to take at least a *seven years voyage*, the Lord willing, and health, life, and other circumstances permitting. Tempests, storms and *contrary* winds we shall doubtless have to contend with. The *artillery* too of the ships of the enemy will have to be encountered. We expect to *sail* along harmoniously with those who *steer* by the *same* compass; but to *clash* with, and cross the course of, those who use any *other*. Receiving assistance and *freight* where we shall *touch*, we hope to *land* safely at the termination of our voyage, with a rich and valuable *cargo*.

EDITOR.

DICTIONARIES AND LEXICONS.

None understand the value of dictionaries and lexicons so well as those who use them most. Every individual who reads any should, when reading, always keep by him an English Dictionary, such as Walker's or Webster's. An *English* word, the definition or meaning of which we are ignorant of, might as well, until understood, be Latin or Greek to those who do not understand these languages. We sometimes hear people complaining of an author for using "*hard words*," when the fault is in themselves, for not seeking the meaning in a Dictionary. They are so cheap, that any one who can afford to read, can afford to get one.

EDITOR.

☞ We had partly prepared an "Essay on the Christian Name" for this number, but must defer it until our next, in order that we may give place to other matter of more importance for our first No. We were anxious to insert it in this, and defer it with reluctance.

☞ Bro. Winans' very able and interesting No. 2, on "Misapplication of Scripture," has been received and is on file for our next.

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. FEBRUARY, 1836.

[NUMBER 2.

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Luke XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH, and IS BAPTIZED shall be SAVED; but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XIV. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS.—Jude, 3.

Supreme authority of revelation.

[FROM DR. CHALMERS' EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.*]

If the New Testament be a message from God, it behooves us to make an entire and unconditional surrender of our minds, to all the duty and to all the information which it sets before us.

There is, perhaps, nothing more thoroughly beyond the cognizance of the human faculties, than the truths of religion, and the ways of that mighty and invisible Being who is the object of it; and yet nothing, we will venture to say, has been made the subject of more hardy and adventurous speculation.

* The little work from which this extract is made, contains one of the finest summaries of the evidences of the Christian Religion, which we recollect to have met with. It is remarkable for force, depth and acuteness of thought, justness of sentiment, earnest and nervous expression, purity of diction and elegance of style. We here present our readers with a specimen of it. It may be asked, does Dr. Chalmers practice what he so forcibly and earnestly inculcates? In respect to this greatest, most learned and renowned Rabbi of all the Church of Scotland, we would say as our Lord did upon one occasion to the multitude and his disciples; "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not."

Ed. C. R.

tion. We make no allusion at present to deists, who reject the authority of the New Testament, because the plan and the dispensation of the Almighty which is recorded there, is different from that plan and that dispensation which they have chosen to ascribe to him. We speak of Christians who profess to admit the authority of this record, but who have tainted the purity of their profession by not acting upon its exclusive authority; who have mingled their own thoughts and their own fancy with its information; who, instead of repairing in every question, and in every difficulty, to the principle of "What readeest thou," have abridged the sovereignty of this principle, by appealing to others, of which we undertake to make out the incompetency: who, in addition to the word of God, talk also of the reason of the thing, or the standard of orthodoxy; and have in fact brought down the Bible from the high place which belongs to it, as the only tribunal to which the appeal should be made, or from which the decision should be looked for.

But it is not merely among partisans or the advocates of a system, that we meet with this indifference to the authority of what is written. It lies at the bottom of a great deal of that looseness, both in practice and speculation, which we meet with every day in society, and which we often hear expressed in familiar conversation. Whence that

list of maxims which are so indolently conceived, but which, at the same time, are so faithfully proceeded upon? "We have all our passions and infirmities; but we have honest hearts, and that will make up for them. Men are not all cast in the same mould.— God will not call us to task too rigidly for our foibles; at least this is our opinion, and God can never be so unmerciful, or so unjust, as to bring us to a severe and unforgiving tribunal for the mistakes of the understanding." Now it is not licentiousness in general which we are speaking against. It is against that sanction which it appears to derive from the self-formed maxims of him who is guilty of it. It is against the principle, that either an error of doctrine, or an indulgence of passion, is to be exempted from condemnation, because it has an opinion of the mind to give it countenance and authority. What we complain of is, that a man no sooner sets himself forward and says, "this is my sentiment," than he conceives that all culpability is taken away from the error, either of practice or speculation, into which he has fallen. The carelessness with which the opinion has been formed is of no account in the estimate. It is the mere existence of the opinion, which is pleaded in vindication; and under the authority of *our maxims, and our mode of thinking*, every man conceives himself to have a right to his own way and his own peculiarity.

Now this might be all very fair were there no Bible and no revelation in existence.— But it is not fair, that all this looseness, and all this variety, should be still floating in the world, in the face of an authoritative communication from God himself. Had no message come to us from the Fountain-head of truth, it were natural enough for every individual mind to betake itself to its own speculation. But a message has come to us, bearing on its forehead every character of authenticity; and is it right now, that the question of our faith, or of our duty, should be committed to the capricious variations of this man's taste, or of that man's fancy? Our maxim, and our sentiment! God has put an authoritative stop to all this. He has

spoken, and the right or the liberty of speculation no longer remains to us. The question now is, not "What thinkest thou?" In the days of pagan antiquity, no other question could be put; and to the wretched delusions and idolatries of that period let us see what kind of answer the human mind is capable of making, when left to its own guidance, and its own authority. But we call ourselves Christians, and profess to receive the Bible as the directory of our faith; and the only question in which we are concerned, is, "What is written in the law? how readest thou?"

But there is a way of escaping from this conclusion. No man calling himself a Christian will ever disown in words the authority of the Bible. Whatever be counted the genuine interpretation, it must be submitted to. But in the act of coming to this interpretation, it will be observed, there is room for the unwarrantable principles which we are attempting to expose. The business of a Scripture critic is to give a fair representation of the sense of all its passages as they exist in the original. Now, this is a process which requires some investigation, and it is during the time that this process is carrying on, that the tendencies and antecedent opinions of the mind are suffered to mislead the inquirer from the true principles of the business in which he is employed. The mind and meaning of the author, who is translated, is purely a question of language, and should be decided upon no other principles than those of grammar or philology. Now, what we complain of is, that while this principle is recognised and acted upon in every other composition which has come down to us from antiquity, it has been most glaringly departed from in the case of the Bible; that the meaning of its author, instead of being made singly and entirely a question of grammar, has been made a question of metaphysics, or a question of sentiment; that instead of the argument resorted to being "such must be the rendering from the structure of the language, and the import and significance of its phrases," it has been, "such must be the rendering from the analogy of the

faith, the reason of the thing, the character of the Divine mind, and the wisdom of all his dispensations." And whether this argument be formally insisted upon or not, we have still to complain, that in reality it has a most decided influence on the understanding of many a Christian; and in this way, the creed which exists in his mind, instead of being a fair transcript of the New Testament, is the result of a compromise which has been made between its authoritative decisions and the speculations of his own fancy.

What is the reason why there is so much more unanimity among critics and grammarians about the sense of any ancient author, than about the sense of the New Testament? Because the one is made purely a question of criticism: the other has been complicated with the uncertain fancies of a daring and presumptuous theology. Could we only dismiss these fancies, sit down like a schoolboy to his task, and look upon the study of divinity as a mere work of translation, then we would expect the same unanimity among Christians that we meet with among scholars and literati about the system of Epicurus or the philosophy of Aristotle. But here lies the distinction between the two cases. When we make out, by a critical examination of the Greek of Aristotle, that such was his meaning, and such his philosophy, the result carries no authority with it, and our mind retains the congenial liberty of its own speculations. But if we make out by a critical examination of the Greek of St. Paul, that such is the theology of the New Testament, we are bound to submit to this theology; and our minds must surrender every opinion, however dear to it. It is quite in vain to talk of the mysteriousness of the subject, as being the cause of the want of unanimity among Christians. It may be mysterious, in reference to our former conceptions. It may be mysterious in the utter impossibility of reconciling it with our own assumed fancies and self-formed principles. It may be mysterious in the difficulty which we feel in comprehending the manner of the doctrine, when we ought to be satisfied with

the authoritative revelation which has been made to us of its existence and its truth. But if we could only abandon all our former conceptions, if we felt that our business was to submit to the oracles of God, and that we are not called upon to effect a reconciliation between a revealed doctrine of the Bible, and an assumed or excogitated principle of our own;—then we are satisfied, that we would find the language of the Testament to have as much clear, and precise, and dictioned simplicity, as the language of any sage or philosopher that has come down to us.

Could we only get it reduced to a mere question of language, we should look, at no distant period, for the establishment of a pure and unanimous Christianity in the world. But, no. While the mind and the meaning of any philosopher is collected from his words, and these words tried, as to their import and significancy, upon the appropriate principles of criticism, the mind and the meaning of the Spirit of God is not collected upon the same pure and competent principles of investigation. In order to know the mind of the Spirit, the communications of the Spirit, and the expression of these communications in written language, should be consulted. These are the only data upon which the inquiry should be instituted. But, no. Instead of learning the designs and character of the Almighty from his own mouth, we sit in judgment upon them, and make our conjecture of what they should be, take the precedency of his revelation of what they are. We do him the same injustice that we do to an acquaintance, whose proceedings and whose intentions we venture to pronounce upon, while we refuse him a hearing, or turn away from the letter in which he explains himself. No wonder, then, at the want of unanimity among Christians, so long as the question of "What thinkest thou?" is made the principle of their creed, and, for the safe guidance of criticism, they have committed themselves to the endless caprices of the human intellect. Let the principle of "what thinkest thou" be exploded, and that of "what readest thou" be

substituted in its place. Let us take our lesson as the Almighty places it before us, and, instead of being the judge of his conduct, be satisfied with the safer and humbler office of being the interpreter of his language.

* * * * *

We do not confine the principle to critics and translators; we press it upon all. We call upon them not to form their divinity by independent thinking, but to receive it by obedient reading; to take the words as they stand, and submit to the plain English of the Scriptures which lie before them. It is the office of a translator to give a faithful representation of the original. Now that this faithful representation has been given, it is our part to peruse it with care, and to take a fair and a faithful impression of it. It is our part to purify our understanding of all its previous conceptions. We must bring a free and unoccupied mind to the exercise. It must not be the pride or the obstinacy of self-formed opinions, or the haughty independence of him who thinks he has reached the manhood of his understanding. We must bring with us the docility of a child, if we want to gain the kingdom of heaven. It must not be a partial, but an entire and unexcepted obedience. There must be no garbling of that which is entire, no darkening of that which is luminous, no softening down of that which is authoritative or severe. The Bible will allow of no compromise. It professes to be the directory of our faith, and claims a total ascendancy over the souls and the understandings of men. It will enter into no composition with us, or our natural principles. It challenges the whole mind as its due, and it appeals to the truth of heaven for the high authority of its sanctions. "Whosoever addeth to, or taketh from, the words of this book, is accursed," is the absolute language in which it delivers itself. This brings us to its terms. There is no way of escaping after this. We must bring every thought into the captivity of its obedience, and as closely as ever lawyer stuck to his document or his extract, must we abide by the rule and the doctrine which this authentic memorial of God sets before us.

Now we hazard the assertion, that with a number of professing Christians, there is not this unexcepted submission of the understanding to the authority of the Bible; and that the authority of the Bible is often modified; and in some cases superceded by the authority of other principles. One of these principles is the reason of the thing. We do not know if this principle would be at all felt or appealed to by the earliest Christians. It may perhaps by the disputations or the philosophising among converted Jews and Greeks, but not certainly by those of whom Paul said, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, were called." They turned from dumb idols to serve the living and the true God. There was nothing in their antecedent theology which they could have any respect for: nothing which they could confront, or bring into competition with the doctrines of the New Testament. In those days, the truth as it is in Jesus came to the minds of its disciples, recommended by its novelty, by its grandeur, by the power and recency of its evidences, and above all by its vast and evident superiority over the fooleries of a degrading paganism. It does not occur to us, that men in these circumstances would ever think of sitting in judgement over the mysteries of that sublime faith which had charmed them into an abandonment of their earlier religion. It rather strikes us, that they would receive them passively; that, like scholars who had all to learn, they would take their lesson as they found it; that the information of their teachers would be enough for them; and that the restless tendency of the human mind to speculation would for a time find ample enjoyment in the rich and splendid discoveries which broke like a flood of light upon the world. But we are in different circumstances. To us, these discoveries, rich and splendid as they are, have lost the freshness of novelty. The Sun of righteousness, like the sun of the firmament, has become familiarized to us by possession. In a few ages, the human mind deserted its guidance, and rambled as much as ever in quest of new speculations. It is

true, that they took a juster and loftier flight since the days of heathenism. But it was only because they walked in the light of revelation. They borrowed of the New Testament without acknowledgment, and took its beauties and its truths to deck their own wretched fancies and self-constituted systems. In the process of time, the delusion multiplied and extended. Schools were formed, and the ways of the Divinity were as confidently theorized upon, as the processes of chymistry, or the economy of the heavens. Universities were endowed, and natural theology took its place in the circle of the sciences. Folios were written, and the respected luminaries of a former age poured their *a priori* and their *posteriori* demonstrations on the world. Taste, and sentiment, and imagination grew apace; and every raw untutored principle which poetry could clothe in prettiness, or over which the hand of genius could throw the graces of sensibility and elegance, was erected into a principle of the divine government, and made to preside over the counsels of the Deity. In the mean time, the Bible, which ought to supercede all, was itself superceded. It was quite in vain to say that it was the only authentic record of an actual embassy which God had sent into the world. It was quite in vain to plead its testimonies, its miracles, and the unquestionable fulfilment of its prophecies. These mighty claims must lie over, and be suspended, till we have settled—what! the reasonableness of its doctrines. We must bring the theology of God's ambassador to the bar of our self-formed theology. The Bible, instead of being admitted as the directory of our faith upon its external evidences, must be tried upon the merits of the work itself; and if our verdict be favourable, it must be brought in, not as a help to our ignorance, but as a corollary to our demonstrations. But is this ever done? Yes! by Dr. Samuel Clarke, and a whole host of followers and admirers. Their first step in the process of theological study, is to furnish their minds with the principles of natural theology. Christianity, before its external proofs are looked at or listened to, must be brought under the tribunal of these principles. All the difficulties which attach to the reason of the thing, or the fitness of the doctrines, must be formally discussed, and

satisfactorily got over. A voice was heard from heaven, saying of Jesus Christ, "This is my beloved Son, hereye him." The men of Galilee gave their testimony; and it is a testimony which stood the fiery trial of persecution in a former age, and of sophistry in this. And yet, instead of hearing Jesus Christ as disciples, they sit in authority over him as judges. Instead of forming their divinity after the Bible, they try the Bible by their antecedent divinity; and this book, with all its mighty train of evidences, must drivel in their anti-chambers, till they have pronounced sentence of admission, when they have got its doctrines to agree with their own airy and unsubstantial speculations.

We do not condemn the exercise of reason in matters of theology. It is the part of reason to form its conclusions, when it has data and evidences before it. But it is equally the part of reason to abstain from its conclusions, when these evidences are wanting. Reason can judge of the external evidences for Christianity, because it can discern the merits of human testimony: and it can perceive the truth or the falsehood of such obvious credentials as the performance of a miracle, or the fulfilment of a prophecy. But reason is not entitled to sit in judgment over those internal evidences, which many a presumptuous theologian has attempted to derive from the reason of the thing, or from the agreement of the doctrine with the fancied character and attributes of the Deity. One of the most useful exercises of reason, is to ascertain its limits, and to keep within them; to abandon the fields of conjecture, and to restrain itself within that safe and certain barrier which forms the boundary of human experience. However humiliating you may conceive it, it is this which lies at the bottom of Lord Bacon's philosophy, and it is to this that modern science is indebted for all her solidity and all her triumphs. Why does philosophy flourish in our days? Because her votaries have learned to abandon their own creative speculations, and to submit to evidence, let her conclusions be as painful and as unpalatable as they will. Now all that we want is to carry the same lesson and the same principle into theology. Our business is, not to guess, but to learn. After we have established Christianity to be an authentic mes-

message from God upon these historical grounds on which the reason and experience of man entitle him to form his conclusions, nothing remains for us but an unconditional surrender of the mind to the subject of the message. We have a right to sit in judgment over the credentials of heaven's ambassador, but we have no right to sit in judgment over the information he gives us. We have no right either to refuse or to modify that information, till we have accommodated it to our previous conceptions.

It is very true that if the truths which he delivered lay within the field of human observation, he brings himself under the tribunal of our antecedent knowledge. Were he to tell us, that the bodies of the planetary system moved in orbits which are purely circular, we would oppose to him the observations and measurements of astronomy. Were he to tell us, that in winter the sun never shone, and that in summer no cloud ever darkened the brilliancy of his career, we would oppose to him the certain remembrances, both of ourselves and of our whole neighborhood. Were he to tell us that we were perfect men, because we were free from passion, and loved our neighbors as ourselves, we should oppose to him the history of our own lives, and the deeply-seated consciousness of our own infirmities. On all these subjects, we can confront him; but when he brings truth from a quarter which no human eye ever explored; when he tells us the mind of the Deity, and brings before us the counsels of that invisible Being, whose arm is abroad upon all worlds, and whose views reach to eternity, he is beyond the ken of eye or of telescope, and we must submit to him. We have no more right to sit in judgment over his information, than we have to sit in judgment over the information of any other visiter, who lights upon our planet, from some distant and unknown part of the universe, and tells us what worlds roll in those remote tracts which are beyond the limits of our astronomy, and how the Divinity peoples them with wonders. Any previous conceptions of ours are of no more value than the fooleries of an infant; and should we offer to resist or to modify upon the strength of these conceptions, we would be as unsound and as unphilosophical as ever schoolman was with his categories, or Cartesian with his whirlpools of ether.

Let us go back to the first Christians of the gentile world. They turned from dumb idols to serve the living and the true God. They made a simple and entire transition from a state as bad, if not worse, than that of entire ignorance, to the Christianity of the New Testament. Their previous conceptions, instead of helping them, behooved to be utterly abandoned; nor was there that intermediate step which so many of us think to be necessary, and which we dignify with the name of the rational theology of nature. In those days this rational theology was unheard of; nor have we the slightest reason to believe that they were initiated into its doctrines, before they were looked upon as fit to be taught the peculiarities of the gospel. They were translated at once from the absurdities of paganism to that Christianity which has come down to us in the records of the evangelical history, and the epistles which their teachers addressed them. They saw the miracles; they acquiesced in them, as satisfying credentials of an inspired teacher; they took the whole of their religion from his mouth; their faith came by hearing, and hearing by the words of a divine messenger. This was their process, and it ought to be ours. We do not see the miracles, but we see their reality through the medium of that clear and unsuspecting testimony which has been handed down to us. We should admit them as the credentials of an embassy from God. We should take the whole of our religion from the records of this embassy; and, renouncing the idolatry of our self-formed conceptions, we should repair to that word which was spoken to them that heard it, and transmitted to us by the instrumentality of written language. The question with them was, What hearest thou? The question with us is, What readeest thou? They had their idols, and they turned away from them. We have our fancies, and we contend, that, in the face of an authoritative revelation from heaven, it is as glaring idolatry in us to here to them, as it would were they spread out upon canvass, or chiselled into material form by the hands of a statuary.

In the popular religions of antiquity, we see scarcely the vestige of a resemblance to that academical theism which is delivered in our schools, and figures away in the speculations of our moralists. The process of

conversion among the first Christians was a very simple one. It consisted of an utter abandonment of their heathenism, and an entire submission to those new truths which came to them through the revelation of the Gospel, and through it only. It was the pure theology of Christ and of his apostles. That theology which struts in fancied demonstration from a professor's chair, formed no part of it. They listened as if they had all to learn: we listen as if it was our office to judge, and to give the message of God its due place and subordination among the principles which we had previously established. Now these principles were utterly unknown at the first publication of Christianity. The Galatians, and Corinthians, and Thessalonians, and Philippians, had no conception of them. And yet, will any man say, that either Paul himself, or those who lived under his immediate tuition, had not enough to make them accomplished Christians, or that they fell short of our enlightened selves, in the wisdom which prepares for eternity, because they wanted our rational theology as a stepping-stone to that knowledge which came, in pure and immediate revelation, from the Son of God? The Gospel was enough for them, and it should be enough for us also. Every natural or assumed principle, which offers to abridge its supremacy, or even so much as to share with it in authority and direction, should be instantly discarded. Every opinion in religion should be reduced to the question of, What readest thou? and the Bible be acquiesced in, and submitted to, as the only directory of our faith, where we can get the whole will of God for the salvation of man.

But is not this an enlightened age? and, since the days of the Gospel, has not the wisdom of two thousand years accumulated upon the present generation? has not science been enriched by discovery? and is not theology one of the sciences? Are the men of this advanced period to be restrained from the high exercise of their powers? and, because the men of a remote and barbarous antiquity lisped and drivelled in the infancy of their acquirements, is that any reason why we should be restricted like so many school-boys to the lesson that is set before us? It is all true that this is a very enlightened age; but on what field has it acquired

so flattering a distinction? On the field of experiment. The human mind owes all its progress to the confinement of its efforts within the safe and certain limits of observation, and to the severe restraint which it has imposed upon its speculative tendencies. Go beyond these limits, and the human mind has not advanced a single inch by its own independent exercises. All the philosophy which has been reared by the labour of successive ages, is the philosophy of facts reduced to general laws, or brought under a general description from observed points of resemblance. A proud and wonderful fabric we do allow; but we throw away the very instrument by which it was built, the moment that we cease to observe, and begin to theorise and excogitate. Tell us a single discovery which has thrown a particle of light on details of the divine administration. Tell us of a single truth in the whole field of experimental science, which can bring us to the government of the Almighty by any other road than his own revelation.

* * * * *

We hear much of revelations from heaven. Let any one of these bear the evidence of an actual communication from God himself, and all the reasonings of all theologians must vanish, and give place to the substance of this communication. Instead of theorising upon the nature and properties of that divine light which irradiates the throne of God, and exists at so immeasurable a distance from our faculties, let us point our eyes to that emanation, which has actually come down to us. Instead of theorising upon the counsels of the divine mind, let us go to that volume which lighted upon our world nearly two thousand years ago, and which bears the most authentic evidence, that it is the depository of part of these counsels. Let us apply the proper instrument to this examination. Let us never conceive it to be a work of speculation or fancy. It is a pure work of grammatical analysis. It is an unmixed question of language. The commentator who opens this book with the one hand, and carries his system in the other, has nothing to do with it. We admit of no other instrument than the vocabulary and the lexicon. The man whom we look to is the scripture critic, who can appeal to his authorities for the import and significancy of phrases, and

whatever be the strict result of his patience and profound philology, we to submit it.— We call upon every enlightened disciple of Lord Bacon to approve the steps of this process, and to acknowledge, that the same habits of philosophising to which science is indebted for all her elevation in these latter days, will lead us to cast down all our lofty imaginations, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.

But something more remains to be done. The mind may have discernment enough to acquiesce in the speculative justness of a principle; but it may not have vigour or consistency enough to put it into execution. Lord Bacon pointed out the method of true philosophising; yet, in practice, he abandoned it, and his own physical investigations may be ranked among the most effectual specimens of that rash and unfounded theorising, which his own principles have banished from the schools of philosophy. Sir Isaac Newton completed in his own person the character of the true philosopher. He not only saw the general principle, but he obeyed it. He both betook himself to the drudgery of observation, and he endured the pain which every mind must suffer in the act of renouncing its old habits of conception. We call upon our readers to have manhood and philosophy enough to make a similar sacrifice. It is not enough that the Bible be acknowledged as the only authentic source of information respecting the details of that moral economy, which the Supreme Being has instituted for the government of the intelligent beings who occupy this globe. Its authenticity must be something more than acknowledged. It must be felt, and, in act and obedience, submitted to,

Three standing Evidences of Christianity.

The evidences or proofs of the divine origin of the Christian Religion, brighten and strengthen to our minds, in the ratio of our acquaintance with it and with man for whom it was instituted and to whom its revelations are addressed. The more we examine, and the better we become acquainted, with it, the more marks we discover of its having come from God and of its having Him for its Author. Viewed in every aspect in which it can be exhibited,

and contemplated from every point from which it can be beheld, it bears the impress of his mind and of his hand; of his mind, in its design and plan, and of his hand, in its formation and execution.

It has *three* classes of evidences; external, internal, and commemorative; as distinct and different, yet as closely connected and united, as the spirit, soul and body of man; and interwoven into one system as much as these are into one being. They are every where connected with it in its progress, from its commencement to every period of its perpetuation, from the place and time of its rise to every region and age of its extension and continuance.

By its *external* evidences, we mean those supernatural facts, constituting the miracles wrought in confirmation of its claims and in attestation of the mission of its Author and Founder and of his Apostles and Ministers; and also those historical facts and events predicted in prophecy and forming its fulfilment. We mean by its *internal* evidences, those proofs that Christianity is a system from God, drawn from the nature and purity of its doctrine and precepts, the character of its dispensation and accordance with the character and attributes of God as far as known to us, the marks of truth and honesty which it every where bears, the harmony and consistency of all its parts, and its agreement with the history of the age in which it originated and correct allusions to its manners, customs and institutions. Its *commemorative* evidences, a term which we have taken the liberty of thus using here, are those institutions, observed and repeated as commemorative of the facts and events which they represent and from which they originated. This is a species of evidence in some respects peculiar to Christianity.

There are *three* commemorative institutions which constitute three *standing* evidences of the divine origin and authenticity of the Christian Religion: Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's Day. They have relation to facts, events and time; and have accompanied this religion through every age of the world since its commencement, and in every country where it has been propagated in its original purity. The first is commemorative of the burial and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Je-

sus Christ; the second, of his death; and the third, of the day on which he arose from the dead. They thus represent, in action and time, his *death*, his *burial*, and his *resurrection*. These are the *three* grand and important facts, which Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, emphasises upon, and defines as "THE GOSPEL." "Moreover, brethren, says he in his first epistle to the Corinthians, "I declare unto you THE GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I have preached unto you"—"for I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how 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." These are the *three* great facts on which the superstructure of Christianity rests, and which have had *three commemorative* institutions to represent them ever since their accomplishment, both in their *action* and their *meaning*.

These three institutions when contemplated in the order in which the facts they represent transpired, stand thus; the Lord's Supper, Baptism, the Lord's Day; but when considered in their present meaning and design, thus; Baptism, Lord's Day, Lord's Supper; as it requires Baptism, to qualify the subject for the Lord's Supper, and we must have the Lord's day in which to observe, or before we can have, the Supper. To thus contemplate and consider them is to do it in the order in which they are represented and exhibited in the New Testament Scriptures. We shall treat them in the order of their design and meaning.

That WATER is the proper element to be used in Baptism, or in which it is to be performed, is not only believed and inferred from the express language of Scripture, but has been, and is now, admitted by almost every sect of the professors of the Christian Religion. That is the element which God, in his wisdom, selected for very obvious reasons, as the most appropriate for the performance of this rite or institution. Baptism is represented and spoken of in the scriptures, as a BURIAL, as a BIRTH, and as an ABLUTION or washing; and hence the necessity of water. As a *burial*, "we are buried with him [Christ] by BAPTISM" BU-

RIED with him *in BAPTISM*"—"what shall they do which are BAPTISED for THE DEAD, if the dead RISE not at all? why are they then BAPTISED for THE DEAD?" As a *birth*; "Except a man be BORN of WATER and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." As a *washing* or *ablution*; "But ye are WASHED, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God"—Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our *bodies* WASHED with pure WATER." In one place this new birth and ablution are in our common version, introduced or spoken of together in close and inseparable connexion; "According to his mercy he saved us by the WASHING of REGENERATION, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

It is as a commemorative institution, of the burial and resurrection of the Messiah, that we design considering Baptism here, as one of the evidences of the Christian Religion. It is from this that its action derives all its significancy, and all its validity. If it is not its design to represent these in its action, and if it is not thus emblematical of them, then, "any application of water will do," pouring, sprinkling or immersing. The idea of a birth and an ablution cannot be conceived in either of the actions of pouring and sprinkling, as these are performed in lieu of baptism; but are perfectly consistent with that of immersion in Christian baptism. A birth always implies a coming out of or from, which cannot possibly take place without a previous *burial* or overwhelming of the subject of the birth in some way; and an ablution implies a thorough washing of the *whole* subject. Now in immersion there is a coming out of or from the water, and a thorough washing or wetting of the whole body, neither of which take place in pouring or sprinkling. It was with this view of this institution, that the Saviour told Nicodemus it was necessary to "be *born of water*;" in order to enter into his kingdom; and Paul, the Hebrews, in his epistle to them, that they had their "*bodies* washed with pure *water*;" and told Titus, in his epistle to him, that we are saved by "the *washing* of *regeneration*," or "*bath*," as is the proper translation of the Greek, *loutron*, here termed washing." It is almost universally ad-

mitted, I believe, by all eminent, erudite and popular biblical critics and commentators, that Christian Baptism is meant in the passages quoted here from John iii. 5, 1 Corinthians vi. 11, Titus iii. 5, and Hebrews x. 22. We might adduce the testimonies of the Presbyterians Henry and Scott, the Congregationalist Doddridge, John Wesley the Father of Methodism, and Dr. Adam Clarke the prince of Methodistic commentators, all of which are lying by us, but it would be foreign to our subject, from which we are digressing; and we shall have a use for them in the essays we intend writing on Baptism. We have introduced the birth and ablution of water here, to show their consistency with Baptism as a commemorative institution, and inconsistency with any other action than that of immersion.

Paul, in the same chapter in 1 Corinthians in which he emphasises so upon the death, burial and resurrection of our Saviour, argues his resurrection, which had been denied by some of the Corinthians to whom he wrote. After introducing the witnesses who saw him and further arguing and expatiating upon it, he makes one of his final appeals to Baptism as a commemorative rite. "What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" As much as to say, If Christ arose not from the dead, why are those who believe upon him thus buried in the water of baptism and raised out of it, as he was buried in the grave and arose from it? What could have originated such an institution as this, but the reality of the facts it represents? The observations of Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comment on this passage, is conclusive for immersion, and subversive of pouring and sprinkling. "The sum of the Apostle's meaning," says he, "appears to be this: If there be no resurrection of the dead, those who, in becoming Christians, expose themselves to 'all manner of privations, crosses, severe sufferings, and a violent death, can have no compensation, nor any motive sufficient to induce them to expose themselves to such miseries. But as they receive baptism as an EMBLEM of death, in voluntarily going under the WATER; so they receive it as an EMBLEM of the resurrection unto eternal

life, in coming up out of the WATER; thus they are baptized for the dead, in perfect faith of the resurrection." Is it not in reference to his burial and resurrection that our Saviour says; "can ye drink of the cup that I [am to] drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am [or must] be baptized with?" But Paul is too plain and positive on Rom. vi. 3 and 4, to be misunderstood. He affirms that by Baptism are represented the burial and resurrection of the Lord. "Know ye not," says he, "that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are BURIED with him by BAPTISM into DEATH; that like as Christ was RAISED UP from the DEAD by the glory of the Father, even we also should walk in newness of life." Mr. Wesley is as conclusive here on Romans as Dr. Clarke is on Corinthians. He says that Paul is "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by IMMERSION;" and that this burial, resurrection and walking in newness of life, "says the Apostle, our very baptism REPRESENTS to us." Dr. Doddridge says, in his note on this passage; "It seems the part of candour to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by IMMERSION, as most usual in these early times;" and Dr. Clarke; "It is probable that the Apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by IMMERSION, the whole body being put under the WATER, which seemed to say, the man is drowned, is dead; and, when he came up out of the WATER he seemed to have a resurrection to life; the man is RISEN again; he is alive." Equally as plain and decisive is the testimony of Paul in Colossians ii. 12 as in Romans. "BURIED with him [Christ] in BAPTISM, says he to the Colossians, "wherein also ye are RISEN with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath RAISED him from the DEAD." Mr. Wesley says that; "The ancient manner of baptizing by IMMERSION is manifestly alluded to here;" Dr. Doddridge refers us to his note on Romans just quoted; and Dr. Adam Clarke lays aside all probabilities, and says; "Alluding to the immersions practised in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be BURIED under the WATER, as Christ was buried in the earth. His rising again the third day, and their EMERGING from the WATER, was an EMBLEM

of the resurrection of the body: and in them, of a total change of life." We shall finish this list of testimonies with those of that eminent and learned Presbyterian biblical critic, Dr. James McKnight—Rom. vi. 4. Christ "submitted to be BAPTIZED, that is to be BURIED under the WATER by John, and to be RAISED out of it again, as an EMBLEM of his future death and resurrection. In like manner, the BAPTISM of believers is EMBLEMATICAL of their own death, burial, and resurrection."—1 Cor. xv. 29. "Baptism being an EMBLEMATICAL REPRESENTATION of the death, and burial, and resurrection, not only of Christ but of all mankind, Rom. vi. 4. it was fitly made the rite of initiation into the Christian Church; and the person who received it, thereby publicly professing his belief of the resurrection of Christ and of the dead, might with the greatest propriety be said to have been baptized for the dead, that is, for his belief of the resurrection of the dead."—Coloss. ii. 12. "Because this spiritual circumcision [ver. 11.] is to be completed by Christ's raising our bodies fashioned like to his glorious body, SIGNIFIED in BAPTISM, by the RAISING of the body out of the WATER, the Apostle, in this verse, to finish his description of the spiritual circumcision, adds, 'Being buried with him in baptism, in which also ye have been raised with him' &c."—"in which BAPTISM also, that it might be a complete EMBLEM of your circumcision, ye have been RAISED with him out of the WATER, as persons made spiritually alive, through your belief of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead." Henry and Scott of former times, and professor Stuart of Andover, and Mr. Barnes of our own day, and every critic and commentator, without a single exception, as far as known to us, agree in admitting that Christian baptism, *water baptism*, is meant in these passages. This admission is all that *immersion* need ask from them. Mr. Wesley and Drs. Clarke and McKnight have fairly given up sprinkling and pouring, in the quotations we have here made from their writings. The admitting and making this institution *emblematical* or *commemorative*, confines its action in figure to the facts represented by it, to the exclusion of every other action. We advert not here to the meaning of the origin-

al (Greek) *baptizo* as used in the ancient Greek Classics and in modern Greek Lexicons; neither do we take up the objections drawn from a want of correspondence in *antithesis* in Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12., and a *spiritual*, instead of a *water* baptism. The futility of these and their utter want of any foundation, we design showing at some subsequent time. Neither is it necessary to say much on the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper, as it is, as far as we know, universally agreed, by all parties in religion, that on this day our Saviour arose from the dead, and that the bread and wine in the Supper, also almost as universally observed, when attended to, on this day, are emblematical of the breaking of his body and the shedding of his blood.

These *three* commemorative institutions form a *threefold* CHAIN of evidence for Christianity, which, though sometimes smaller and sometimes larger, has never yet been broken since its commencement and the formation of its first links. Infidelity, in all the forms and modes in which it has attacked the Christian Religion, has left it untouched and never been able to sever it. Could the records of time and all its unwritten history be laid open before us, we could trace all its parts back, link by link, through every age and every century which has passed away since its origin. We could go from Immersion to Immersion, until we would come to the burial and resurrection of the Messiah; from Lord's Day unto Lord's Day, until the day on which he arose from the grave; and from Lord's Supper unto Lord's Supper, until we would come to Calvary, where he suffered and died, where his body was broken for our sins and his blood poured out for their remission. This is a chain connecting firmly and indissolubly the past with the present; and link shall be added to link, until it shall extend from the beginning to the end of the Christian dispensation, and connect them together in one unbroken series!

These *three* commemorative institutions are the *three adamantine* PILLARS, upon which the Temple of Christianity rests; which, immovable and unshaken, Infidelity in all its various attacks, has never aimed at or touched; and which all its battering rams and artillery may assail in vain. R₁

sing from the pedestals formed by the three grand and supernatural facts of the *death, burial and resurrection* of the Lord, and supported by the foundation of the "*Rock*" which He has laid, they rear its resplendent walls & battlements, above the "tempests" of infidelity, the mists of superstition, and the clouds of error, to where the Sun of Righteousness, inexhausted and inexhaustible, pours his radiance upon it in one perpetual day!

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm,
Though round its breast the rolling clouds
are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

From commemorative institutions is drawn the strongest argument which can be adduced in support of the certainty of the Christian facts and events. Three great arguments are drawn from these three institutions, "introduced at the time of the events which they celebrate and perpetuate ever since;" constituting "a species of evidence that has never been falsified in the records of all time." Should the facts and events of the birth of Washington, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and the battle of New Orleans, ever be denied, the American could point to their celebrations and silence the denier. And thus can the Christian point to Baptism, the Lord's Day and Lord's Supper, and put to silence the infidel. Will the objector to Christianity point us to any other causes for the origin of the institutions, than the facts and events from which they took their rise? Can he account for their existence in any other way? Until then, let him be silent and hold his peace. But, alas! how have the action and meaning of these institutions been perverted, by the innovators and corruptors of Christianity! Baptism "is converted into a Pagan lustration, a Jewish ablution, or Levitical sprinkling holy water;" "the Lord's Day is a Christian Sabbath, a substitute for a Jewish sanctification of a seventh part of time;" and "the Lord's Supper has lost its significance as a commemorative institution in being converted into transubstantiation, consubstantiation," and a sacrament. Thus men have endeavoured to place upon the three great facts and events of the Gospel, so

important and full of meaning, three pillars of "wood, hay and stubble;" and have built a temple upon them of their own planning and of like materials to worship the Lord in! Call it by what name you will, it is not the Temple of Christianity; and while this shall stand, they are destined to fall and crumble into ruins to rise no more!

That our readers may appreciate properly the value and importance of commemorative evidence, or evidence drawn from commemorative institutions, we will give the conclusion of this article an excellent extract from Dr. Abercrombie's work on the "*Intellectual Powers.*" Treating upon memory, he observes:—

"It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the subject of arbitrary association, as the observation of every one will furnish numerous examples of it. There is one application of the principle, however, which deserves to be referred to in a more particular manner. I allude to the practice of commemorative rites, or periodical observances, for transmitting the remembrance of remarkable events. These are in their nature, in general, entirely arbitrary; or, if they have any analogy to the events, the relation is only figurative. But the influence of such celebrations is of the most extensive and most important kind. If the events, particularly, are of a very uncommon character, these rites remove any feeling of uncertainty which attaches to traditional testimony, when it has been transmitted through a long period of time, and consequently through a great number of individuals. They carry us back, in one unbroken series, to the period of the events themselves, and to the individuals who were witnesses to them.

The most important application of the principle in the manner now referred to, is in the observances of religion which are intended to commemorate those events which are connected with the revelation of the Christian faith. The importance of this mode of transmission has not been sufficiently attended to, by those who have urged the insufficiency of human testimony to establish the birth of events which are at variance with the common course of nature. We have formerly alluded to one part of this sophism, and have stated the grounds on which we contend that no ob-

jection to the credibility of these events can be founded upon our observation of what we call the course of nature. We have admitted that a much higher species of evidence is required for them than would be required for events which correspond with our previous observation; and this high and peculiar evidence is confirmed in a striking manner by the periodical rites now referred to. By means of these we are freed entirely from every impression of the fallibility of testimony, possibility of the statements having been fabricated; as were conducted in one uninterrupted series to the period when the events took place, and to the individuals who witnessed them. This will appear, if we state in a few words a hypothetical case. Let us conceive a person attempting to impose upon the world by an account of some wonderful or miraculous event, which he alleges occurred five hundred years ago. He, of course, exerts every possible ingenuity in fabricating documents, and framing the appearance of a chain of testimony in support of his statement. It is quite possible that he might thus deceive a considerable number of credulous persons; and that others, who did not believe his statement, might yet find difficulty in proving its fallacy. But if their report were further to bear testimony, that ever since the occurrence of the alleged event it had been regularly and specially celebrated by a certain periodical observance, it is clear that this would bring the statement to the test of a fact open to examination, and that the fallacy of the whole would be instantly detected.

"On these principles it must appear that the statements of the sacred writings, respecting the miraculous events which are said to have occurred upwards of 1800 years ago, could not have been fabricated at any intermediate era during that period. It is unnecessary to state how much more improbable it is that they could have been fabricated at the very time and place in which they are said to have occurred, and in the midst of thousands who are said to have witnessed them, many of whom were deeply interested in detecting their fallacy. This part of the question is not connected with our present inquiry, but it is impossible to dismiss the subject without one reflection:—that if we are to proceed upon

the principle of probabilities, we must balance fairly the probabilities of fabrication. If we do so, we hesitate not to assert, that the probability of the world being imposed upon, under all the circumstances now alluded to, is more at variance with our firm and unalterable experience than all that we are called upon to believe."

The argument drawn from *baptism* as a commemorative institution of the Messiah's burial and resurrection, is almost or perhaps quite as conclusive against the opposer of immersion, as the action of baptism, is against the infidel denier of the truth of the facts represented by that institution. If the *real* action of baptism has not always been *immersion*, will he show us how, when, and where it originated? Until then, let him hold his peace and remain in silence. Pious and sincere as he may be, while he opposes *immersion* as Christian baptism, he contends against one of the most powerful arguments, one of the strongest evidences, of the divine authenticity of Christianity, loses it in whole or in part, puts it away from him, and is really and actually, though unknowingly, and unintentionally, taking part with the infidel opposer of the religion which he professes to esteem and venerate so highly!

EDITOR.

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. 2.

BRO. HOWARD:—In my former communication I spoke of sundry misapplications of Scripture.

In this, I shall speak of another kind of misapplication, which I shall call the "*Room of application*," or the confounding of things, such as *Circumcision*, *Dedication*, and *Baptism*. These Institutions belonged to three distinct Dispensations; the *Patriarchal*, in which the promise was a *numerous seed*; the *Mosaic*, in which the promise was the *land of Canaan*; and the *Christian*, in which the promise is *eternal life*.

Those who say that baptism came in the room of circumcision, first confound circumcision, and dedication, as though they were one and the same thing. Hence they speak of dedicating their children to the

Lord in Baptism,—and at the same time say that it came in the room of circumcision. Such reasoners do not know, that none were dedicated in the days of Abraham, and that dedication belonged exclusively to the Mosaic Dispensation,—nor do they know that none were initiated into the Church under Moses by circumcision; which will be clearly seen by reading Joshua v. chap. Not a soul was circumcised from the passage through the Red Sea until after the passage through Jordan under Joshua. Then Joshua renewed circumcision, not for the purpose of initiating them into the Jewish Church however; because they were already of that body, and constituted the Church in the wilderness, under Moses their leader, while uncircumcised. So that it cannot be shown from the Scriptures, that ever an individual was inducted into the Jewish Church by circumcision.

The fact is, that they were *born* Jews, and not made so by circumcision. Hence, when the new dispensation or kingdom of Heaven was about to commence, and Nicodemus, a Rabbi of the Jews, called on the Lord to make enquiry how men were to be made subjects of the new reign, he was told by a *new-birth*, which he understood to be a *re-birth*, and could not imagine how a grown person could be *re-born*! This shews that it was by a birth, and not by circumcision that the Jews became subject to the law of Moses. And by a re-birth of "*Water and Spirit*," instead of Mother and Father, they became subjects of the government of Jesus Christ, called the kingdom of God.

It would be more rational, therefore, to say, that *Baptism* came in the room of the *natural birth*, than to say that it came in the room of either *Circumcision* or *Dedication*; seeing that neither circumcision nor dedication was ever used as initiatory institutions.

If any one will read the law of Dedication as recorded in Leviticus the 27 chap. they will see that men, women, and children, of all ages could be dedicated;—and that beasts both clean and unclean could also be dedicated;—and that any thing thus dedicated, whether man, woman, child or beast, clean or unclean, could be redeemed with *money*. If, then, children are ded-

icated in Baptism, they are all redeemable with money according to the law of dedication.

See how badly the law of dedication fits in this dispensation. It is like planting Sugar cane in latitude 45 degrees North.

Then turn to Genesis the 17 chap. and read the law of circumcision as delivered to Abraham; and you will find that *males* only were the subjects of that law,—and that two things entitled them to the rite; 1st. to be born an Israelite, and 2nd. to be purchased with money.

From which it will be seen that that law, will not suit this Dispensation any better than the law of Dedication.

Baptism embraces both males and females, of all nations, provided they believe the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But neither animals nor unbelievers, have any right to the ordinance.

Therefore it is evident, that Baptism did not come in the room of either circumcision, or dedication; and that those who contend that it did, misapply both the law of circumcision, and the law of dedication.

Another misapplication of this kind, is the confounding the *change of heart*, with the *new-birth*, the former of which existed in all the preceding dispensations, as well as in the present, but the latter, belongs exclusively to the present dispensation or kingdom of Heaven.

No such thing as a new-birth, or re-birth, is mentioned in the Jewish Scriptures;—and for the best of reasons; it being that by which men enter into the kingdom of Heaven, which kingdom was not established until after the advent of Jesus Christ; therefore none could be born into it. It would not be more absurd to speak of men's being born into the world before the creation, than to speak of the new-birth before the kingdom of Heaven was set up, which did not take place till in the days of those Kings of whom Daniel the Prophet spoke, when interpreting the dream of the King of Babylon, namely in the days of the Cæsars.

Therefore none of the old Saints were born again; yet they all experienced a change of heart. Hence it is evident that a change of heart is not the new-birth, although the change of heart is necessary and must precede the new-birth.

W. WINANS.

Divine Origin of Christianity.

NO. 2.

CHARACTER AND OFFICES OF THE MESSIAH.

In the concluding part of our preceding or first number on the divine origin of the Christian Religion, we announced to our readers, that in our next, or some future No. we intended to take up the character and offices of the Apostles; but not having said as much there as we wished about the Saviour, we have been induced from this and other considerations, to defer it until our next, and to give place to an essay on the character and offices of the Messiah.

The Christian cannot know too much about the Messiah. It is important to him to be as well acquainted as revelation or the word of God can make him with his Lord, the character and offices of that Lord, and all the relations which he sustains to God, to man, and to the Universe. We say, *the word of God*; because it reveals to us all that we do know or can know, on these interesting, sublime and important subjects. The common-sense individual of the humblest capacity, with his Bible in one hand and a good Lexicon of his language in the other, can attain to all the necessary knowledge of divine things, so plain and easy of apprehension are all the revelations of God. To the Bible, as we have before asserted, every system of theology and body of divinity are indebted for all real and correct knowledge of religion which they contain; and to this book we wish to direct the eyes of our readers and to confine our inquiries, on this most momentous and interesting subject.

The Christian Religion being a divine system, must have a divine origin, and having a divine origin, must have a divine Author. It accordingly claims a divine origin, and a divine Founder; and with these claims well attested and confirmed, it comes to us demanding our faith and obedience. All human systems of religion (and of these there are & have been many) are of human origin, and have men for their founders.—Christianity not being one of these, claims a higher origin and a superior Founder. It as infinitely surpasses all human systems, and its Author, all human founders, as the

sun does the planets which shine only by the reflection of his light.

The Lord Jesus Christ is the divine Author and Founder of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION. It is from Him that it takes its name, and all real Christians, their name. He is emphatically and definitively—"THE SON OF GOD." It is upon this ROCK, upon this firm and immovable foundation, that he told his apostle Peter he would build his church, (the CHRISTIAN church); and for confessing this TRUTH he gave him the promise of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. "Thou art THE Christ," says Peter, "THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD." "Upon this ROCK*," replies the Saviour, "I will build MY church; and the gates of hell [hades] shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee THE KEYS of the kingdom of heaven." It is through the belief of this truth, that another apostle, John, affirms that we are to obtain eternal life. "These [signs or miracles] 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." The belief of this proposition is, then, according to John, what is necessary to constitute any one a "believer," and entitle him to life; and according to the Saviour's declaration to Peter, what is also necessary in order to be built upon the ROCK. We mean the belief from the heart of this proposition, in its full and scriptural import and meaning, including every thing connected with it; and by the term "belief," we mean not "faith only," but as including the "obedience of faith." We see, according to the declaration and affirmation, what greater faith, what other faith, or faith in any thing else, can be required in order to life and a place in the spiritual temple of the Lord. Certain we are, that no real Christian, who understands his religion, can either rationally or consistently require any

*The name "Peter" is translated from *petros*, masculine, and "rock" from *petra* feminine. So our Saviour did not tell Peter he would build his church upon him, as contend the catholics, but upon what he had declared The Jews in the wilderness, says Paul, (1 Cor. x. 4. "drank of that spiritual Rock [*petram*] that followed them: and that Rock [*petra*] was Christ.")

other confession of faith in Christ. Philip required no other of the Eunuch when he baptized him. "See here is water;" said the Eunuch as they were journeying along, "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" "If thou BELIEVEST *with all thine heart*, thou mayest," answered Philip. "I believe that Jesus Christ is THE SON OF GOD," responds the Eunuch. Paul and Silas required no more of the Jailor, when they baptized him and his house. "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"—is the inquiry of the Jailor. "BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST; and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," is the reply.

If any one will show us where, in all the Christian record from Pentecost down, any more, or any thing else, than this was required, we will thank him, and yield the position here assumed.

All "professors" of every sect and name who claim for their systems the religion of the Bible, how much soever they may differ as Trinitarians, Unitarians, &c. profess to believe this truth—that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Upon this truth—the belief of this one proposition and acknowledgement of the Messiah,—all were once united in the days of primitive Christianity, and all must be united again when its corruptions shall be done away. Differ as much as they otherwise may, they all profess to agree here, on this most *fundamental* and important truth, the *pivot* if I may be allowed the use of the figure here, upon which the whole system of Christianity turns. Would they now abandon their *speculations*, call Bible things by *Bible names*, and rest contented with the representations of this Book, they would again agree, again be united, not only in their views of the character and offices of the Messiah, but on all other subjects embraced within the divine volume. It is *speculation* which has generally led men into error on this and almost every other subject connected with it. Speculation has always been a most fruitful source of error, not only in religion, but in every thing else upon which it has been employed; and is forbidden, not only by the clearness, perspicuity and explicitness of the revelations and representations of the Bible, but by divine injunction itself. Men have not been satisfied with the representations of the Son

of God which the Holy Spirit has revealed in his word, but must speculate upon them, must reconcile their seeming inconsistencies, and make out a system of views to suit their notions and opinions. Nor have they stopped here, but must attempt to pry into things upon which revelation is silent, and which, incomprehensible to them and not necessary to be known, God in his wisdom has not revealed. The language which Moses used to the Israelites concerning the law, we may with equal propriety apply to ourselves in reference to the Gospel. "The *secret* things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which *are revealed* belong unto us, and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.." Speculation in religion has always had an evil tendency. It has almost invariably drawn man off from the performance of the commands of God and the duties enjoined upon him by his creator.

We object to the terms *Trinity, Eternal Son, &c.* simply because they are not *Bible* terms; and therefore do not use them. They belong to the language of Ashdod, and not that of Canaan. We make use of the vocabulary of Heaven in preference to that of the world; and have learned to call the things revealed by the Holy Spirit by the terms which the Spirit used. Certain we are, that in thus speaking of them we are right and cannot be wrong, and that in calling them by other names, we may be wrong, not right. Besides, in using these names of *human* invention, we must speak without *meaning* to the Bible student, who is unacquainted with sectarian theology and scholastic divinity. What would the Roman, Corinthian, and Ephesian Christians, to whom Paul addressed his epistles, have understood by the term, Trinity, or the names, Trinitarian and Unitarian, had any of our "theologians" been there to have used them? They might have unrolled their parchments and searched Paul's epistles for them in vain. To them they would have been unintelligible jargon. They would have perfectly understood what was meant by the names, God, the Word, and Holy Spirit—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, because they were acquainted with their meaning, and made familiar with them by the teachings and writings of the Apostles. Our reverence for God and for His word, induces us

to use the plain, intelligible and appropriate terms and names of the Holy Spirit, in preference to this unintelligible jargon and barbarous nomenclature. We do not see how any intelligent Christian can so abate his reverence for God and love for his word, as to give these terms and phrases of human devising and invention the preference over the vocabulary of Heaven!

But in discarding terms, names and phrases from our use because they are not *scriptural*, we wish not to be understood as rejecting the things and truths of the Bible for which they have been made to stand, by being substituted for the real terms and phrases there used. The *innocent* have been made to *suffer* much here. Because they reject these names, &c. they are supposed also to reject those things and truths in the definition of which they are employed and to which they have been appropriated; and are accused of "denying the divinity of the Saviour," "the operation of the Spirit," "the atonement," &c.! We suffer by misrepresentation here in the same way as do many of the opposers of Bible, Tract and Temperance Societies, Sunday Schools, Missionary Societies, &c. In consequence of their opposing these they are charged with being unfriendly to the progress and extension of Christianity, of the conversion of the Heathen, Temperance, &c. when they are really as great or greater friends to all these, than those who so unjustly accuse them. It is merely these plans and modes of accomplishing these objects to which they are opposed.

Jesus Christ was the Son of God in the real and full import of that term. The name Son is a *relative* term, as are all the names of God but *one*. Had this been noticed and attended to as it ought, the "religious" world would have been saved from all the scholastic strifes and questions about the "Trinity" and the mode of the Divine existence; and we would have had none of this barbarous and unintelligible jargon about the Trinity, Unity, Filiation, Eternal Generation, Procession, &c., and none of these names, Trinitarian, Unitarian, Socinian, Arian, &c. With the exception of this *one* name to which we have alluded, all the names of God are the names of relations. The name God is a relative term. Were there no Satan there would be no

God, or term God; as this is used in relation to Satan, as the term *good* is in relation to *evil*. And in the same way were there no *mighty* there could be no *Almighty*; were there no *dominion*, there would be no *Lord*; if no *creation* no *Creator*; if no *subjects*, no *King*, &c. The term *JEHOVAH* is the only absolute and irrelative name of God in our language. It is equivalent to *I am, I exist*, and is only applicable to Him who is SELF-EXISTENT. It has no relation to any other being in time and eternity, past, present and to come; and therefore to no *creature*.

As the term Son is a *relative* term, were there no Son there could be no Father, as there could be no Father without a Son. These imply relations which began in time, not in eternity. It is as impossible for there to be an *eternal* Son as an *eternal* Father. Can we imagine a *son* before he is born, or a *father* before he has a son? Reason and commonsense would say no; and language could not define such a relation. Man was created in the image and after the likeness of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our *image*, after our *likeness*."

* * * So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." The relation of man *and* woman did not exist until the creation of Eve. Eve was created from Adam. "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, *because she was taken out of Man*. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be *one flesh*." It is not in reference to the man alone as one individual, that he is said to have been created in the image or likeness of God; it is in reference to *both* as "*one flesh*." This is evident from another notice of their creation. "In the day that God created man, in the *likeness* of God made he *him*; male and female created he *them*; and blessed them, and called *their* name *Adam*, in the day when *they* were created. And Adam lived an hun

dred and thirty years, and begat a son in *his own likeness*, after *his image*." The term "*them*" here is placed in opposition to, or correspondence with, "*him*," and the term "*likeness*" is as applicable to one as the other, as also the terms "*their*" and "*Adam*." The name Adam is applied to both, because, as says Paul, "the husband is the head of the wife." "Wives!" says he, "submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; *for the husband is the head of the wife*, even as Christ is the Head of the Church: and he is the Saviour of the Body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands! love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself; for no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. *This is a great mystery*: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." The same Apostle in his first epistle to the Corinthians, in directing them how to behave and deport themselves at their meetings, illustrates still further the relation between *man* and *woman*. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the *image* and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." We now come to a point in this essay to which we have been all along looking from its commencement, and from which we can not only take a retrospective review of what we have said, but also be better enabled to look forward over the ground upon which we shall enter.

As there were unity, plurality and society in man when first created, so must

there be unity, plurality and society in God, in whose image and likeness he was made. And (Greek, *theos*, singular) God (*eipen*, singular) said, (*poicesomen*, plural) Let us make (*an thropon*, singular) man in (*heemeteran*, from plural *heemeis*, we, us) our (*eikona*, singular) image, after (*heemeteran*) our (*homioisin*, singular) likeness, and (*archetosan*, plural) let them have dominion," &c. "So (*theos*) God (*epoicesen*, singular) created (*anthropon*) man (*eikona*) in his own image, in (*eikona*) the image (*theou*) of God (*epoicesen*) created he (*auton*) him; (*arsen*, singular,) male and (*theclu*, singular) female (*epoicesen*) created he (*autous*, plural) them." Again, we read in another notice of the creation of man, by the inspired historian Moses: "In the day that (*theos*) God (*epoicesen*) created (*Adam**) man, in the (*eikona*) likeness (*theou*) of God (*epoicesen*) made he (*auton*) him: (*arsen*) male and (*theclu*) female (*epoicesen*) created he (*autous*) them; and blessed (*autous*) them, and called (*onoma*) their name Adam, in the day when (*epoicesen* *autous*, he created them) they were created." We have been thus particular here in repeating these quotations, and giving the nouns and verbs of the original with their numbers, for the sake of our unlearned readers, that they may understand us well, and appreciate properly our remarks; and also that we may leave as little room as possible for *speculation* and fruitless controversy upon this subject, of both of which it has been a most prolific theme.

As the man is the "head of the woman," the terms "Adam" and "man" are made use of by Moses, the inspired narrator of the history of creation, in reference to both; and he has been followed in this by all the inspired penmen since, both prophets and apostles. The term "man" has been very commonly used by subsequent writers, and is as often made use of now, to designate the whole human race of both sexes. Paul, the apostle to the Gentile world, brought up at the feet of Gam-

* Thomson has translated this more correctly thus: "This is the genealogy of (*an thropon*, plural) men. On the day God made (*adam*) Adam, he made him after an image of God."

ahel, a learned Doctor of the Mosaic law, and instructed in all the Jewish lore and wisdom, has in his writings, strictly observed and adhered to, the use of terms and phrases employed by Moses, of whose law he was such an infallible and able expounder. As man "is the image and glory of God," and woman "the glory of the man," according to Paul,—Moses said in reference to his creation; "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them;" and in reference to God; "God said, Let us make man in our image, in our likeness—so God created man in his own image." Here is unity, plurality and society in man, a *him* and a *them*, and unity, plurality and society in God, a *his*, a *we*, and *our*. The former plainly imply all the latter, without which they could not have been, without which there could have been no image or likeness. Man was created in the image of God in the faculties and endowments of his mind or spirit, and man and woman were created in his image in plurality and society. So speaks the language of inspiration to our understanding, and so nature interprets the sacred volume.

And what and how is this plurality and this society in God? Let the volume of God's revelations, speak. "In the beginning was THE WORD, and the Word was with God, and THE WORD was God." Here is unity, plurality and society, implied and expressed as much as in man's creation, when it is said;—"in the image of God created He HIM, male and female created He THEM." God, in whose image man was created, always had his Word and always had his Spirit. They are as eternal and uncreated as himself; and are and ever have been *one* and the *same* with him; and are all together, the eternal, uncreated, unoriginated, *self-existent* JEHOVAH. The "Word was God," and "God is a Spirit;" and the Word is the "Word of God," and the Spirit, "the Spirit of God" We cannot imagine or comprehend how *three* beings, having *bodies* and occupying space and time, can be one and the same being! But we can conceive that three *spiritual* existences can be one and the same. But man, vain, weak, erring man, because he comparing spiritual things with corporeal,

his Creator with the created, cannot comprehend the one, rejects the other; and, while professing to be a *Christian* and to believe *all* that his God tells him, refuses to receive all the information he has imparted to him, and thus rejects the plain truths of revelation!! Might he not as well, and could he not on the same grounds, refuse to believe that there is a self-existent Creator, because he cannot comprehend how such a thing could be?!—how He could be without beginning and infinite! Yet he professes to believe this, and the other is not any more incomprehensible or unreasonable! Belief in one is as much objectionable and rejectable on the score of *incomprehensibility* as the other. We call not upon any one to believe a proposition *because* it is incomprehensible. On this ground we might claim their credence to any thing under the sun which we might propose, however absurd. But we call for their faith, when we present the *testimony* of the word of God; and claim their credence to what God *has revealed* concerning Himself and his Son, and not to any of our affirmations, assertions or speculations. Man, as we have said, was created in the image of God, as it respects the faculties and endowments of his mind or *spirit*, and thus bears a likeness to the *Spirit* of God; and the man and woman were created in the image of God, and thus in their plurality and society bear a likeness to God and his Word. Indeed man has plurality and unity in his individual self, as he has a body, soul and spirit, and is but one being. So teaches revelation, and so nature interprets.

Our Saviour was the Son of God and the Son of man, as he himself affirmed during his ministry on earth. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"—"and the Word was made FLESH [or became INCARNATE] and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *only* BEGOTTEN of the Father,) full of grace and truth." He became "the Son of God" by his conception and birth. "Adam was a son of God, and all Christians are sons and daughters of God," but our Lord was not created out of the earth like Adam, was not adopted into the family of God by faith like Christians, and was not born of superanu-

ated parents by special promise and a particular providence like Isaac or John the baptist; but born of a VIRGIN, one who had never known man, and therefore the Son of God, descended from above, and heavenly in his origin. This was foretold to his mother by the angel sent to predict his birth to her. "Hail, thou art highly favoured, blessed art thou among women. Fear not, Mary, thou hast found favour with God, and thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shall bring forth a son, and shall name his name JESUS." Mary inquires, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" The angel replies, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also that holy thing which shall be BORN of thee, shall be CALLED the SON OF GOD." A Jew whose name is Joseph takes Mary to be his wife; but being espoused to her and learning her situation resolves to separate from her. An angel informs him of her real situation and predicts the birth of the Messiah. We will let his disciple and historian Matthew relate the circumstances. "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Spirit. Then Joseph her husband, being a just [virtuous] man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived [begotten] in her is of [by] the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS [i. e. Saviour]: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and they shall call his name Emmanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us. Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her first born son: and called his name JESUS." Thus the Word became the Son of God by a conception and birth, and a new relation

of Father and Son began, who before were God and the Word. Not only did his deportment, teachings, conduct, manifest his character as the Son of God, but the acknowledgement of him as such by his Father, and the miraculous works which he performed. Twice was he declared by the immediate voice of God to be his Son; first at his baptism, and then at his transfiguration. Besides this, he was introduced to the Jewish nation, ("his own to whom he came and they received him not,") by the Prophets and by his harbinger, John the baptist or baptizer. But he appeals to his works, his miracles, as the evidences principally to be relied on in proof of his character and mission; and declares that the rejection of him without them would be senseless. "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." The same authority and power appeared in performing these, as in the creation of the Universe and all things of which it consists. His fiat was sufficient. "He spake and it was done! he commanded and it stood fast!" He said unto the deaf, "Be opened," and his ears were unstopped and he heard; He said to the blind, "Receive thy sight," and forthwith he opened his eyes and saw; He said to the lame, "Rise up and walk," and he immediately arose and walked; He said to the stormy sea, "Peace, be still," and all was calmness and silence; He said to the dead, "Lazarus come forth," and he came forth into life! He did not perform these works in the name of another, as did his disciples in His own name. His word alone is sufficient. And how is his fiat like that by which the Universe was created! "God said, Let there be light: and there was light." "God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters—and it was so." "God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so." And thus in regard to all the other works of creation. The works done by the Messiah were equal in their performance to the works of creation. Indeed it was by Him that the Universe was created. "In the BEGINNING," at creation, "was the Word, and the Word was WITH God, and the Word was God. The same was in the

beginning with God. *All things were made by HIM; and without HIM was not any thing made that was made.* "He was in the world, and the world was made by HIM, and the world knew him not." *In the beginning,*" says Moses, "God created the heavens and the earth;" and Paul speaking of God says, "who created *ALL things* by Jesus Christ;" and again in Colossians, "*by HIM were ALL things created,* that are in heaven, and that are in earth—*ALL things were created by HIM* and for HIM: and HE is BEFORE *ALL things,* and by HIM *ALL things* consist;" and again in Hebrews, "*by whom* he [God] also made the worlds—and UPHOLDING *ALL things* by the word of his power." But it is needless to multiply quotations. The Messiah was "the IMAGE of God—the image of the invisible God—the BRIGHTNESS of his GLORY, and the EXPRESS IMAGE of his PERSON," or as it is more correctly rendered in the New Version, "an EFFULGENCE of his GLORY and an EXACT REPRESENTATION of his CHARACTER." Thus "through faith," in the testimony of Moses in Genesis, "we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God;" and through the testimony of John, that "the WORD was [made FLESH [became INCARNATE] and dwelt among us," and "all things were made by him—and the world was made by him;" and through the testimony of Paul, that God created *ALL things* by JESUS CHRIST." Thus we learn that all things were created by the Word of God, that the Word became the Son of God, and that all things were created by Jesus Christ.

So intimate was the union between God and the Word, that "all things were made by him, [the Word] and without him was not any thing made that was made;" and so intimate was the union between the Father and Son, that "what things soever he [the Father] doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." As not only, "in the beginning was the Word," but, "the Word was God," Jesus could say in truth and with perfect propriety, "I and my Father are ONE," and "the Father is in me and I in him," and "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." As "the Word was God" and "the Word was made FLESH," Paul could truly and properly say, "God was MANIFEST in the FLESH," and "God was IN Christ, reconci-

ling the world unto himself." Hence the angel announced to Joseph, that his name should be called Emmanuel, "God with us;" and hence Paul in Hebrews could apply to Messiah the prophecy, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," and "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands;" and could say in Colossians, "*in HIM* [Christ] dwelleth *ALL* the FULNESS of the GODHEAD [or Divinity] *bodily*;" and in Romans, "Christ, *over ALL*, God blessed forever."

God having been characterised in the writings of Moses and the Prophets, our Saviour could be identified as his Son; and here perhaps is one reason why the Jewish economy preceded the Christian. Being the Son of God, all his teachings, works and miracles were exhibitions of his wisdom, benevolence and philanthropy; and as much so of his compassion and sympathy as of his power and might. He never exhibited his wonderful works merely to gratify the curiosity of individuals or multitudes; but in assisting the distressed and healing the afflicted. He performed no miracle for the curiosity of Herod, but raised a poor widow's son; He would not change the stones into bread for Satan, but created the loaves and fishes to feed the hungry; He would not give the Jews the useless sign from heaven which they demanded, but died and arose from the grave for them. "He came to his own, (the Jews,)" but they notwithstanding all these astounding and supernatural evidences of his mission, "received him not," as the promised Messiah. Expecting some great temporal Deliverer, some mighty earthly Potentate, who would redeem them from under the yoke of their Roman masters and subject the whole world to their dominion, they could not regard the real Messiah in any greater light than some great prophet, or, in accordance with their speculative notions, one of their mighty prophets of old who had re-appeared among them. Hence when he asked his disciples, "Whom do men say that I am?" they reply, "Some say that thou art John, the baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Even his harbinger, John, seems at one time, and that after Jesus had been manifested by

the descent of the Holy Spirit at his baptism and declared by the voice of God to be his Son, to have doubted whether he was the Messiah or not. Hearing in prison of the miraculous works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples to him with the question, "Art thou he that should come, (the Messiah,) or look we for another?" Jesus tells them to report to him the works which he performed before them, which had been predicted of him by the prophets, and thus pointed him out and established his claims as the Christ. "Go," says he to them, "and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them."

Jesus was also the Son of man as well as the Son of God. As his mission to our world was not to redeem angels, but the children of men, he took not on him the angelic, but the human nature. "Forasmuch then," says Paul in Hebrews, "as the children are partakers of *flesh and blood*, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.* Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people: for in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted," and "we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Being the Son of God and of man, he united in himself the Divine and human natures, and combined the dignity, grandeur, glory, power and authority of God, with the humiliation, the abasement, degrada-

* "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision (to the Jews) for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."—Rom. xv, 8.

tion, poverty and suffering of man. Hence the seeming contrarieties which were predicted of the character of the Messiah and which really met in his person. "Being in the form of God, [he] thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in the fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." He was "*exalted and abased, master and servant, priest and victim, king and subject, mortal and a conqueror of death, rich and poor, a king, a conqueror, glorious, yet a man of grief, involved in our infirmities, and in a state of great humiliation.*" Being "God manifest in the flesh," he could say "I and the Father are one—the Father is *in me* and I *in him*," and yet at the same time say, "the Father is *greater* than I—the Son can *do nothing* of himself—I can *of mine own self do nothing*." He was "the *root and offspring* of David:" for "*all things* were made by him," and consequently David, and he was "the *son* of David—made of the seed of David, according to the flesh." It was in consequence of not understanding this, how Jesus was both the Lord and Son of David, that he put the Jews to silence with a question. He asked the Pharisees, "what think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" They reply very readily, "the Son of David." He then asks them, "how doth David in Spirit call him Lord? saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" To this they could give no reply. He could say to his disciples, "ye call me *Master* and Lord: and ye say well, for so I am;" and yet "he took on him the form of a *servant*." He was "made a high *priest* forever after the order of Melchisedec;" and yet "he hath given himself for us, an *offering and sacrifice* to God for a sweet-smelling savor—to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Though "all things were created by him and for him," and he is "heir of all things;" yet he was so poor that he had not "where to lay his head." He "became obedient unto *death*, even the death of the cross;" and yet he "*abolished* [or vanquished] death, and hath brought life

and immortality to light through the gospel."

Not only was his character made up of these seeming *contrarities*, but also of *contrasts*, as seemingly irreconcilable. "It had one distinction," says an eminent writer, "which, more than any thing, forms a perfect character. It was made up of contrasts; in other words it was a union of excellencies which are not easily reconciled, which seem at first sight incongruous, but which, when blended and duly proportioned, constitute moral harmony, and attract, with equal power, love and veneration. For example, we discover in Jesus Christ an unparalleled dignity of character, a consciousness of greatness, never discovered or approached by any other individual in history; and yet this was blended with a condescension, lowliness, and unostentatious simplicity, which had never before been thought consistent with greatness. In like manner he united an utter superiority to the world, to its pleasures and ordinary interests, with suavity of manners and freedom of austerity. He joined strong feeling and self-possession; an indignant sensibility to sin and compassion to the sinner; an intense devotion to his work, and calmness under opposition and ill success; a universal philanthropy, and a susceptibility of private attachments; the authority which became the Saviour of the world, and the tenderness and gratitude of a son. Such was the Author of our religion. And is his character to be explained by imposture or insane enthusiasm? Does it not bear the unambiguous marks of a heavenly origin?"

The Word being God, the Son being thus equal with the Father, all the names, offices and attributes of the Father belong unto him. "All things," says he, "that the Father hath are mine," and in his prayer, "all mine are thine, and thine are mine." The names God, Lord, Almighty, King, Redeemer, &c. belong as much to him as to the Father. He is not merely called the one or the other of these. They are not names without relations and offices, any more than the term Son or Saviour. When the prophet said "they shall call his name Emmanuel—God with us," he meant that he would be as really God with us as did the angel when announcing his

birth to Mary he said, "that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," meant that he really should be the Son of God, and when he said to Joseph, "thou shalt call his name Jesus," [Saviour] meant that he would really be the Saviour. Hence his disciple Thomas could say, "My Lord and my God," without meeting with a rebuke for applying a title to him which was not his in reality. When it is considered that the term "God" is *relative*, I do not see how any man who believes Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, can refuse it to him in its fullest import.

As the Messiah saw Philip under the figtree, when it was impossible for him to behold him with *human* eyes, and as all things were created by him and he upholds all things, he must be *OMNIPRESENT*; as "he knew *all* men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was *in* man," and as his apostle Peter could say, "Lord, thou knowest *ALL* things," without a rebuke, he was *OMNISCIENT*; as he has all power in heaven and in earth, he is *OMNIPOTENT*; as he could say, "before Abraham was, I am," and his apostle, "Christ preached unto the spirits in prison," (the antediluvians) through "Noah, a preacher of righteousness," and could say, "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last," before and after which we know nothing, he is *ETERNAL*. As he was "in the beginning with God," he is before the beginning; and as he is "the first born of every creature," he is before all creatures, and therefore *not a creature* himself. No, in worshipping Jesus we worship not a creature, but "God manifest in the flesh—God with us." "All men should honor the Son," says Jesus, "even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that sent him."—Think you that God has commanded, "Let all the *angels* of God worship him," and men are to be exempted? The angel refused the adoration of John in Patmos, and the Apostles rent their clothes because men were about to sacrifice to them, but they prostrate themselves before Jesus and he rebukes them not. In Him we have an almighty Lord, Saviour and Redeemer. "All power is given unto me," says he to

his apostles, "in heaven and in earth;" and then commissions them, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." He is therefore "able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him," but is "the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;" and "shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the GOSPEL of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Having been anointed with Holy Spirit, he is our Prophet, Priest and King. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life," says he, and "no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

EDITOR.

NOTE TO PRECEDING ESSAY.

The following contains the best exposition of John i. 1 that we recollect to have ever met with. It is from the 10th number of the 4th vol. of the "Christian Baptist." The first part of it, containing some preliminary remarks, is from another vol. of the same work.

Ed. C. R.

1. The pretensions of the Bible to a divine authority, or origin, are to be examined by our reason alone. Its evidences are addressed to our reason, and by our reasoning powers the question is to be answered, "Is the Bible of divine or human origin?" So soon as reason has decided this question, then,

2. The truths of the Bible are to be received as first principles, not to be tried by our reason, one by one, but to be received as new principles, from which we are to reason as from intuitive principles in any human science.

3. The terms found in the Bible are to be interpreted and understood in the common acceptation, as reason or use suggests their meaning; but the things taught are to be received, not because we have proved them by our reason to be truths, but because God has taught them to us,

* * * * *

The names *Jesus, Christ,* or *Messiah,* *Only Begotten Son, Son of God,* belong to

the Founder of the Christian religion, and to none else. They express not a relation existing before the christian era, but relations which commenced at that time. To understand the relation betwixt the Saviour and his Father, which existed before time, and that relation which began in time, is impossible on either of these theories. There was no Jesus, no Messiah, no Christ, no Son of God, no Only Begotten, before the reign of Augustus Cesar. The relation that was before the christian era, was not that of a son and a father, terms which always imply disparity; but it was that expressed by John in the sentence under consideration. The relation was that of God, and the "Word of God." This phraseology unfolds a relation quite different from that of a father and a son—a relation perfectly intimate, equal, and glorious. This naturally leads me to the 1st sentence of John. And here I must state a few *postulata*.

1. No relation amongst human beings can perfectly exhibit the relation which the Saviour held to the God and Father of All anterior to his birth. The reason is, that relation is not homogenous, or of the same kind with relations originating from creation. All relations we know any thing of are created, such as that of father and son.— Now I object as much to a created relation as I do to a creature in reference to the original relation of God and the word of God. This relation is an uncreated and unoriginal relation.

2. When in the fullness of time it became necessary in the wisdom of God to exhibit a Saviour, it became expedient to give some view of the original and eternal dignity of this wonderful visitant of the human race. And as this view must be given in human language, inadequate as it was, the whole vocabulary of human speech must be examined for suitable terms.

3. Of these terms expressive of relations, the most suitable must be, and most unquestionably was, selected. And as the relation was spiritual and not carnal, such terms only were eligible which had respect to mental or spiritual relations. Of this sort there is but one in all the archives of human knowledge, and that is the one selected.

4. The Holy Spirit selected the name *Word,* and therefore we may safely assert that this is the best, if not the only term, in the whole vocabulary of human speech adapted to express that relation which existed "in the beginning," or before time, between our Saviour and his God.

These *postulata* being stated, I proceed to inquire what sort of a relation does this term represent: And here every thing is plain

and easy of comprehension. I shall state numerically a few things universally admitted by the reflecting part of mankind:—

1st. A word is a sign or representative of a thought or an idea, and is the idea in an audible or visible form. It is the exact image of that visible thought which is a secret to all the world until it is expressed.

2d. All men think or form ideas by means of words or images, so that no man can think without words or symbols of some sort.

3d. Hence it follows that the word and the idea which it represents, are co-etaneous, or of the same age or antiquity. It is true the word may not be uttered or born for years or ages after the idea exists, but still the word is just as old as the idea.

4th. The idea and the word are nevertheless distinct from each other, though the relation between them is the nearest known on earth. An idea cannot exist without a word, nor a word without an idea.

5th. He that is acquainted with the word, is acquainted with the idea, for the idea is wholly in the word.

Now let it be most attentively observed and remembered that these remarks are solely intended to exhibit the relation which exists between a word and an idea, and that this relation is of a mental nature and more akin to the spiritual system than any relation created, of which we know any thing. It is a relation of the most sublime order; and no doubt the reason why the name *Word* is adopted by the apostle in his sentence was because of its superior ability to represent to us the divine relation existing between God and the Saviour prior to his becoming the Son of God. By putting together the above remarks on the term *word*, we have a full view of what John intended to communicate.

As a word is and exact image of an idea, so is "*The Word*" an exact image of the invisible God. As a word cannot exist without an idea, nor an idea without a word; so God never was without "*The Word*" nor "*The Word*" without God; or as a word is of equal age or co-etaneous with its idea, so "*The Word*" and God are co-eternal. And as an idea does not create its word, nor a word its idea; so God did not create "*The Word*," nor "*The Word*" God.

Such a view does the language used by John suggest. And to this do all the scriptures agree. For "*The Word*" was made *flesh*, and in consequence of becoming incarnate, he is styled the *Son of God*, the Only Begotten Son of the Father. As from eternity God was manifest in and by *The Word*, now God is manifest in the flesh. As God

was always with "*The Word*," so when "*The Word*" becomes flesh, he is Emanuel, *God with us*. As God was never manifest but by "*The Word*," so the heavens and the earth, and all things were created by "*The Word*." And as "*The Word*" ever was the effulgence or representation of the invisible God, so he will ever be known and adored as "*The Word of God*." So much for the divine and eternal relation betwixt the Saviour and God. You will easily perceive, that I carry those views no farther than to explain the nature of that relation uncreated and unoriginated which the inspired language inculcates. * * * * *

The first sentence of John I paraphrases thus: From eternity was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was, I say, from eternity with God. By him all things were made, and he became flesh and dwelt amongst us. He became a child born and a son of man. As such he is called Emanuel, Jesus, Messiah, Son of God, Only Begotten of the Father.

CHRISTIANITY

THE defensive armour of a shrinking or timid policy does not suit her. Hers is the naked majesty of truth; and with all the grandeur of age, but with none of its infirmities, has she come down to us, and gathered new strength from the battles she has won in the many controversies of many generations. With such a religion as this there is nothing to hide, All should be above boards, And the broadest light of day should be made fully and freely to circulate throughout all her seceries. But secrets she has none. To her belong the frankness and the simplicity of conscious greatness; and whether she grapple it with the pride of philosophy, or stand in fronted opposition to the prejudices of the multitude, she does it upon her own strength, and spurns all the props and all the auxiliaries of superstition away from her.—*Dr. Chalmers*.

Hence jarring sectaries may learn
Their real interest to discern,
That brother should not war with brother,
And worry and devour each other;
Shunning division here below,
That each in charity may grow,
Till, joined in Christian fellowship and love,
The Church on earth shall meet the Church
above.—*Cowper*.

[From the Preface to the stereotype and royal octavo one volume edition of the Christian Baptist, by D. S. Burnet of Cincinnati.]

A SYNOPSIS OF DIVINE REVELATION.

DISPENSATIONS.

PATRIARCHAL, (*Adam.*) JEWISH, (*Moses.*) CHRISTIAN, (*Messiah.*)

EACH of these "dispensations" had its gospel, ordinances, laws, priesthood, &c. The gospel proclaimed by God to Adam is found, *Genesis* iii. 15, the gospel proclaimed by Moses to the Israelites, *Exodus*, iii. chap., and the gospel of Jesus the Messiah, preached by the apostles to the world, *Acts*, ii. chap.

Christianity contains a Gospel—Ordinances—Laws.

Scheme of the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord to the World.

THE GOSPEL Is divisible into	1st. NEWS. Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.	Involving Three Facts to be believed.	1. <i>Fact.</i> —Death of Jesus for our sins, according to the Jewish scriptures. 2. His burial in our earth. 3. His resurrection for our justification, according to the Jewish scriptures.
	2d. COMMANDS. Believe and obey him.	Involving Three Duties to be performed.	1. <i>Duty.</i> —Belief of God's testimony concerning his Son. 2. Repentance unto life. 3. Immersion in water into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
	3d. PROMISES. And you shall be saved.	Involving Three Blessings to be enjoyed.	<i>Blessing.</i> —Remission of all past sins. 2. The Holy Spirit the gift of God 3. The hope of eternal life, to be attained by perseverance.

Concerning the above table which might have been extended to many times its length, let the reader notice:

1. That all things in the departments of nature, society, and religion, are divisible into original elements; so that we must have light, heat, moisture, &c., to produce vegetation—intelligence and law as well as human beings to produce good society; and we must have all the items which were originally proclaimed for immediate salvation, to assure us that we have the gospel. Light and heat alone, can by no ingenuity produce an apple or a pear; masses of men, subordinated

to authority, but devoid of intelligence, will be but enslaved savages; and a religion called christian, wanting either the gospel, the ordinances or the laws of Christ, though it have the other items, is a false religion; for all false religions of all ages and all nations, are but perversions of one or all of the revealed systems. Likewise, any gospel deficient in any of the nine items of the foregoing scheme, is not the gospel of Christ, but should be sur-named after its modern inventor.

2. The elements of any system being determined, it is then equally necessary to ascertain the order in which they are properly asso-

ciated. We have the natural, social and evangelical order. God, the author of all things, is the author of order, and in disregarding it we are sinning against him. Now, it is impossible to prove the Bible divine if we precede the patriarchal age by the christian, or succeed the christian by the Jewish. So the christian scheme becomes a humanized—sectarian thing, if in its operation we make it commence in ordinances, succeeded by laws, and consummated by the gospel, as do some. The evangelical order is gospel for the rebellious sinner—baptism for him, believing and penitent, and the King's table and all his laws for him, when, by regular naturalization, he becomes a true subject.

Again, if in this degenerate age we would be assured that we have the original gospel, after having ascertained to whom it was committed, when and where it was promulged, we must repair to the person, at the time and place, by the aid of the scriptures, and assemble all the items of the proclamation in the precise order in which they were delivered. Now, in the foregoing *scheme* we have the gospel divided into *news*, *commands* and *promises*. Who does not see that were the promises, the third item in this division, made the first, they would thereby be effectually separated from the gospel, while the gospel without them would be useless? Interfere with this order any other way, and the consequences are equally disastrous. —Once more, each of these three items is divided into other three; the first into three facts. Can we, by any effort of imagination, place the resurrection of Christ before his death? Would not such a gospel be anathematized by all good sense? But it is as great an infraction of good order to put baptism, the third duty, before faith, the first. And who would think of placing eternal life precedent to remission of sins? —But this is not the place to pursue this subject. It may not, however be amiss to observe that this scheme can be sustained, and is largely sustained in this volume, item by item, and position by position, in the light of reason and revelation.

Letters to Christians.

LETTER I.

ON CONVERSATION AND BEHAVIOUR.

Beloved Brothers and Sisters in the Lord;

Whom I love in the *truth*, and not I only, but all they that have known the *truth*; for the truth's sake that dwelleth in us, and *shall* be with us forever. I rejoice greatly to know that there are so many walking in the truth; for I have no greater joy than to see, or hear of, my fellow travellers to eternity, walking in *all* the commandments of my Lord and Master *blamelessly*.—Therefore, it has seemed good to me to write to you, and lay before you a few *scriptural* admonitions, such as refer particularly to the conversation or behaviour of Christians, that I may stir up your pure minds, by way of *remembrance*, to a more diligent performance of every good *word* and *work*; and at the same time believing that it will be a benefit to myself, as well as to others, knowing that I have need of them.

Our heavenly Father, knowing that we live in a land of forgetfulness, surrounded by the vain delusive things of time, and that we are fallible creatures and liable to be led astray by these things, has given us a *rule* to walk by, and set inducements sufficient before us, to exalt our desires and lead us far above all earthly pursuits. Paul told Titus, to "speak the things which become sound doctrine," in order that Christians should be sober minded; that they might be in behaviour as became holiness; that they used soundness of speech, which could not be condemned, that they who were of the contrary part might be ashamed, because they could have no evil thing to say of them. Paul tells the Philippian brethren, to behave in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ. Our great Lawgiver said, that *men* should give an account in the day of judgment for every pernicious *word* which they should utter, for by their words they should be acquitted and by their words they should be condemned. Paul told the Colossian brethren, to let the word of Christ dwell in them richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. He also tells the Ephesian brethren, to

speaking among themselves in the same manner, that they might make melody in their hearts to the Lord. Paul also tells the Thessalonian brethren, to let their speech be always with grace. And how this accords with what he says to the Ephesian brethren, to "let no corrupt communications proceed out of their mouths, but that which was good to the use of edifying, that it might minister grace to the hearers," (that is, having their speech always with grace.)

Beloved brothers and sisters; do we not know that the *words* that our Lord has spoken, are to judge us in the last day? Then let us be careful to live by his *word*; to let our conversation, our behaviour, yea, all our actions fully and completely harmonize with it. We should read it much, search it closely, and meditate upon it by day and by night. Any one pursuing such a course as this, will never find any difficulty in moulding themselves in the gospel mould.

Beloved brothers and sisters; we profess to have been purged from our old sins. So now let us keep ourselves *unspotted* from the world, by walking worthy of our high vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness. Let us be sober minded, shewing ourselves a pattern of good works, with all gravity and sincerity. Our conversation (or behaviour) should be honest and upright before gainsayers, that whereas they speak against us as evil doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse our good conversation (or behaviour) in Christ. We are citizens of the kingdom of Heaven; we have separated ourselves from the world; therefore, we must not follow after the vain and foolish things that belong to the world; but we must follow after righteousness and true holiness, for these are things that belong to the kingdom of which we profess to be citizens. The church of the living God is designed to be the light of the world. Then let *us* let our light *shine* before the world, that they may see our good works, and be constrained to glorify our heavenly Father. The church of God is built of lively stones, and of course light should emanate from every one. Wherefore, let us gird up the loins of our minds, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace (or favour) that is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus

Christ. Let us be obedient children, not fashioning ourselves according to our former lusts in our ignorance, when we were foolish, disobedient, and to every good work reprobate. For as He which hath called us is holy, so let *us* be holy in all manner of conversation (or behaviour), because it is written, "be you holy, for I am holy." Then let us present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, for it is our reasonable service. We must be holy, transformed by the renewing of our minds to the image of him who hath called us out of darkness into the marvellous light of His kingdom. We profess to be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world. Then let us not be subject unto them. We must not touch, taste, or handle the unclean thing, if we wish and expect to hear the welcome plaudit; "Well done, good and faithful servant." Our King will not say, "*well done*," to those who have *not* done. If we shun every thing that has in it the appearance of evil, the God of peace will be with us, and preserve our whole souls, bodies and spirits, blameless unto the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Let us be followers of God as dear children, and walk in *love*, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of *good works*. Therefore, we should have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. When in company with the giddy and gay, we should not join in their light conversation; for Paul says that "foolish talking and jesting are not convenient," or comely. Neither is it becoming one who professes to be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus; for he has taught us, that we should deny ourselves of all ungodliness and worldly lusts; that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; to put away from us all bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, and evil speaking. Surely what things were gain to us, we can count them loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, (like Paul) we can count *all* things but lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our lord, that we may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto him; if

by any means we may attain to the resurrection of the just. And this one thing we must do; forget the things that are behind and reach forward to the things that are before. Let us therefore press toward the mark for the prize of God in Christ Jesus. If we all walk by the same rule, we will be sure to mind the same things; and will be found striving together in one spirit for the faith of the gospel; and then we can contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints; and if that should bring upon us reproaches we can bear them. But let none of us suffer as *evil doers*; but if we suffer as *Christians*, we need not be ashamed, but can glorify God on this behalf.

Oh! what a happy reflection it will be to the Christian when he comes to lay down dull mortality, to look back on a well spent life, and to know by it that he has secured immortality beyond the grave. Then let us go on unto perfection, adding to our faith, courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and love. For if we give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, we shall never fall, and when time with us shall be no more and we will fall asleep in Christ, in the morning of the resurrection we shall find an abundant entrance ministered unto us into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Your sister in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,
L. V. C.

“BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM.”

The following extracts from the *Methodist Discipline* describe a “state of religion” too common among the professors of all sects.

“*Personal religion*, either towards God or man, is too superficial among us. We can but just touch on a few particulars. How little faith is there among us! How little communion with God, how little living in heaven, walking in eternity, deadness to every creature! How much LOVE of the WORLD! Desire of PLEASURE, of EASE, of GETTING MONEY! How little BROTHERLY LOVE! What continual judging ONE ANOTHER!—What GOSSIPING, evil SPEAKING, TALE BEARING! What WANT of MORAL honesty! To instance only one particular; who does as he would be done by, in buying and selling? * * * * Our religion is not sufficiently deep, univer-

sal, uniform; but SUPERFICIAL, PARTIAL, UNEVEN. * * * In ourselves there is much dullness and laziness, so that there will be much ado to get us to be faithful in the work. We have a BASE M ANPLEASEING temper, so that we let them *perish* rather than love their love: we let them go quietly to hell lest we should offend them. Some of us have a foolish bashfulness. We know not how to begin and blush to contradict the devil. But the greater hindrance is *weakness of faith*. Our whole motion is weak because the spring of it is weak. * * * Why are we not more holy? why do we not live in eternity? walk with God all the day long? why are we not all devoted to God? Breathing the whole spirit of missionaries!—Chiefly because we are ENTHUSIASTS! looking for the END without USING THE MEANS.”

DECLENSION OF METHODISM.

[Extract from a Methodist paper.]

DECREASE OF MEMBERS IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

When the Minutes of the annual conferences were published at New York, our friends were rather startled to learn that the increase of members up to that date was quite small, compared with former years but what will they think when the minutes recently printed at Cincinnati, containing the latest returns from the western conferences, show them a total loss of FOUR THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY NINE! Yet such is the FACT. The decrease of some eastern conferences, and the small increase of others, it was thought, might be accounted for in part, by emigration to the west; but where are our western members who are MISSING? The east may have suffered by emigration to the west, and some parts of the west by removals to other parts, and if the favoured parts have kept their own, with the addition by emigration, the case would be less HUMILIATING; but fix it as you will, there is in the aggregate a fearful DECLENSION. Instead of an increase of from forty to fifty thousand, we have fallen to a decrease of more than FOUR THOUSAND. Such a report has not occurred before in the annals of Methodism since about the time of the last war with England, and it becomes us all to make honest inquiry into the cause thereof. * * * * The work has not declined for want of preachers; for, notwithstanding the loss of members, there has been an increase in the itinerant connexion of 172 the past year, nor is it owing to any difference respecting doctrine, or church government, for on these subjects we have no controversy

among ourselves— * * * There has been no uncommon neglect of their interests of missions, sabbath schools, or education; on the contrary they have all received increasing attention—of course the principal error is not in reference to them. But there is utterly a fault among us somewhere—*

But after all, we fear that the greatest difficulty is in ourselves, as a church, among preachers and people; that there is a disease of the *heart*, preying upon the vitals of the whole body, attended with that alarming symptom, a lowering of moral discipline. For a few years past there has been a *great* rage among us to *get* MEMBERS, and it was *not difficult to succeed*; such is the influence of the Methodist that *other churches* imitate it more or less, and the world is becoming so far reconciled to it, that the offence of the cross is measurably ceased. * * * We have become *one of THE EVANGELICAL churches*," and to join us is *popular*; for in some places we are *very numerous*, and as *most people* like to go with the crowd, PROSELYTES are obtained by *multitudes*. Among these some are thoroughly broken up, who count the cost well, and make excellent members. There are others, perhaps, but slightly awakened, who are "hunted up" by their friends, and being found half willing under a general EXCITEMENT in the congregation, are led to the ALTAR to give their NAMES as applicants for admission on TRIAL. All this might answer well enough if they were fully attended to afterwards, until they become soundly converted, and properly Methodized; but being only drafts in the first place, and then not well disciplined, as is too often the case, many of them make poor soldiers of the cross, and in time of temptation fall away.

Western Christian Advocate.

NUMBERS IN THE REFORMATION.

From the best estimates we can make from all the documents in our possession, the advocates of this cause in the United States alone do not much, if at all, fall short of one hundred and fifty thousand; for we regard every one who has enlisted under the banners of the restoration of original christianity as an advocate of the cause. This, for the period of time in which the cause has been plead, is much more than could have been expected by its most sanguine friends. Perhaps no cause so unadequately plead, and so powerfully opposed, has, at least in modern times, moved forward with gratest power and progress. Had it not been for its overwhelming evidence, it could not have sustained itself against the want of concert and co operation and occasional mismanagement in

the ranks of its warmest friends, to say nothing of the ten thousand calumnies, reproaches, misrepresentations, and detractions if its opponents. It appears indeed, to us the Lord deings and it is marvellous in our eyes.

Millennial Harbinger, Dec. 1835.

The above comes from one who has all the means which, perhaps, any one man in the Union can possess, for ascertaining our real numbers; and from one who is very rarely ever wrong in the calculations and estimates which he makes. It is therefore entitled to full credit. It has far surpassed our own suppositions. "ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND!" And all this from a little handfull, in about a *dozen* years! And this almost unparralled progress too, amidst a combination of opposition, of talents, learning, wealth, influence and power, as unexampled! But so far from being arrested in its onward course, in which it has been moving with such gigantic strides, it seems to have gathered new power and energy from the opposition arrayed against it. It is a truth, known to most acquainted with the progress of this Reformation, that the greater the rage and violence of opposition the more rapidly it has advanced; and that the more violent and powerful the assaults made against it, the greater and more splendid has been its triumphs! A reference to times and places will sufficiently illustrate this. Opposition while it has excited investigation, has exhibited its own weakness and the strength of what it has opposed. So conscious have our opponents become of this, that an eminent one long since remarked, "the best way to fight *Campbellism*," as he opprobiously termed the Gospel, "was to let it ALONE!"

But notwithstanding all this, we may be in the midst of tremendous dangers, the more to be feared and guarded against because too much unnoticed and too generally unseen. It is not the number of an army which constitutes its strength; but the discipline, the training, the armour and advantages of its troops. Leonidas with his 300 faithful Spartans, was a match for Xerxes with his millions, in the straits of Thermopyle, until they all fell in the ranks. There is danger that an overgrown religious body, like an overgrown empire, will fall to pieces by its own weight, if not prop-

erly united and cemented together by the ligaments of faith, hope and love, nourished and kept strong by the "sincere milk & meat of the word" of God, and standing in a perfect and hearty obedience;—, holding the Head [Christ], from which all the body by joints and bands having *nourishment* ministered, and knit together, *increaseth* with the *increase* of God."

EDITOR.

PROGRESS OF THE PRESENT REFORMATION.

ALL our ideas of growth, value, goodness, &c., applied to terrestrial matters are comparative; A. is a rich merchant, but he would be a poor emperor; nor would he be accounted a wealthy importer on the seaboard. Now it is estimated that one hundred and fifty thousand persons have, within twelve or fifteen years, embraced the gospel and laws of Jesus Christ, set forth by the periodical publications and personal labors of his servants of this reformation. Lest this number should prove too great, we will suppose it at present not to exceed one hundred thousand. By comparison with the religious parties in the United States, our numbers will not be found far in the rear of the most prosperous societies. But it is by comparing the respective ages of these sects, and their present size, with the age, and numbers of the reformation, that a proper estimate of our growth must be made. By dividing the present numerical strength of each party, by the number of years it has existed in this country, we have, as a quotient, the average yearly increase of each.— This is set forth in the subjoined table.

Seats.	Present No.	Age.	Ann. increase.
Baptists,	400 000	197 years.	2,030
Presbyterians,	850 000	190 "	1,315
Methodists,	550 000	70 "	7,857
The reformation,	1,000 000	12 "	8,333

This scale leaves our *average* annual increase four times as great as the Baptists', six times as great as the Presbyterians', and greater than the Methodists'. But this at last gives but an unfair view of the subject. The increase of societies is proportioned to their age. Their interest is not simple but compound. As the table shows, the Methodists, next to us, have been far the most successful, (tho' they *decreased* more than *four thousand* in the last year,) but during the first eighteen years of their existence terminating with the ordination of Bishop Asbury, they had numbered by immigration and con-

version only fourteen thousand nine and eighty eight, which would leave them at twelve years of age, less than ten thousand; that is, our proportionate increase has been ten times as great as that of the Methodists', and it will be perceived that the rate of increase is inconceivably greater in comparison with the other societies. "What hath God wrought!"

Allowing our members to be only one hundred thousand (as in this estimate,) our increase has been unparalleled in the annals of our country. In measuring with Methodism, we are coping with the prince of proselytes: whose organization is the best of all human contrivances for rapid adult increase. In this comparative estimate, I have included all the "denominations," of numerical strength, except the Catholics, the mass of whose increase is by immigration, and consequently improper data for the purposes of this table.

There are now ten periodicals devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity, and six have ceased being published; and one of which, (and the first to raise the standard,) after completing its week of years, and running through two editions, has been stereotyped. And yet "they are going down," is the cry from the y'cleped religious press throughout this country.

Editor of the Christian Preacher.

ONE ARGUMENT SUBVERSIVE OF PAIDOBAPTISM.

BAPTISM is either the duty of parents in reference to their children, or it is the personal duty of the children in reference to themselves. It would be anomalous to represent it as the duty of both. If it be the duty of parents to have their children baptized, then the children are free from all responsibility on the subject. It never can be the duty of any child to be baptized if it be the duty of its parents to have it baptized, for God has no where confounded personal and relative duties. Whatever is strictly personal cannot be relative, and whatever is strictly relative cannot be personal. In one sentence personal and relative are two ideas, not one. Now if the law says, *Baptize your children*, then are children blameless and praiseless for their baptism or the want of it; the responsibility is upon the parents: but if the command be to parents and children, *Be baptized every one*

of you," then is father and son equally disobedient and culpable who makes it not a personal duty to obey the Lord for himself. We do not remember to have seen this argument in print. If it is logical, as we presume it is, it must settle the controversy in the minds of all reflecting and unbiassed persons. Every one must see that the duties that belong to the father as such, cannot belong to the child as such; and if, like circumcision, baptism be only the duty of the parents, those children who have been neglected are under no obligation to be baptized, for the Lord will not condemn the children for the sins of their parents; and he has no where made any special arrangement in behalf of such children as have been neglected by their faithless, unfeeling, or unrighteous parents.

Millennial Harbinger.

OUR PERIODICALS.

Would our brethren only exert themselves a little they might give our periodicals an extensive circulation; not only among themselves, but among others, professing and non-professing, sectarian and non-sectarian. It is here that they, our papers, have, and that they can, generally effect most good, at least many of them. It is their design to do good, to promote the knowledge of religious truth, to induce mankind to obey the Gospel, and thus extend the Redeemer's Kingdom on earth. Brethren, do you desire the accomplishment of these noble and glorious objects? Will you then sit still and not exert yourselves for us, while the land is flooded with sectarian papers with which the press is hourly teeming, and our opponents are exerting themselves with all their might to disseminate soul destroying error and to suppress the life giving TRUTH? But even among ourselves you should make a distinction. Our papers which are the most valuable and calculated to do the greatest good among "saints and sinners" as well as being the cheapest, deserve the most extensive circulation, and for these you should principally exert yourselves. A large circulation not only enables our editors to devote their time to the "work of the Lord," but acts as

a spur to their efforts in the glorious cause of Christianity.

Where the brethren and others live convenient to each other, they could by each taking one or two different papers, have the reading of most or all, and our periodicals would thus circulate more widely and visit more neighborhoods. The brethren in each State should feel themselves particularly bound and called upon to patronise the paper or papers published there.

EDITOR.

TO EDITORS OF PERIODICALS.

Editors of Periodicals to whom this paper has been sent and to whom we now send it in *exchange*, will please, if not disposed to reciprocate the favour, to return us both this and the preceding number, carefully enveloped. To those who unsolicited have sent their paper in exchange to us, we hereby return our thanks, as well as to those who have bestowed a favorable notice upon it. We would thank Editors of weekly periodicals to send us their papers from the time they received ours, or from the commencement of the year if so disposed, particularly the No. or Nos. in which they have noticed us; and the Editors of monthlies, &c. to send us theirs from the commencement of the year.

EDITOR.

☞ We are again compelled to defer our "Essay on the Christian name" to a future number, perhaps our next. We have more Essays on file from bro. Winans. A notice and review of part of Mr. Hanner's discourse on "Salvation by the death and life of Christ," in the January No. of the "Western Methodist Preacher," in our next. Also "Progress of Christianity."

EDITOR.

ERRATA.

Page 45, for "as were conducted," read "as we are conducted;" p. 46, for W. read M. Winans. W. is a very different man from M. and engaged in a very *different* cause. Would that he could be the author of such sentiments as M. P. 45, for "is against the infidel," read "as it is against the infidel;" p. 47, for "we see according to the declaration," read "we do not see," &c.

In No. 1 on p. 25, for Carls read 'books'—for 1836 read 1826.

ar

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME 1.]

PARIS, TENN. MARCH, 1836.

[NUMBER 3.

Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Luke XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XIV. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS
Jude, 3.

Religious Enthusiasm.

[It is with more than ordinary pleasure that we give the following article an insertion in our paper, considering the source from which it comes. It is from the "Philosophy of the Human Mind, in respect to Religion," by Dr. James Fishback, of Lexington, Ky. The author was a *Baptist*, in full communion with them, when it was published, (1813) and is *now* as far as we are informed; and not only so, but is, according to the most recent accounts we have of him, and has been for some time past, one of our *opposers*, strange as it may appear from the tenor of his writings. The article before us completely explodes the *modern* system of conversion, by stripping it of the immediate physical operations of the Holy Spirit, which occupy so conspicuous a place in it, and substituting the scriptural and rational influences of the Spirit in their place. Dr. Fishback is one of the ablest writers which the Baptists have in the west, perhaps the very ablest, and is moreover considered, as far as we know, perfectly sound and orthodox in their faith. This extract, therefore, deserves particular attention.

EDITOR.]

"To judge the spirits whether they are of God, we must antecedently judge our own spirit whether it be of reason, and sound sense; whether it be fit to judge at all by being sedate, cool, and impartial; free from every biasing passion, every giddy notion, or bigotted opinion. This is the first knowledge, and previous judgment—to understand

ourselves, and know what spirit we are of. Afterwards we may judge the spirit of others; consider what their personal merit is, and prove the validity of their testimony by the solidity of their brain, and purity of their heart." These are the sentiments of a piercing genius of the last century. When the mind is taken up in the contemplation of its own feelings, when under religious fervours or transports, arising from mental exercises upon divine subjects, and is taught previously to believe in the immediate operations of the Spirit by physical power, and names the feelings so, they become at once exalted by *name*, into the character of the Spirit's own immediate, personal operations. The heathen, before the coming of Christ, had their fancied inspirations. It was not less common amongst the Latins than the Greeks. There were persons who were said to have seen some species of divinity, and to have felt the immediate operations which threw them into such transports as overcame their reason. These *ecstasies* expressed themselves outwardly in quakings, tremblings, tossings of the head, and limbs, agitations, and (as Livy, who lived before the time of Christ, calls them,) fanatical throws, or convulsions. No poet can do any thing great in his own way without some fancied inspiration. Even Lucretius makes use of inspiration when he writes against it. He first raises an apparition in a divine form, to emulate, and conduct him in his very work

of degrading every thing that is divine. Atheism itself is not exempt from enthusiasm; for, as some have remarked, there have been *enthusiastic atheists*. Our Saviour knew too well the existence of this principle in the human mind, and the sad effects of it, when left to regulate, and determine the truth in the affairs of religion, to place any reliance upon it. So far from that, he often argues both with his disciples, and his adversaries as with reasonable men on the principles of reason. Without this faculty, he well knew they could not be susceptible of either religion, or law; and without its proper exercise they would be as apt to believe error as truth. He argued from prophecy, and the conformity of the event with the prediction. He argued from the testimony of John the baptist, who was generally acknowledged to be a prophet. He argued from the miracles which he himself performed, as incontrovertible evidence that God Almighty operated by him, and sent him. He expostulates with his enemies for not using their reason on the subject: Why, said he, even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? In like manner we are called upon by the Apostles of our Lord to act the part of wise men, and judge impartially of what they say.—Those who do so are highly commended for the candour, and prudence they discover in an affair of so great consequence. Acts 17, 11. We are even commanded to be always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason for our hope. 1 Peter. 3. 15. And earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. Jude 3. Without any aid from secret, unintelligible, and incommunicable feelings, and *supposed* operations, God has given demonstrative evidence, in clear, and distinct propositions, in his word, and its practical connexion with the mind, its powers, and operations, and the external circumstances, and internal condition of the human frame, sufficient to confirm the wavering, to convince the impartial, and dispassionate, to silence the gainsayer, and to render inexcusable the infidel and atheist. This evidence, it is our

duty (and of course we have a capacity) to examine, and to permit our belief to go no further than it justifies. We must prove all things, as we are most expressly commanded by holy writ, if we would ever hope to hold fast that which is good. 1 Thess. 5. 21. Enthusiasm is the delusion of a mind falsely supposing itself under the *immediate* inspiration of God. It disqualifies the mind for the use of ordinances, for intellectual and moral purposes, and refuses to the word of God the instrumental agency of communicating the knowledge of invisible and spiritual things to it. It denies that the entrance of God's word giveth light; that it giveth understanding to the simple—that it is the means through which the Spirit of God communicates the things of God.

Enthusiasm is the peculiar engine of Satan, by which he does most harm. He first operated upon the imagination of our first parents to sin against God; and since the establishment of the Gospel dispensation, he advances his own kingdom by passing the delusions of imagination for the dictates of the Holy Spirit. He has many ways of tempting man to sin: but, if any please him most, it is when these delusions of imagination and feelings are taken for the inspirations of the Spirit of God. It is the effect of enthusiasm in the mind to make those delusions the test and rule of truth—the standard of orthodoxy: then with conscientious sincerity, every man's experience is to be squared by it—like the iron bed of Procrustes, it is to be lopped or stretched as the standard requires. Out of this delusion arises an abundant crop of such fruit as is agreeable to the parent stock above described; a multiplicity of denominations springing up, and with the strange fire with which each warms their devotions, they would consume one another. Amongst such, the great test of Christianity, which inspiration has established in the scriptures, seems, by common consent, to be regarded as spurious, viz: "by this ye shall know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another. Neither pray I for these (the immediate disciples) alone; but for them also

which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." Enthusiasm having established the rule, the conscience feels very easy, and really sincere in obeying it. It was with an eye to this character of the human mind, that Christ told his disciples that "the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." This prediction was not only verified in the death of the Apostles, but in the martyrdoms, in many succeeding ages, of the true Christians, which were executed in the name of Jesus Christ.

They who are not made wise by the word of God, and would yet be doing great things in an extraordinary character, are in danger of the evil spirit, who has ever taken advantage of that zeal which is without knowledge, and turns it to his own purposes.

Enthusiasm proceeds from ignorance of the scriptures, as well as their design and use. The regular way to true piety is by knowledge. There is no real enthusiasm until we are taken off from the word of God, and have assumed some other principle of knowledge.

Not understanding rightly the means of grace, or thinking them below their attention, they claim the grace of God without means, and wait as for the blowing of the wind; and, indeed, should they use the means, they do it with an eye to immediate physical operations; which, being contrary to his will, who hath appointed an inward and outward religion, accommodated both to the soul and body of man, it is not strange if they get something else instead of it.—Enthusiasm affects great and extraordinary fervors of devotion, above the measure of other men; and discourages the piety of sober christians, as formal and lifeless. The proof of its pretensions being not in its fruits, but in its feelings, which are evidence only to the person himself; it refuses to be brought

to a trial, and so is above conviction. And, if submitted to the test, there is scarcely any trait of resemblance between it, and the standard rule prescribed by God himself. An enthusiast is not obliged to answer any thing, having an inward testimony that he is right, and all others are wrong; and to question this is to *quench the Spirit*, and despise prophesying; so it is impossible they should be reclaimed. If pressed a little hard upon the subject, they take refuge in the declaration of Christ to Nicodemus, "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and ye hear the sound thereof," &c. But no sound can be described as having been heard, which had a *distinction in it*, and by which the information of the things of God were communicated to the understanding. The affectation of superior austerity is one mark of enthusiasm, and by which deceivers impose upon mankind. The Montanists, in the first centuries, despised the Catholics as a carnal people, because they themselves ostentatiously practised greater mortification and severity. As to convulsions, roarings, dancings, ravings, and falling senseless to the ground, &c. these were formerly the marks of a demoniac, not of the Spirit of Christ, which is first pure, then peaceable. Enthusiasm has no principle but imagination, and nervous feeling, to which it commits itself: and when there is no rule but fancy and impulse, every thing a man does is right, and he can think himself in the exaltation of charity, when he is in the gall of bitterness. He rises to a sphere above others, from whence he looks down upon them with disdain, which he calls piety. From a loose, idle, and disorderly life, he is converted without repentance, and commences teacher without knowledge. He despises the necessary labour of study. While forty years were requisite to form an *Andrews*; an ordinary person, if a gifted enthusiast, shall be far beyond him in a few days.

Enthusiasm has been the root of the greatest evils that have befallen the Christian church. From this alone originated the Popish legends of the saints, which have

been used as instruments in the hands of evil minded persons, to induce others to reject the belief of the real miracles of Christ, and his apostles. Extraordinary inspirations, and immediate agencies of the Spirit are not to be credited, unless vouchsafed by miracles which God always sent to attest an extraordinary commission, and doctrine—and if they are pretended to come from him and do not, they must come from a spirit of error. Enthusiasts have no principles; they have no will but their own fancy; which is strongest in madmen; and this they mistake for inspiration, and then their madness is at the height:—it is as inconsistent as the wind, for they can promise themselves nothing for an hour together. Enthusiasm is an art by which we impose upon ourselves, and others. It is said that a man may tell a lie until he comes to believe it himself; a strong enthusiastic habit may fix a man's thoughts upon a favourite, and beloved object, till it dazzles his understanding, and glares so in his sight, that the worst absurdities will go down, and the highest blasphemy obtain the character of piety, and devotion. It is a fatal mistake of the soul, and generally irrevocable when it falls in love with its own disease. In a *calenture** the unhappy patient mistakes an unfathomable ocean for a pleasant field; as an enthusiast mistakes presumption, and blasphemy for holy contemplation, and humility; which, in effect, is mistaking hell itself for heaven. So writes the great Bishop Horn. The causes of enthusiasm being known, the cure is made easy. If enthusiasm arises from ignorance of the scripture, and of its use, and design, let the scripture be studied, as it is in truth, and indeed the word of God; not with an expectation of an immediate physical act, but with a view of learning divine truth, and, by its evidences, of believing it—of learning the character of God, and his purposes as manifested in, and by Jesus Christ, with a view of learning what has been, what is, and what will be the operations of the Spirit, and power of God; what

are the covenant relations of man; what in the first, and what in the second Adam—what his future destiny, and how determined—thus using the word of God as the light by which mental vision is produced upon spiritual subjects, by which those things which are not seen by sense or looked at, and which things alone are eternal, and known only to be so by the will of God who governs them all, being revealed by his Spirit through his word. There is nothing necessarily existent but God. What he wills to be, exists on account of that will, and his power exerted in pursuance of it. What he wills, he does not by necessity, but by choice; and it is by the revelation of that choice to us that we know the future designs of God with respect to us, and our world. The most effectual way of preventing, and curing enthusiasm, is to believe no proposition true but by the evidence which supports it in religion, and never to yield a greater measure of assent than the proof will justify; he who does (as Locke observes) exceed this limit, it is plain receives not the truth for truth's sake, but for some other bye-end. For the evidence that any proposition is true, lying only in the proofs a man has of it; whatsoever degree of assent he affords it beyond the degrees of that evidence, it is plain all that surplussage of assurance is owing to some other affection, and not to the love of truth; it being as impossible that the love of truth should make me assent to any proposition for the sake of that evidence which it has not that it is true, as that I would love it as truth because it is false. A further, and an essential mean of curing enthusiasm, and promoting religion, is the study of one's own mind, by which the passions, and imaginations; the feelings, and affections, &c. will be distinguished from the immediate operations of the Spirit, and they will not be further regarded than as *effects* flowing from mental exercises upon religious subjects; and, when thus received, they never can be so conceived of, named, and fostered, as to issue in not only disorder, but frantic madness, and bitter persecution. If they are by

* A *calenture* is a burning fever peculiar to sailors.

misapprehension, called the immediate operations of the Spirit, they are at once exalted into the divinity, and he who would correct the errors arising out of this *misnomer* by correcting this misuse of terms, is charged with the sin against the Holy Spirit, or some other dreadful impiety. It is very rare, that persons thus labouring under a delusion as to the proper nature, and character of their feelings, which they improperly attribute to the immediate operations of the Spirit, are not greatly defective in their views of the depravity of human nature, and the exceeding sinfulness of sin. They rarely ever manifest that tender concern, and christian solicitude for the salvation of their poor fellow creatures, unless towards those who enlist under their banner, or profess a devotedness to their singular ideas, and notions. They scarcely ever receive a brother weak in the faith, but to doubtful disputation; unless he has the virtue of passive obedience, and a blind acquiescence. In short, instead of manifesting the *fruits* of the Spirit, which are love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, with the crucifixion of the fleshly lusts; they manifest too evidently the works of the flesh, such as hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, &c.; disputing about *their own peculiar explanations of scriptures*, rather than going on to perfection in the unity of the Spirit, and the bonds of peace, working out their salvation with fear and trembling.

Confirmation and reception of the Word.

NO. 2.

PARABLE OF THE SOWER.

The "Parable of the Sower" containing an illustration of the "reception of the word" and its effects upon different classes to whom it is addressed, we have selected it for the 2nd no. of our essays on the "confirmation and reception of the word."

Without entering into a discussion on the design and interpretation of scripture parables, (a subject, by the way, which we design attending to at some future time,) we will merely remark here, that they are always used for *illustration* and never for *argument*. This is a distinction as to their

design which should always be carefully attended to, in order to prevent misconstructions and misapplications of scripture. That this is their design, the definition of the term in the original (Greek) plainly imports. It is, *parabolee*, from *paraballein*, "to collate, compare together, assimilate," *Horn*—"to compare things together, to form a parallel or similitude of them with other things," *Calmet*—"signifying to compare things together," *Cruden*, &c. To illustrate the affairs of the then approaching kingdom or reign of Heaven, appears to be the design of the most important parables of Christ; and to illustrate the reception of "the word of the kingdom," the design of the one under consideration. Our Saviour who "knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man," was perfectly acquainted with the human head and heart, with all the various dispositions of men and how they were affected and operated upon by the circumstances in which they were placed, and always knew, therefore, how to address man.

The parable of the sower illustrates the four different situations, with their attendant circumstances, in which those who "hear the word," may be placed, and its present and permanent effects upon those in each. We will quote it, as narrated in the gospels or testimonies of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

"Behold a sower went forth to sow—went out to sow his seed; and when he sowed—as he sowed—some seeds fell by the way-side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up. And some fell upon a rock—upon stony places—on stony ground, where it had not much earth; and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth; and when the sun was up, it was scorched, and because it had no root it withered away—as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns grew up—sprang up with it—and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased, and brought forth, some an hundred fold, some sixty fold, some thirty fold."—*Matt. XIII, 3-8; Mark IV, 3-8; Luke VIII, 5-8.*

After our Saviour had spoken this parable, his disciples inquire of him, "What

might this parable be?" We will give his interpretation of it as narrated by the three inspired writers above mentioned.

"The seed is the word of God.—The sower soweth the word.—And these are they by the way-side where the word is sown—they that hear;—but when they have heard—when any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one—satan cometh immediately,—and taketh away—catcheth away—that—the word—which was sown in his heart—out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.—This is he which received seed by the way-side. But he that received seed into stony places—they on the rock—they likewise which was sown on stony ground,—the same is he that heareth the word—which, when they hear—when they have heard,—with joy reiveth it—receiveth the word with joy—immediately receive it with gladness,—yet hath he no root in himself—these have no root—have no root in themselves,—but dureth for a while—and so endure but for a time—for a while believe,—afterward when affliction or persecution—tribulation or persecution—ariseth because of the word—for the word's sake,—by and by he is offended—immediately they are offended—and in time of temptation fall away. He also that received seed among thorns—that which fell among thorns—they which are sown among thorns,—is he that heareth the word—such as hear the word—which, when they have heard the word,—the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things—cares, riches and pleasures of this life—entering in, choke the word,—and he becometh unfruitful—it becometh unfruitful,—and bring no fruit to perfection. But he that receiveth seed into the good ground—they which are sown on the good ground—that on the good ground,—is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it—such as hear the word, and receive it—which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it,—which also beareth fruit—bring forth fruit with patience, some thirty fold, some sixty, and some an hundred." *Matt.* xiii, 19—23;—*Mark* iv, 14—20; *Luke* viii, 11—15.

Thus, we have the explanation of this parable by the Lord, as quoted from the testimonies of the three writers above. Here we have the sower—the seed, THE WORD of the kingdom—and the soil, the HUMAN HEART, into which it was received. We may here learn, or infer, from this parable, that without the reception of the seed, into

the soil, without the reception of the word of God, or "of the kingdom," into the heart, no fruit can be produced. The soil may be good, and the sun and rain lend all their genial influences, but if the seed be not sown—it can yield nothing. We might as well and with as much propriety talk of the warm influences and operations of the sun impregnating the soil and causing it to produce fruits without seed being sown, and as of the human heart bringing forth fruits by the operations and influences of the Holy Spirit without the word of God being sown and received into it! All the fruits spoken of in this parable, and consequently all that the heart can produce, (as this parable must have an application to all) are represented as springing from "THE WORD." The word of God having emanated from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is the word of the Spirit, and consequently the fruits of the word are the "FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT," of which we read in the scriptures. Thus the Holy Spirit produces his fruits in the hearts of men by his word which is sown in them; and thus it is that he influences and operates upon them. As without the seed, so without the soil, there can be no fruit. The seed cannot produce without the soil, nor the soil without the seed. The seed, or word, is not sown or received into the *head*, but into the *heart* of man! It must take root here and grow, or the soil will yield rank and poisonous weeds; the moral affections and feelings must be controlled and directed aright, or the heart will manifest the "WORKS OF THE FLESH," which we find contradistinguished from the "FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT." It is through the avenue of the understanding that the "word of truth," must reach the heart; it is through the citadel of the understanding that it must be approached. But we are digressing.

We shall here notice and expose a perversion of some scriptures which stand in connexion with this parable, and which false construction it is wrested and adduced to illustrate. When our Saviour had spoken it to the multitude, his disciples inquired of him, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For

whosever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." These passages of scripture have been wrested, if we are not mistaken, to support a religious theory the most inconsistent with, and repugnant to, the character, will, and attributes of God, as far as known to us, of any which the imagination of man has ever conceived. The perversion, or misconstruction, is this: That our Saviour addressed the perverse Jews in parables in order, or on purpose, that they might *not* understand what he spoke! But this idea is here excluded by the very reasons adduced to support it. A few remarks on the design of teaching by parables will make this obvious, in which the soundest and most popular Biblical critics and commentators agree. "The *design* of speaking in parables," says Mr. Barnes in his Notes, "was the following: 1st. To convey truth in a more interesting manner to the mind; adding to the truth conveyed the beauty of a lovely image or narrative. 2d. To teach spiritual truth so as to arrest the attention of ignorant people, making an appeal to them through the *senses*. 3d. To convey some offensive truth, some pointed personal rebuke, in such away as to bring it *home* to the conscience. Of this was the parable which Nathan delivered to David (see 2 Sam. xii, 1—7), and many of our Saviour's parables to the Jews. * * * Our Saviour's parables are distinguished above all others for clearness, purity, chasteness, intelligibility, importance of instruction, and simplicity. They are taken mostly from the affairs of common life, and intelligible, therefore, to all men, They contain much of *himself* in them.

his doctrine, life, design in coming, and claims, and are therefore of importance to all men; and they are told in a style of native simplicity and purity intelligible to the child, yet instructive to men of every rank and age." Dr. A. Clarke speaks to the same effect in defining a parable: "A comparison or similitude," says he, "in which one thing is compared with another, especially spiritual things with natural, by which means these spiritual things are better understood, and make a deeper impression on an attentive mind. Or, a parable is a representation of any matter accommodated, in the way of similitude, to the *real subject*, in order to delineate it with the greater *force* and *perspicuity*." Thus also Scott: "Parables are a kind of pictures of spiritual things which we are slow to understand, under the similitude of external objects with which we are more fully acquainted: so that, when we have got the key, we perceive more of their nature by a single glance, than we could otherwise learn by laboured descriptions, or multiplied distinctions." If, agreeably to these critics, this is the principal design of parables; the representation and elucidation of *spiritual* things by *natural*; then there must be *spiritual things* in the parable of the sower. And where else can they be there but in the seed—the *word*? Our remarks above, then, in reference to the fruits of the Spirit and the word, are just and appropriate. But all this by the way. Scott observes still farther; "He [Christ] had doubtless several reasons for adopting this method of instruction, which is peculiarly suited to assist the memory, and engage the attention; and which communicates information and conviction to the teachable in the most simple and compendious way." Bloomfield in his Critical Digest, says; "Thus by the parabolical mode of instruction, not only were the truths of religion rendered more familiar to the comprehension of the *multitude*, but to the understandings of *all*, those truths were more vividly represented, and more lasting impressions of them inculcated." After quoting so much, and that to the purpose, it is unnecessary for us to say any thing here about the design of parables; which, besides, the limits of this essay will not permit. Before we are done here,

however, we must give one more extract from Bloomfield; "Jesus," says he, "involves the doctrine of the Gospel in parables, that his hearers might be thus excited to attention, and not by inattention to be deprived of all knowledge, but make as great a proficiency as possible. *Kuioncl.* Christ adopted the parabolical method as best adopted to try his hearers, whether they were really earnest, attentive, and desirous of instruction, and therefore worthy of salvation." We shall finish our list of quotations from the critics here, with Thomas Hartwell Horne, who adverts to the very perversion of scripture under consideration.

"As some persons," he observes, "have taken occasion from the prophecy of Isaiah (vi. 9, 10.) as cited by Matthew (viii. 13—15.), to insinuate that our Lord spake in parables in order that the perverse Jews might *not* understand, it may not be irrelevant if we conclude the present strictures on parabolic instruction, with a few remarks on the reasons why it was adopted by our Lord.

"1. The practice was familiar to the Jews in common with the other inhabitants of the East, as already stated; and some of our Lord's parables were probably taken from Jewish customs, as the royal nuptials (Matt. xxii. 1—15.), the rich glutton (Luke xvi. 10—31.), and the wise and foolish virgins. (Matt. xxv. 1—13.) This method of teaching, therefore, was intelligible to an attentive and inquiring auditory. See Matt. xv. 10. and Mark iv. 13.

"2. It was customary for the disciples of the Jewish doctors, when they did not understand the meaning of their parables, to request an explanation from their teachers; in like manner, Christ's hearers might have applied to him, if they had not been *indisposed* to receive the doctrines he taught, and had they not preferred to be held in error by the Scribes and Pharisees, rather than to receive instruction from his lips.

"3. Parabolic instruction was peculiarly well calculated to veil offensive truths or *hard sayings*, until, in due season, they should be disclosed with greater evidence and lustre, when they were able to hear and to bear them, lest they should revolt

at the premature disclosure and mystery. Compare Mark iv. 33. with John xvi. 12, 25.

"4.—It was a necessary screen from the malice of his inveterate enemies, the chief priests, Scribes and Pharisees; who would not have failed to take advantage of any *express* declaration which they might turn to his destruction (John x. 24.); but yet they could not lay hold of the most pointed parables, which, they were clear sighted enough to perceive, were levelled against themselves. See Matt. xxi. 45. Mark xii. 12. and Luke xx. 19.

"5. The parables did not contain the fundamental precepts and doctrines of the Gospel, which were delivered in the audience of the people with sufficient perspicuity in Matt. v.—vii and elsewhere, but only the mysteries relative to its progress among both Jews and Gentiles.

"6. Lastly, the Jews were addressed in parables, because as their wickedness and perverseness *indisposed* them to receive profit from his more plain discourses, Jesus Christ would not vouchsafe to them a clearer knowledge of these events. To "have ears and hear not," is a proverbial expression, to describe men who are so wicked, and slothful, that they either do not attend to, or *will not* follow the clearest intimations and convictions of the duty. See instances of this expression in Jer. v. 21. and Ezek. xii. 2. To this remark we may add, with reference to the quotations from Isaiah vi. 9, 10. that it is common for God to speak, by his prophets, of events that would happen, in a manner as if he had enjoined them."

But aside from all this criticism and comment, which have been introduced here to make the design of our Saviour in teaching the perverse Jews by parables as plain as possible and so do away perversions and misconstructions, his design, at least at that time and in the parables he then used, is sufficiently obvious from his reply to the interrogatory of his disciples. "Unto YOU [the DISCIPLES] *it is GIVEN TO KNOW THE MYSTERY* of the kingdom of God: but unto THEM *that are WITHOUT*, [the *tois exoo*, persons not admitted to confidence] all these things are done in parables."—Mark. "For those," says Bloomfield, "were discipuli, *esooterikoi*, perpetually accom-

panying Christ, who could interrogate him, and hear the same thing often explained. To those (the *exoterikoi*, the *oi exoo*. Mark, 4, 11. not regular attendants, but only temporary auditors, drawn by curiosity only, not excited by desire for instruction) it is not permitted. Rosenmuller and Kunionel." Why was this privilege granted to the disciples and not to the others? Because they were "ordained" to be "ministers and stewards of the mysteries of God;" and through them these mysteries had to be revealed to the world. Thus Clarke and Barnes. "It is not given to them to know the purport and design of these things—they are gross of heart, earthly and sensual, and do not improve the light they have received; but to you it is given, because I have appointed you not only to be the first preachers of my gospel to sinners, but also the persons who shall transmit accounts of all these things to posterity. The knowledge of these mysteries, in the first instance, can be given only to a few; but when these faithfully write and publish what they have heard and seen to the world, then the science of salvation is revealed and addressed to all."—Clarke. "The word *mystery*, in the Bible, properly means a thing that is concealed, or that has been concealed. It does not mean that the thing was incomprehensible, or even difficult to be understood. The thing might be plain enough if revealed, but it means simply that it had not been made known.—Thus the *mysteries of the kingdom* do not mean any incomprehensible doctrines in themselves considered, but simply doctrines about the preaching of the gospel, and the establishment of the new kingdom of the Messiah which had not been understood, and which were as yet concealed from the great body of the Jews. See Rom. xvi. 25; xi. 25. Eph. iii. 3, 4, 9. Of this nature was the truth that the gospel was to be preached to the Gentiles, that the Jewish polity was to cease, that the Messiah was to die, &c. To the disciples it was given to know these truths. It was important to them, as they were to carry the gospel around the globe. To the others it was not then given. They were too gross, too earthly; they had too grovelling conceptions of the Messiah's kingdom to understand these truths, even if presented. They

were not to preach it, and hence our Saviour was at particular pains to instruct his apostles; yet the Pharisees, and Jews generally, were not prepared for it, and would not have believed it, and therefore he purposely employed a kind of teaching that they did not understand. * * * He had truths to state which he wished his disciples particularly to understand. They were of great importance to their ministry. Had he clearly and fully stated them to the Jews, they would have taken his life long before they did. He therefore chose to state the doctrines so that if their hearts had been right, and if they had not been malignant and blind, they might have understood them. His doctrines he stated in the best possible way: and it was not his fault if they did not understand him. By little and little, in this way, he prepared many even of the Jews to receive the truth when it was proposed by the only possible way of ever gaining access to their minds. It was, moreover, entirely proper and right to impart instruction to his disciples, which he did not intend for others."—Barnes. Had it been the design of our Lord in teaching by parables that the wicked and perverse Jews should not understand him, and thus be lost, then he would not have employed a method of teaching calculated in its very nature, as we have seen and shown, to defeat the very end he had in view. They were so immersed in sensuality, had such earthly and grovelling views of the kingdom he came to establish, that they could not understand him by this plainest, simplest manner of teaching. Though they saw his miracles and though they heard his teaching, they could not perceive or understand either: and our Saviour affirms that it was in consequence of this that he thus taught them. "Therefore," says he, "speak I to them in PARABLES: BECAUSE they SEEING, see NOT; and HEARING, they hear NOT, NEITHER do they UNDERSTAND." He then adduces the prophecy of Isaiah, and shows from that, that the fault was in themselves. "For this people's HEART is WAXED GROSS, and their EARS ARE DULL OF HEARING, and their EYES THEY have CLOSED." Was it not their own fault? Were they not the authors of their own situation? If the Lord placed them thus, it must have been by his teaching, as a re-

ference to the context will show; and the kind of teaching employed could not effect this, but the very reverse. He blesses his disciples for possessing the opposite character to the Jews. "But blessed are *your EYES*, for *they SEE*: and *your EARS*, for *they HEAR*." And so far was he from being the author of this deplorable situation of the Jews, or of using a method of teaching (if it can be called *teaching*) which they could not understand because of their situation, that he tells his disciples that even prophets and *RIGHTeous* men had been debarred from this knowledge, from seeing and hearing what they did. "For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and *righteous* men *have DESIRED* to *see* those things which *YE see*, and *have NOT seen* them; and to *hear* those things which *YE hear*, and *have NOT heard* them." He tells his disciples, that to them, such as they were, who had much real knowledge and many privileges, should be given more; but to them who had not, such as were the perverse Jews who knew and would understand nothing of the real nature and design of his mission and kingdom, what privileges, &c. they had should be taken away from them. This is well illustrated in the parable of the *talents*; and plainly announced in the declaration which our Saviour made to the Jews: "The kingdom of God shall be taken *from you*, and *given* to a nation *bringing forth THE FRUITS* thereof." Besides all this, the perversions and misconstructions against which we are contending here, would, if true, make God a *respector* of persons; and he has plainly and frequently declared, that he is "NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS."

Adam Clarke says in reference to this quotation by our Saviour from Isaiah: "verse 14. *In them is fulfilled*] *Anapleeroutoi*, *IS AGAIN fulfilled*: this proper meaning of the Greek word has been generally overlooked. The evangelist means, that these words were fulfilled in the Jews in the time of the prophet *Isaiah*, so that they are now *again* fulfilled in these their posterity, who exactly copy their fathers' example." With this agrees Bloomfield: "*hai anapleeroutoi*, i. e. verified. What happened in the time of *Isaiah* has again happened." And also Barnes: "This place is quoted substantially from *Isaiah* vi. 9, 10. It was

literally fulfilled in the time of *Isaiah*. In the time of Christ the people had the same character; like them, they closed their eyes upon the truth, and rejected divine teaching. The words of *Isaiah* were therefore *as well fitted* to express the character of the people in the time of Christ, as in that of the prophet. In this sense they were *fulfilled*, or filled up, or *a case occurred that corresponded to their meaning*. It is not by any means intended that *Isaiah*, when he spoke these words, had any reference to the time of Christ. The meaning in both places is, that the people were so gross, sensual, and prejudiced, that they *would not see* the truth, or understand any thing that was contrary to their grovelling opinions and sensual desires; a case by no means uncommon in the world." Dr. Clarke farther observes: "From ver. 17. of the same chapter we learn, that *many prophets and righteous men had desired to see and hear these things, but had not that privilege: to them it was not given*: not because God designed to exclude them from salvation, but because he who knew all things, knew either that they were not proper *persons*; or, that it was not the proper *time*: for the choice of the *persons* by *whom*, and the choice of the *time* in *which* it is most proper to reveal divine things, must ever rest with the all wise God.

"But it is not intimated that our Lord spoke to the Jews in parables, that they might *not* understand: the very reverse, I think, is plainly intended. It was to lead them by a familiar and appropriate mode of instruction, into the knowledge of God, and the interests of their souls. I speak to them, said he, in parables, i. e. natural representations of spiritual truths; that they might be allured to inquire, and to find out the spirit which was hidden under the letter. Because, said he, *seeing* the miracles which I have wrought, *they see not*, i. e. the end for which I have wrought them. And *hearing* my doctrines, *they hear not*, so as to profit by what is spoken: *neither do they understand*, oude suniousi, *they do not lay their hearts to it*, so as to consider it with that deep attention which such momentous truths require. But that they might not continue in their ignorance, and die in their sins, he adds parable to parable, to make the whole sci-

ence of salvation as plain and intelligible as possible. Is not this obviously our Lord's meaning? Who that is not most miserably warped and be-gloomed by some Jewish exclusive system of salvation, can suppose that the wise, the holy, the benevolent Christ, would employ his time in speaking enigmatically to the people, on purpose that they might not understand what was spoken? Could the God of truth and sincerity act thus? If he had designed that they should continue in darkness, he might have saved his time and labour, and not spoken at all, which would have as effectually answered the same purpose, viz: that of leaving them in destructive ignorance, as his speaking in such a way as should render his meaning incomprehensible." One more extract from Bloomfield, and we are done here. "When Jesus says that he propounds the nature of his divine kingdom obscurely, and by parables, because of the stupidity of the people, it may seem strange, to those who do not sufficiently consider the thing, that he did not rather instruct them by plain and perspicuous words. But Christ had very wise reasons for using the mode of instruction which he adopted. It is clear from history that the Jews expected the Messiah to be a splendid monarch. If therefore they had heard from Jesus that the kingdom was to be nothing but a religious society (i. e. *ecclesia*), and that to be a member of the divine kingdom was to be nothing but being a worshipper of God, they would have altogether despised him, nor lent an ear to his discourses. * * * Possessed with a vain fancy of the splendid dominion of the Messiah, they desired to hear only such things as should nourish the empty hopes of earthly benefits. On the contrary, heavenly doctrines, and the mode by which they might attain to happiness, here and hereafter, they consigned to oblivion. *Rosenmuller*."

In the parable of the sower, our Saviour in illustrating the "reception of the word," begins with a class of hearers on whom the least impression (or no impression) is made and who are the least benefitted of any others, (or not benefitted at all) then proceeds to a second class on whom the impression is still deeper and who are more benefitted, then a third, on whom it is still

more abiding and permanent, and then a fourth, the only permanently benefitted class and who produced any fruits. Let it be noticed that the first three are left in the event in the same condition. *1st. Class.* "Some seeds fell by the way-side," the hard, beaten pathway or road, lying across the field or by its side, where the ground was trodden and made hard by the passengers, and where no plough having touched or broken up the ground, there was no opportunity for the seed to enter or sink into the earth. It appears from Matt. chap. xii. ver. 1. that the Jews had roads or paths through their corn fields. The consequence was, that the seed was either trodden to pieces by the passengers, or the birds picked up and devoured it. These are they who "hear and understand not," or according Clarke; "*mee sumientos*, perhaps more properly, *regardeth it not*, does not lay his heart to it;" and Bloomfield; "*mindeth not, attendeth not to it.*" * * That the verb *sunnieemi* frequently signifies this in the Scriptures is certain;" and in the New Version; "considers it not." Satan "is represented," says Barnes, "by the fowls that came and picked up the seeds by the way-side. The gospel is preached to men hardened in sin. It makes no impression. It lies like seed in the *hard path*; it is easily taken away and never suffered to take root." "The knowledge of any thing may be said to be taken away," observes Bloomfield, "when it passes into oblivion, or seeming oblivion. Here Satan is said to impede the fruit of true doctrine, that men may not be saved. How he impedes it is not said. This, however, we may observe, that instruction is made void by negligence and inattention; a vice to which very many of the Jews were then too prone." Not only are men hardened, inattentive and forgetful, but there are always the wicked, profligate and unbelieving ready to banish or take from their minds what they have heard. We have examples enough of this in the instances recorded in the New Testament of the preaching of the Gospel and the fate with which it met; and are witnesses ourselves in the cases which come under our own observation where it is now proclaimed in its purity. *2nd Class.* "Some fell upon stony places," "where," observes

Barnes, "there was little earth, but hard and rocky underneath; so that the roots could not strike down into the earth for sufficient moisture to support the plant. When the sun was up, became hot, they of course withered away. They sprang up the sooner because there was little earth to cover them. *Fortwith*. Immediately. Not that they sprouted or grew any quicker or faster than the others, but they were not so long in reaching the surface. Having little root they withered away." This is he who hears the word, receives it with joy, but when afflictions or persecutions arise in consequence of it, he *relapses*, for this is the proper translation of the Greek term for "is offended." "When they are tried," further observes Barnes, "and persecution comes, they *fall*, as the rootless grain withers before the scorching rays of the noonday sun. *Anon. Quickly, or readily*. They do not look at coolly, and as a matter of *principle*. *Is offended*. That is, stumbles and falls. Persecution and trial are placed in his path, and he falls as he would over a *stumbling block*. He has not strength of *principle* enough—not confidence enough in God to carry him through them."—Barnes. To find examples of this class, let the reader examine well the history of the progress of the gospel in the New Testament. We often meet with such in our own day & land; who without counting up the cost well, without due deliberation and a firm unshaken resolution, take upon themselves the profession of Christianity. Captivated by its novelty, forward and blindly zealous in the cause, they are readily distinguished from the more modest, unobtrusive, firm and unwavering character of the opposite cast; and being superficial and unsteady in their profession, they wither and fall before trial and persecution; while the other remains firm, deep rooted and unmoved. *3rd. Class*—"Some fell among thorns," "that is, in a part of the field where the thorns and shrubs had been imperfectly cleared away, [rather not at all] and not destroyed. They grew with the grain, crowded it, shaded it, exhausted the earth, and thus choked it." B. These were they who hear the word, but worldly cares and riches and the inordinate desires and pleasures of this life choke and stifle it, and prevent it from bringing

any fruit to perfection. This is a class too, to find examples of which let the reader examine his Bible well. As mankind are the same now that they were during our Saviour's ministry on earth and that of his apostles, and as there are the same or greater temptations from riches and carnal pleasures, wherever the pure Gospel is proclaimed we meet with similar examples. *4th Class*. "But other fell into good ground," where the earth was deep, the field well ploughed," and the thorns cleared away. This is he who heard the word, understood it, received and retained it "in an honest and good heart," and by patience or perseverance brought forth fruit in *perfection*. Observe the kind of heart,—"*honest and good*." "Let it be observed," says Adam Clarke, "that to *hear, to understand, and to bring forth fruit*, are the three grand evidences of a genuine believer. He who does not *hear* the word of wisdom, cannot *understand* what makes for his peace: and he who does not understand what the Gospel requires him to *be* and to *perform*, cannot *bring forth fruit*; and he who is not *fruitful, very fruitful*, cannot be a disciple of Christ; see John xv. 8. and he who is not Christ's *disciple*, cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It will suffice to say that this last class includes all *real* Christians.

The first and last of these classes are the very reverse and opposites of each other. In the first, the state of the word or seed is not at all changed. While on the ground it remains the same without even germinating. In the last it germinates, grows and produces the perfect fruit. It seems to have been the design of our Saviour to represent or illustrate by this first class all the aliens or unbelievers who hear the word but do not submit to or obey it, or in other words, do not become Christians; for he says that they understood or considered it not, and that it was taken from them by Satan, "lest they should *believe and be saved*." Or if they *are baptized*, it is upon some delusive conceit or notion of their own, upon some mere, bare and blind assent of their minds to the word, and not upon a real or intelligent faith, produced by a heartfelt conviction and firm persuasion of the reality of the gospel

facts and truths, from prophetic and apostolic *testimony*. These are in reality the "baptized infidels," of whom we hear much said, and of whom we fear there is a very large class among the "professors of religion." All such, in whatever denomination found, are nothing more than *covert infidels* under the garb or cloak of Christianity which they wear. As this parable was a *prophetic* illustration, designed to illustrate the reception and effects of the word when the kingdom of heaven which was then at hand should be "set up," our Saviour might have had a reference to this very class. That however would not alter the case any, for an infidel is an *infidel* any how, whether baptized or not. As this *first* class includes all aliens who hear, but believe and obey not the Gospel, and the *last* class includes all faithful and obedient Christians, the *second* and *third*, or two intermediate classes, must include all the *apostates* from the Christian faith. As there must be a *state* of grace or *favour* differing from that in which all aliens or unbelievers are, in which those are placed who apostatise, (for they must *fall* or *apostatise* from *something* and not from *nothing*;) these two classes must have received, believed and obeyed the word; and accordingly the word or seed is represented in the illustration as germinating and growing, before it withers away or is stifled. All the apostacies from the Christian religion which take place are referable to one or the other of the two classes of causes enumerated in the explanation of this parable, in the illustration of these second and third classes: on the one hand, a shallow, superficial profession, without a firm and deeprooted conviction, which the individual is driven from or led to renounce by trial, persecution or temptation; and on the other, the choking and stifling of worldly cares, delusive and deceptive riches, the lusts or inordinate desires of other things, and pleasures of this life.

Various are the theories entertained in regard to the reception, germination and production of the seed, but all partaking more or less of the *mystical* character. Some imagine that the ground is prepared by some mysterious and indescribable operation or process, for the reception of the seed; others, that some special, mystical

influence attends the seed which causes it to be received into the ground; and others imagine that this mysterious and indescribable operation upon the ground will make it germinate and produce of itself without the seed being sown at all! In other words; some imagine that the heart of man must be prepared for the reception of the word, by some mysterious and indescribable physical or metaphysical operation of the Holy Spirit; others, that there must be some special influence accompanying the word that will impress it upon or sink it into the heart; and others imagine that this mysterious, indescribable operation will prepare the heart and cause it to produce the fruits of the Spirit without any reception of the word at all!! To expose the unreasonableness and absurdity of all these theories, let us suppose three farmers in conversation about their vocation. A. contends that the ground must be prepared without plough or harrow, by some mysterious operation upon it which cannot be described, in order that it may receive the seed properly; B. argues that the proper reception of the seed depends, not upon any preparation of the ground, but upon some mystical and special operation accompanying it, which causes it to sink into the soil and germinate; and C. supposes that this mysterious, undefinable operation upon the ground, will make it produce without plough, harrow or seed!!! Thus the inefficiency of all these theories can be seen at a glance. They all leave the soil and the seed just as they find them!

The inquiry may here be made, What is the necessary preparation of heart for a profitable reception of the word? Let us reply in way of illustration by asking, What course would a wise farmer pursue with the three different grounds or soils mentioned in the parable? Is the ground hard and trodden like that of the "way-side?" Then he breaks it up with his plough and to pieces with his harrow. This part of the process is more or less necessary to *all* ground in its natural and uncultivated state; and hence the aptness in its place of the part of the parable *first* introduced. Is it "stony ground," or the soil thin upon the rock? Then he removes the rock or increases the depth of the mould. Is his ground covered with "thorns?" Then

he roots them up and destroys them. Thus the human heart, the soil which is to receive the seed of the word of God, must be prepared by the *testimony*, the arguments, motives, inducements, &c. exhibited in the Gospel, for such a reception of the word as will cause it to produce all the fruits of the Spirit which it is capable of so richly bearing.

This brings us to the conclusion of this essay and to the commencement of our next, in which we design to illustrate still further the "confirmation and reception of the word."

The reader will pardon us for dipping as much and as deep as we have into the Commentators. It is our maxim to

"Seize upon truth, where'er 'tis found."

But as a very talented, learned, discriminating and experienced brother observed in a letter to us several weeks since, "*They are more or less DANGEROUS.*" As some author, John Wesley as well as we can recollect, said of "ardent spirits," that "they should be *well diluted and cautiously used;*" so we would say of commentators, that "they should be *well sifted and cautiously quoted.*"

EDITOR.

Baptist testimonies against the modern theory of Conversion.

The following extracts are entirely subversive of the modern theory of conversion, the main pillar of sectarian theology, and which occupies so prominent a place in what is said and written on the subject of Religion. They are from Andrew Fuller and Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, eminent "*Baptist divines,*" the one of former times, the other of our own day. Fuller is so well and generally known that it is unnecessary to say much about him here. Let it suffice to observe, that such is the influence he has obtained among the Baptists, that a large class of them are called '*Fullerites.*' Frey who is well known as the '*converted Jew,*' is the author of a popular work on baptism, from which we make this extract, and ranks perhaps as high as almost any other Baptist Rabbi, for talents and learning.

EDITOR.

That there is danger of deceiving ourselves in this matter [conversion], of all oth-

ers the most important, is evident from our Lord's declaration that *many* will find themselves thus deceived on the last and final day of account. His *memorable* words are these: "Not every one that *saith* unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter in the kingdom of heaven: but he that *doeth the will* of my Father, which is in heaven. *Many* will say to 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? And then will I profess to them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that *work iniquity,*" Mat. VII. 21—23.

Let us guard then, my beloved brethren, against building our assurance on *mere feelings*, the effects of our own imaginations. Oh how many have I met with, who professed to have obtained a hope of being in the way to heaven and which had filled their heart with joy and gladness; but being asked when and how they obtained that hope, some said, "God had told them in a *dream* that their sins were pardoned, and thus he was now their reconciled Father;" others replied that "they had been favoured with a vision of the night of a dear departed friend, who assured them of a mansion being prepared for them in glory." Others "that they had seen a bright angel, or perhaps the Lord Jesus himself, saying 'be of good cheer, your sins are forgiven:'" and not a few replied that "they had put their finger into the Bible, and on opening found it lighted on a gracious promise," &c. &c. Gracious Lord keep us from all such delusions! Is this the way to "read our title clear to mansions in the skies?" Is this the way to prove that we are the heirs of the heavenly inheritance? Would men act thus in their worldly concerns? Surely not. Well might our blessed Lord say "the children of this world are in *their* generation *wiser* than the children of light." Luke xvi. 8. For what should we think of the man who applies to a counsellor to defend his claim to the estate of a person lately deceased, upon no better title than his earnest *desire* to possess it; because the lease of his present habitation is just expiring and cannot be renewed; and his *inexpressible joy and gladness* of heart, arising from a *full assurance of hope* that he shall obtain it, according to a revelation from heaven made to him in a dream, or vision, &c. &c. What counsellor in his senses would undertake such a cause? How ridiculous would both appear before judge and jury? Yet not a whit better is the title to the heavenly inheritance of the persons mentioned above.

—Frey.—*Essays on Baptism*, pages 156,

157, Newark, N. J. edition, 1830.

I SHALL not trouble you with the *opinions of men* as to what the Gospel is, nor even with *my own*, but direct you to the account given by its Author. The *New Testament* informs us what it is, in such *plain and pointed* language, that he who runs may read: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life."—"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you, the *Gospel* which I preached unto you, which also ye *have received*, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain: for I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how 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."—"This is a faithful saying, (a truth of such importance as to be a kind of Christian proverb.) and, worthy of all acception, that *Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners* of whom I am the chief."—WE PREACH *Christ crucified*."—"I determined NOT TO KNOW ANY THING, SAVE *Jesus Christ and HIM CRUCIFIED*"—"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HAS GIVEN TO US *eternal life and this life is in his son*." * * * *

What say you to this? The truth of it hath been confirmed by the most unquestionable proofs. It first began to be spoken by the Lord himself, and it has been confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing witness with signs, and words, and divers miracles. The witness of the three in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, is borne to this, namely, that "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son;" and to this is also directed the witness of the three on earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. Can you subscribe to this great truth, in all its bearings, and rest the salvation of your soul upon it? * * * *

I am well aware, that the great concern of persons, in your situation, is to obtain *peace of mind*; and any thing which promises to afford this, attracts your attention. If this gospel be BELIEVED *with all your heart*, it will give you peace. This is the good and the old way; walk in it, and you shall find rest for your soul: but it is not every thing which promises peace, that will ultimately afford it. It is at our peril to offer you other consolation, and at yours to receive it. * * * *

1. Beware of brooding over your guilt in a way of unbelieving fondness; and so of standing aloof from the hope of mercy. * * * *

2 Beware of dwelling, in a way of self-complacency, on those reformations which may have been produced by the power of conviction. * * * *

3. Beware of deriving comfort from the *distress of mind* which you may have undergone, or from any *feelings* within you. Some *religious* people will tell you, that these workings of mind are a sign that God has mercy in reserve for you; and that if you go on in the way you are in, waiting as at the pool, all will be well in the end: but such language requires great qualification. It is not your *being distressed* in mind, that will prove any thing in your favour, but the *issue* of it. Saul was distressed, as well as David and Judas, as well as Peter. When the murderers of our Lord were pricked in their hearts, Peter did not comfort them by representing this their *unhappiness* as a *hopeful sign of conversion*; but exhorted them to "REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED, every one of them, in the NAME of Jesus Christ, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS." * * * *

4. Beware of considering faith *itself* the meritorious ground of acceptance with God.

Finally; Beware of taking comfort from any *impulse* or *unfounded persuasion* that your sins are forgiven, and that you are a favorite of God. Many are deceived in this way, and mistake such a persuasion for faith itself. When a sinner is driven from all his former holds, it is not unusual for him to catch at any new conceit, however *unscriptural* and *absurd*, if it will but afford him relief. If in such a state of mind he receives an *impression*, perhaps in the words of scripture, that God has forgiven and accepted him, or dreams that he is in heaven, or reads a book, or hears a sermon, favourable to such a method of obtaining relief, he eagerly imbibes it, and becomes intoxicated with the delicious draught. The joy of hope, being so new and unexpected a thing, and succeeding to great darkness and distress, produces a wonderful change in his mind. Now he thinks he has discovered the light of life, and feels as one that has lost his burden! Now he has found out the true religion; and all that he read or heard before, not affording him relief, is false doctrine, or legal preaching. Being treated also as one of the dear children of God by others of the *same description*, he is attached to his flatterers, and despises those, as *graceless*, who would rob him of his comforts, by warning him against "THE LIE WHICH IS IN HIS RIGHT HAND."—Fuller.—Extracts from one of the Tracts issued by the Baptist General Tract

Society, entitled the "Great Question Answered."—See also Fuller's Works. vol. 2. p. 697, 698, 699. 700.

BAPTIST TESTIMONIES ON THE IMPORTANCE AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Some are diverted from the examination of this subject, by considering it as a thing of *small moment*, and that time is better spent in schemes of general usefulness. That *baptism* is a thing of *small moment*, is an *opinion* that is not likely to have been suggested by the *accounts* of it in the *Scriptures*. It is an ordinance that *strikingly* represents the *truth* that *SAVES the soul*; and is *peremptorily* enjoined on all who believe. But were it the *very least* of all the commandments of Jesus, it demands attention and obedience at the *hazard of LIFE itself*. Nothing that *CHRIST has appointed* can be *innocently* neglected. To suppose that schemes of general usefulness ought to take place of the *commandments of GOD*, is a *direct affront* to the *wisdom and power* of Jehovah. Saul alleged that he had substantially obeyed the word of the Lord, though he spared Agag, the king of Amalek, and a part of the spoil for a burnt-offering; but the answer of the Prophet ought forever to deter from the exercise of a discretionary power with respect to the commandments of God. "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in *obeying the voice of the Lord*? Behold *to obey is better than sacrifices*; and to hearken, than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry: because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king."—[Carson on Baptism, New York Baptist edition, p. 6.]

"If baptism," he (the Rev. Joseph Kinghorn) observes "was *once necessary to communion*, either it was then *essential to salvation*, or that which was *not necessary to salvation was essential to communion*. If it was *then essential to salvation*, how can it be proved *not to be essential now*? If it be argued that it was *not essential to salvation then*, it must either be proved that *communion was held without it*, or Mr. Hall's position must fall."

Of the preceding dilemma, I embrace, *without hesitation, the affirmative side*; and assert that, in the *apostolic age*, *BAPTISM was necessary to SALVATION*. To the query which follows, "How, then, can it be proved that it is *not essential now*?"—I reply, that it is unnecessary to attempt it, because it is admitted by Mr. Kinghorn himself; and it is

preposterous to attempt the proof of what is *acknowledged by both parties*.

Robert Hall: *Harpers' new edition of his works, vol. 1, p. 416.*

We *wash away sins in baptism*, just as we eat the flesh of Jesus in the Lord's supper. "The cup of the blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" How is the cup the communion of Christ's blood? How is the bread the communion of his body? In figure. And when *the figure is observed in faith, the real communion is effected*. Just so *baptism washes away sin*. Just so in baptism we die, we are buried, and we rise.—But the truth of the emblem is effected, not by baptism in any sense, but by faith of the operation of God. It is absurd and ridiculous to suppose that an ordinance can wash away sin in any other than a figurative sense. Was it not in this way that Jewish rites were said to make an atonement and to cleanse from sin? The first ordinance observed has no more to do with these things than the last. The death, burial, and resurrection, which are ascribed to baptism, take place in *baptism, and by means of baptism*. *The washing away of sins, ascribed to baptism, is effected by baptism*. This washing, this death, this burial, and this resurrection, then, cannot be the washing, death, burial, and resurrection, which are effected by faith, and which take place before baptism. If the washing away of sins, the death, burial, and resurrection, ascribed to baptism, were effected *previously and by other means*, the Scriptures are not true that speak of them as effected in and by baptism. The reality has already taken place, but it is represented in figure as taking place in the ordinance, & by means of the ordinance.—Carson on baptism p. 262.

Here (Acts ii.) I observe how Peter understood his commission: he began with preaching or teaching—waiting for the success of his labor. Nor did I find a word of baptism, till they were pricked in their hearts; then, indeed, and not before, he says, Repent and be baptized, in the name of the Lord Jesus; which I understood after this manner: If, indeed, you are grieved and ashamed of your conduct towards this Jesus whom you have crucified—if you are convinced by the Spirit of God that he is the promised Messiah, the great Redeemer and King of his church, and have a fiducial dependence on him for salvation; then you are to be baptized in his name, and may hope for a *comfortable evidence in your BAPTISM, of the REMISSION of your SINS*, and that you may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. And for

their encouragement he adds, "For the promise is to you, and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

Now I thought the evidence of children's right to baptism began to open, especially as I had often heard this verse mentioned as incontestible proof of it. But being willing to see with mine own eyes, I considered what this promise might be; the text indeed I found, if not wholly silent, yet not directly expressive; but, on close reflection, I thought it must be either the great promise of the Messiah, as the seed of Abraham, in whom all nations should be blessed; or, of the remission of sins for his sake; or, of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Accordingly I brought infants to each of these; and presently saw as to the first, the great honor which was done to the Jews and their offspring, that Christ should be allied to them according to the flesh; but found no reason to conclude that all Abraham's natural children were the children of the promise, as to the spiritual part of it; nor could I see how the general promise of the Messiah, as the seed of Abraham, could give them a right to baptism, if impenitent and uncalled, any more than the Gentiles, or those afar off.

As to the promise of the remission of sins, I saw not how this could be claimed, but by believers. And as to the gift of the Holy Spirit, if it was the same kind with what had been lately poured out on the Apostles, the thing spoke for itself; there was no room to expect it in a state of infancy.—[*Satan. Wilson's Scripture Manual*, published by the Baptist General Tract Society, Philadelphia.]

Nor is this ordinance adapted merely to separate between believers and unbelievers, individually considered: its design is also to draw a line of distinction between the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of Satan.—Whatever may be said of baptism, as it is generally understood and practised, and of the personal religion of those who practise it, it was originally appointed to be the boundary of visible Christianity. This is a principle, which, if properly acted upon, would go far to prevent the confounding of the church and of the world; and which, consequently, tends more than any thing of the kind to counteract ecclesiastical degeneracy and corruption. Had the Christian church in all ages admitted none to baptism, from whomsoever descended, but those who professed to repent and believe the gospel, it is scarcely conceivable that any others would have been admitted to the Lord's supper: and if so, a stream of corruption which has actu-

ally deluged it with antichristianism, would have been diverted at the spring-head. The church might indeed have been corrupted from other causes, but these would have been merely accidental. Hypocrites and formalists might have imposed themselves upon it, as they did in some degree in the apostolic age; but they would have been intruders.—Whatever of this kind might have existed, believers could not have been constitutionally yoked together with unbelievers.

* * * * *

As the leading idea suggested by a death & burial is that of separation from the world, so the principal thing denoted by a resurrection is an entrance into a new state of being. Such is that "newness of life," of which the emersion of the body from the waters of baptism is a sign, and to which it furnishes an important motive. The religion of Jesus does not consist in mere negatives. It is not enough that we be dead to the world: we must be alive to God. With real Christians, old things are passed away, and all things are become new. Unless our baptism, therefore, be merely a sign, or an unmeaning ceremony, our hopes, fears, sorrows, joys, companions, principles, and pursuits are opposite to those of this world. Even a partial return to it is inconsistent with our baptismal vows. If those who profess to be dead to the world cannot walk in the course of it, without being considered and shunned as a kind of apparitions; those who are alive from the dead cannot return, without resembling a living character who should take up his abode in a sepulchre.

* * * * *

If the ordinary acknowledgments of many who live in the neglect of this ordinance, and disapprove of the zeal of others who submit to it, may be considered as expressive of their principles, their conduct is not owing to a solid conviction, arising from impartial inquiry accompanied with prayer, that it is unscriptural, or that they have already been baptized according to the institution of Christ: but to a notion that it is of little or no account. If it be of little or no account to bind ourselves to the Lord, in the way of his own prescribing; to confess his name before men; to avow our being dead to the world, and alive to him; to preserve the church from being constitutionally corrupted, and yoked together with unbelievers; to obey his commandments who saith, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you;" and to follow his example who yielded obedience to this institute, saying, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness;"—then may this excuse be admitted. But if these things be important

then is believers' baptism important; and all attempts to *depreciate* it are offensive in the sight of him who is the Lord and Law-giver of Zion.

[*"The Practical Uses of the ordinance of Baptism,"* a tract published by the Baptist General Tract Society, p. 7, 8, 9, 10.]

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. III.

BRO. HOWARD:—Having received your letter of the 28th ult., in which you inform me that your periodical is being launched, I again resume my pen for the purpose of supplying freight. Well then, I shall say something more of the misapplication of scripture: and shall begin with the *general application of special cases*. Such as the pardoning the thief on the cross, and the pardoning of Mary who washed the Lord's feet with tears, and wiped them with her hair, and such as the pardoning of the sick man who was let down through the roof of the house in which Jesus was preaching. How common the practice of making an application of these *special cases* in this, our day, to persons who are placed under a *general provision*. Hence if any one preach baptism for the remission of sins to believing penitents, he is replied to, by saying the thief on the cross was not baptized. Mary was not baptized, nor was the sick man, who was let down in his couch, baptized,—therefore baptism is not necessary in order to the remission of sins. By this dangerous misapplication of special cases, thousands have been prevented from obeying the command of God, which is addressed to every penitent believer. The command is "*repent and be baptized EVERY one of you.*" Not such of you as *think* it a *duty*; and if you should not *feel* it to be your duty, God will forgive you without it, as he forgave the thief, and Mary, and the sick man. Isay such sophistry as the above, and such *misapplications* of Scripture have caused many to stumble at the word, or command of God.

This kind of misapplication is as delusive in its nature, as it would be to make a general application of the special cases of Enoch and Elijah; and begin to preach to all men an immediate translation to Heaven, without undergoing death, because

Enoch and Elijah were thus translated.

How many poor souls are deluded now, by such misapplications of the scripture, who are led to suppose that God will make their cases special, and by this delusion are prevented from accepting the common salvation according to the appointment of God!

It would be as rational, and not more delusive, to teach men to expect special cures of all their diseases, because Jesus performed such cures while on the earth; or to expect a special resurrection from the dead, because Jesus raised Lazarus and others from the dead, while on the earth.

Besides these general applications of special cases, as above mentioned, many things that belonged specially to Kings, Apostles, and Prophets, as such, are taken and applied to all men, who never stood in any such relations, nor do they now stand in any of these relations.

What is more common than the application of David's prayer to all men; and what more common than to hear men praying to God not to take his spirit from them, because David thus prayed, as though they were in possession of the spirit as David was, who had the spirit of a king which had been taken from his predecessor Saul and confined upon him when a boy; by which spirit he slew a lion and a bear, and also Goliath of Gath.

When he transgressed he prayed to God to forgive him, and not to deprive him of his spirit as he had done to his predecessor Saul.

And almost all things that were spoken, or promised to the apostles, have been appropriated to men now, as though all men were apostles, such as "that if two of you shall agree on earth as teaching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven," which promise was fulfilled in the case of the Samaritans, when Peter and John went down from Jerusalem to Samaria and prayed that they might receive the Holy Spirit, and also in the cure of the lame beggar at the beautiful gate of the temple, and in divers other instances.

But suppose that two of our modern apostles were to agree to ask God to cure the lame, or the blind, or to raise the dead, I conclude their prayer would not be an-

answered, because God never promised to answer them touching such matters, he never having constituted them apostles.

Yours, &c.

M. WINANS.

Letters to Christians.

LETTER II.

ON PRAYER, PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING.

Beloved Brothers and Sisters;

Favour, mercy and peace be unto all that call on the name of the Lord out of a pure heart and with faith unfeigned.

In a former letter, I endeavored to lay before you a few scriptural admonitions, relative to the conversation and behaviour of Christians. And as there are many relative duties equally enjoined on us in the Gospel, I feel a disposition to address you again on the all important subject of obedience to all the commands of our Heavenly Father; not because I think you do not know them, but because I know we all are mortal and fallible, and as such we are liable to neglect at times what we know to be our duty, being daily exposed to the temptations of the world, the flesh and Satan. Therefore it is necessary to have our minds often stirred up by way of remembrance. So said an inspired pensman.— And as Christians we are commanded to exhort one another daily, to consider one another to provoke unto love and good works. I hope you will not consider me assuming too much, when, in the language of inspiration, I exhort you to a strict observance and a diligent performance of all the duties required of us as creatures to our great Creator.

My design at present is to take up the subject of prayer and thanksgiving, knowing that these are important duties which should not be neglected on any occasion; for we are commanded to pray always, (not sometimes,) and in every thing (not a few things) to give thanks. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from God; and he has liberally bestowed them on us, the fallen and degenerate sons and daughters of men. Yet he has made it our duty to ask for such things as we need, and to return thanks for such things as we have received. I understand by good gifts, those temporal blessings which we so abundantly enjoy,

and for which our hearts should constantly swell with gratitude towards the Giver thereof. Perfect gifts I understand to be spiritual blessings, which God in his goodness and great love wherewith he hath loved us, condescended to make known (or reveal) unto us; first, the gift of his Son, the darling of his bosom, to die for us. He who was the admiration of all heaven's triumphant throng, could lay aside the glory he had with his Father, enter this lower world of sorrow and misery, and die that we might live! "Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." Oh Christians! let your highest praises and thanksgivings ever ascend for this unspeakable gift. Next, the gift of revelation, together with many other spiritual blessings which we enjoy, for which our hearts should ever expand with gratitude, and praise and thanksgiving should ever ascend from the same. Our Lord spake a parable to this end, that men ought always to pray and never faint." Paul said he would that men pray every where, (that is, those men who could lift up holy hands,) without wrath or doubting; and this shows the necessity of praying in faith; for without faith it is impossible to please God. "For he that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." James said, that some asked and received not, because they asked amiss. But he has given us an assurance, that if we ask according to his will, he will hear us. Therefore we should make ourselves perfectly acquainted with his will, in order that we may pray consistently with his will. There is much error in the world (I mean the sectarian world) in regard to prayer; praying for that which God has not promised; consequently such prayers are not according to his will, and therefore he will not hear them. Not only must we ask according to his will, but we must keep his commandments, or he will neither hear us nor we receive his promises. "And whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." 1 John 3. 22. Therefore I would infer, that it would be in vain for us to call on the name of the Lord if we do not the things that He has commanded us.

All prayer should be addressed to God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by the Holy Spirit. "By him [that is the Son] let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." Heb. 13: 25. "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit." The apostle Paul speaks in divers places, of his always praying for all saints; and exhorts them to pray with and for each other, and to pray for him, that the word of the Lord might have free course. James says, if any lack wisdom let them ask of God. He also says, we must ask in faith. If we knew what the will of the Lord is, and our faith is active and in exercise, then it is that we can come boldly to a throne of grace or favour, and be sure to obtain mercy, and find grace or favour to help in time of need. If temptations surround us, let us pray. If we meet with trials and troubles, let us cast our cares upon the Lord, for he careth for us. But we must not forget to pray, "for the eyes of the Lord are on his children and his ears are open to their cries." If we sin, let us confess our sins to Him who is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all iniquity. We can of our own selves do nothing, but our sufficiency is of God; therefore the necessity of constantly looking to Him in his own appointed way. When we have been supported in difficulties or relieved in wants, can we be so ungrateful as not seasonably to render sacrifices of thanksgiving and praise to the God of victory, help and mercy?—to admire and celebrate Him who is our *strength* and our *deliverer*, our *faithful refuge* in trouble, our fortress, and the *rock* of our *salvation*. Without a good temper fitting for, and a good appetite or desire prompting to, devotion, we scarcely can or ever will apply ourselves thereto. If there be not in our heart a root of devotion, from whence should it spring? How can it live or thrive? If there be, from stupidity of mind, from coldness of affection, from sluggishness of spirit, from worldly concerns, any indisposition or averseness to offer spiritual sacrifices, in an acceptable manner to God by Jesus Christ, we should by serious consideration and industrious care, labour to remove them; rousing our spirits, and kindling in our affections a

desire towards spiritual things; otherwise we shall be apt to shun or let slip the opportunities inviting to devotion, our hearts will become hard, and it will be a task to us instead of a pleasure, to perform acts of devotion. Then let us pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks, and we will avoid this state of coldness and stupidity which is so *dangerous* to the spiritual health and vigor of the children of the Most High. Let us maintain in our souls a ready disposition or habitual inclination to devotion. Let us be careful (or anxious) about nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let our request be made known to our Heavenly Father. Watch ye therefore and pray always, saith our Lord; continue in prayer and watch in the same, saith the apostle Paul; be ye sober and watch unto prayer, saith the apostle Peter: which expressions import a most constant and careful attendance on this duty.

Beloved brethren and sisters; let us stand fast in the Lord, ever pressing along the *mark* for the prize. Let us be like the Thessalonian brethren, having the word of the Lord sounding out from among us. Let us pray that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified. Do we wish to exercise an influence over the irreligious community? Then we must never let them see us faltering in any acts of devotion. And you, my beloved brethren, who are heads of families; do you wish to exercise an influence over your children? You must then pray with and for them, How often do you call them together, read the Living Oracles to them, and admonish them out of the same, and humbly bow your knees to supplicate a throne of divine mercy? I have no hesitation in saying, that if parents would attend strictly to this duty, they would see their children growing up Christians. Like Timothy, they would know the holy scriptures from childhood, which are able to make them wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Beloved brothers and sisters; do we not know that we shall be made partakers with Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end? Therefore let us not cast it away, for it hath great recompense of reward. We have need of

patience, that after we have done the will of God, we might receive the promises. Yea, we know that we shall have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us; which hope, we have as an anchor to the soul, because it enters to that within the veil, whither Jesus the forerunner is for us entered. When we finish our course on earth, may we have it to say, that we have fought a good fight and kept the faith, that we may receive the crown of life, which the Lord will give in the morning of the resurrection to all his faithful and obedient followers.

The favour of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. You sister, in hope of that immortal crown reserved in heaven for the faithful in Christ.

L. V. C.

Faith—the assent of the Understanding.

We are charged by our opponents with making religious faith nothing but the mere, bare assent of the human understanding. If by this our accusers mean mere assent to a proposition as true without its proofs, or apart from evidence, then we discard and reprobate the idea as much as they do. Such an assent cannot be called faith—is not entitled to the appellation. It is *credulity*—blind credulity and nothing else. It cannot pardon, save, justify or sanctify. And where is the most of this to be found?—among others or among ourselves? Ask the great body of “religious professors” with whom you meet if they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. “O yes,” “certainly,” or “of course,” will perhaps be the general reply. Ask them *why*? If they cannot give you prophetic and apostolic *testimony*, you then have the “mere assent of the understanding.” Ask them to give you a reason for the hope of eternal life and salvation that is in them? If they cannot give you this *testimony*, then you have one of the consequences of this “assent.” Examine those who are generally most loud in denouncing *us* for this “heretical view” of faith, and you will probably find a large number or a majority whose “faith” is nothing more than this “assent of the understanding.” Until they and those with whom they stand connected can render an intelligent reason for their “faith,”

it is but right and fair that they should hold their peace and let *us* alone.

Faith, as *we* understand the term, at least that faith which has for its objects the things pertaining to religion, is more than this bare and blind assent. It is a *belief* from the *heart* that Jesus Christ is the Messiah and Son of God, upon the testimony of inspired prophets and apostles. It is by the light of this testimony, that he who has this faith beholds the objects upon which it is placed. This is the faith which saves—or is “*saving faith*.” “The word of FAITH which *we preach*,” says Paul to the Romans, is, “that if thou *shalt confess* with thy *mouth* the Lord Jesus, and *shalt BELIEVE in thy HEART* that God hath RAISED him from the dead, thou *shalt be SAVED*.” How can Jesus be confessed to be Lord with the mouth and his resurrection believed in from the heart, without this testimony or evidence? It was by testimony, or words accompanying it, that Peter’s Pentecostian hearers “*heard*” and were “*pricked in their HEARTS*.” But we may be asked, what is meant by “believing with the *heart*?” What do we mean when we say, that we believe any thing with all our heart? Do we not mean what we say? Do we not mean that we really and sincerely believe it? A faith that reaches not the *heart* of man is not the faith of the gospel. As the heart is the seat of sin and moral corruption and pollution in man, its affections, the moral faculties and feelings, must be entirely under the influence and control of faith. The faith of the Gospel is a “*faith UNFEIGNED*” “which works by LOVE and PURIFIES the HEART.” Those who are in the possession of this faith can say with Paul, “Let us draw near [God] in FULL ASSURANCE of FAITH, having our HEARTS *sprinkled* from an evil conscience and our BODIES *washed with pure WATER*.”

EDITOR.

“Rev.” John W. Hanner’s “Sermon.”

The “sermon” from which the following extract is made, is entitled, “Salvation by the Death and Life of Christ,” from Rom. v. 10. “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life;” and was pub-

lished in the January number of the "Western Methodist Preacher."

"The only way in which we can become personally and savingly interested in the atonement of Christ, is in 'believing in him with the heart unto righteousness.'" It is a remarkable fact, that the Apostle Paul in treating of this subject, lays down *faith* as a principle of justifying righteousness, without the deeds of the law. His language is: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law, is manifested, even the righteousness which is by *faith* of Jesus Christ, unto all them that *believe*."—Therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by *faith*, without the deeds of the law." And again: "Abraham *believed* God, and it was counted unto him for *righteousness*. Now to him that *worketh*, is the reward not reckoned of *grace*, but of *debt*." If salvation be the reward of external obedience to the commands of God, it is a matter of debt, and not of grace; and consequently, Jesus Christ lost his whole labor of love, & by his death accomplished a solemn nothing! If a sinner is capable of obeying any given command of God, without the influence of the Holy Ghost upon his heart, and salvation is the necessary result of such obedience, God could have commanded, and the sinner could have obeyed as well without the death of Christ, as with it. If this supposition be true, Christianity is a base imposture, the Bible is a book of fables, and all the Apostles and Prophets of olden time, were deluded, fanatical hypocrites. As an illustration of the doctrine of salvation by works, take the case of one who believes that if he assent to an established fact, and suffer himself to be immersed in water, God will pardon his sins. In this instance, the act of immersion is the grand condition; *faith* in the given fact, is its prerequisite; and salvation is the stipulated wages, or reward of the work. Therefore, the individual goes down into the water, not trusting in Christ for pardon, but in his own obedience, and comes up out of the water, a dripping worm, saying to God Almighty, "Pay me, that thou owest!" If such an one be reconciled to God, it is rather by immersion, than by the death of his Son; and the blood of Jesus has no more to do with his salvation, than the blood of Julian the Apostate. "But to him that *worketh* not, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, his *faith* is counted for righteousness." No doctrine of Christianity is sustained by more abundant testimony, than that of justification by *faith*. The grand condition of par-

don, is *faith* in Christ; its prerequisite, is repentance towards God; its concomitants, are regeneration and adoption; and its effects, are purity of heart, peace, love, joy, and every other Christian grace. The Scriptures present us with two leading views of *faith*, assent, and reliance. We must not only give credence to the declarations of the gospel, but we must trust in Christ.—"That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first *trusted* in Christ. In whom also ye *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye *believed*, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

There are degrees in *faith*; and every degree is saving. By believing there is a God, a man is saved from Atheism; that Jesus (Christ is God, he is saved from Deism, or Arianism; and by believing in Jesus, with the heart unto righteousness, he is saved from the guilt of past offences. If *faith* be nothing more than the mere assent of the mind to a proposition, which is supported by indubitable testimony, there can be no degrees at all in *faith*; and the *faith* of one man will be just as strong as that of another. But the Scriptures speak of *some* that were weak in *faith*, and of others that were strong in the *faith*, giving glory to God. They also speak of *little faith*, and *great faith*. "The disciples said unto the Lord, increase our *faith*." Again: "I have not found so *great faith*, no not in Israel." And again: "O ye of *little faith*." It is plain, therefore, that saving *faith* is something more than the assent of the mind. A conviction of the truth, that "there is a God; and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, is not sufficient for the salvation of a sinner. For the Publican went up to the temple to pray, with this conviction upon his mind, yet he acknowledged himself a sinner, and in that relation, by prayer, obtained mercy. When the Phillippian jailor was convicted of sin, he came as a trembling penitent to the Apostles saying, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The probability is, this man had previously heard the gospel, and believed it to be true; and now being alarmed by the earthquake, he felt the need of that salvation of which the Apostles had spoken, and therefore comes to them for further instruction. Seeing his penitence, they adapted their exhortation to his condition, and said, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Was the jailor entirely destitute of *faith*? He doubtless believed he was lost; and that he had a Saviour. Notwithstanding this, the Apostles told him to *believe*. Not repent and believe,

for he had already repented,—not believe and be baptized, but simply, “believe and thou shalt be saved.” Now if the jailor was not saved by *faith only*, the promise of the Apostles was but a tantalizing falsehood.”

The reader now has before him a specimen of *modern divinity*, *Methodistic divinity* and the divinity of the day; and also accompanying it, a sample of the misrepresentations and slanderous imputations which are too generally its concomitant, since the commencement of the present Reformation. Were it not for the circulation and influence of the vehicle (this “Preacher”) in which this sermon has travelled to its readers, it would not perhaps deserve or demand a notice, and would very probably have found its way but little beyond the limits of Nashville. It is the *circulation and influence* of these mediums of communication from writer to reader, called “religious newspapers and periodicals,” and the possession of the “vantage ground” with their readers by those who write for them, that render the articles in them worthy of notice, and thus give them perpetuity, when they otherwise would have attracted little or no notice and sunk into merited oblivion.

One of the first things which will strike the attention of the observant Bible reader on reading the above extract, is the omission in the principal quotation which Mr. Hanner has made, of a part of the passages of which it is composed, calculated when left out as they are here, to give a different meaning to it, or no meaning at all. He *has not quoted fairly* but only in part as the reader shall now see. We will give that part of it containing the words he has “skipped over,” as it stands in the Bible, marking what he has left out in *italics*.

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, *being witnessed by the law and the prophets*; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe: *for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the*

remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.”

The first of these Mr. H. has omitted without giving the reader notice by dash, asterisk, quotation mark, or any thing else; and merely put a comma, making the sentence thus appear as a continued one, a *trick* well calculated to impose upon a reader who does not compare the quotation with the passage as it stands in the Bible; and all the second omission is marked by only a short dash! Why should he thus “skip over” the expression, “being witnessed by THE LAW and THE PROPHETS?” And why thus leave out too, “*by THE LAW of FAITH?*” But we will not, after all, blame him so much for omitting what he has left out, as for the *manner* in which he has done it, by not giving the reader the usual notice by asterisks or quotation marks. We have given it at length, that *our* readers may have the whole of it before them.

But the principal thing which will attract the attention of the intelligent reader of the Bible in the first part of the extract above, is the confounding of the “deeds or works of law” with the “work of faith,” a distinction between which is carefully kept up by the apostles every where in their writings. That Paul by “works of law” means law such as the Jewish or Mosaical, is evident, not only from the whole of the above passage from Romans, but also from the connexion out of which it is taken, as well as from the general tenor of the whole epistle. In the verse immediately preceding it, he says; Now we know, that what things soever (*honomos*, the article retained) THE LAW saith, it saith to them that are under (*too nomoo*, retained again) THE LAW; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” And immediately after it; “Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, which shall justify THE CIRCUMCISION by FAITH, and THE UNCIRCUMCISION through FAITH. Do we then

make void THE LAW through FAITH? God forbid: yea, we establish THE LAW." When Paul makes use of the term "law," he generally does it in contradistinction to that of "faith." "It is worthy of remark," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "that [Greek] *honomos*, the LAW, is used by St. Paul, to signify not only the law, properly so called, but the whole of the Mosaic economy; so, he *pistis*, the FAITH, is used by him to express not merely the act of believing in Christ but the whole of the Gospel." In like manner Paul calls the law "the LETTER," because "written" "in tables of stone," and also the ministration of condemnation," because it "killeth," and the gospel, "the spirit," and "the ministration of the spirit," ministered by the Spirit and giving spiritual "life."

But why this confounding of "works of law" and "of faith" together? Or rather why this attempt to make both the same?—If the reader will examine well the extract above, he will very easily see. It is to make Christian baptism a "work of law," and thus, by perverting or putting a false construction on the first part of the quotation above from Romans, and one which the apostle never intended, to make room for the theory of justification and salvation by "faith alone." That Paul had not baptism or any other ordinance or any work belonging to the Christian Religion in view when he wrote the above in Rom is obvious from the tenor of the whole of that epistle and all his other writings. It would have involved him in a positive contradiction with the apostle James. If the "deeds and works of law" are not to be understood in the sense for which we are contending, then there is a real contradiction between them which cannot be reconciled by any rules of scripture interpretation, and which would destroy all confidence in both. James says; "*Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being ALONE.*"—And again; "*Wilt thou know, O vain man, that FAITH without works is DEAD?*" And again, in illustration; "*As the body without the SPIRIT is DEAD, so FAITH without works is DEAD also.*" That James is speaking of the "works of faith" or of the Gospel, and not those of law, is too obvious to be denied; and that Paul means "works of law," and not those of faith, is equally as plain. Any other construction would involve them in an irreconcilable contradiction.

Equally as unfortunate is Mr. Hanner in the citation which he has made from Romans of the case of Abraham, as he is in the above. Abraham was not under either the Mosaic or Christian dispensation, and therefore could not have been justified by any of the ordinances or works peculiar to either. He was justified by the obedience of faith under the Patriarchal dispensation in which he was placed;—not faith without obedience, nor obedience without faith.—Hence Paul himself, in illustrating the effects or obedience of faith and its necessity in order to obtain the promises of God, cites the case of Abraham: "*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. By faith he SOJOURNED in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise.*" But was Abraham justified by "faith alone?" Hear James upon his justification. "Was not Abraham our father JUSTIFIED by WORKS WHEN he had OFFERED his son Isaac upon the altar? Seest thou how FAITH wrought with his WORKS, and BY WORKS WAS FAITH made PERFECT? And the scripture was FULFILLED which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then, how that BY WORKS a man is JUSTIFIED, and not by FAITH ONLY." Faith and obedience have been the indispensable conditions of justification and salvation in every dispensation of religion which God has placed man under in every age of the world. But so far is Paul from contradicting James that he asserts in this same epistle to Romans; "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the DOERS of THE LAW shall be JUSTIFIED." To this I will merely add for Mr. H.'s sake, the note of John Wesley the father of Methodism, on this passage, and the comment of Dr. Adam Clark, its great commentator. Mr. Wesley says; "*For not the hearers of the law are even now just before God; but the doers of the law shall be justified.*"—Finally ACQUITTED and REWARDED. A most sure and important truth; which respects the Gentiles also, though principally the Jews. But St. Paul speaks of the former, ver. 14, &c. [chap. ii.] of the latter ver. 17, &c.—

Here is therefore no parenthesis: for the 16th. verse also depends on the 15th, not on the 12th." Dr. Clarke; "It does not follow that because one people are favoured with a divine revelation, that therefore *they* shall be *saved*: while the others, who have not had that revelation, shall finally perish: this is not God's procedure; where he has given a *law*, a *divine revelation*, he requires *obedience* to that law; and only those who have been *doers of that law*, who have lived according to the light and privileges granted in that revelation, *shall be justified*: shall be finally acknowledged to be such as are fit for the kingdom of God."

Let us see now what is the inference which Mr. H. has deduced from the premiss which he has laid down. "If salvation be the reward of external obedience to the commands of God, it is a matter of debt, and not of grace." As we have shown that his premiss is false, and based upon a perversion or misconstruction of scripture, his conclusion is wrong of course, and must fall with it. There is no such expression as "*external obedience*" in the Bible. It is like many other such; necessary in a theological system, but not the one taught there. He seems to admit, however, by using it, that some sort of *obedience* is necessary.

We come now to his illustration of the "doctrine of salvation by works," in which he is as unfortunate as he is in his arguments. It is, he says, "the case of one who believes that if he assent to an established fact, and suffers himself to be immersed in water, God will pardon his sins." It will be very easily perceived, that the allusion here made is to *ourselves*. Where have we ever taught, let us ask, what is intimated in the first part of this extract?—that "assent to an established fact" is all the necessary qualification? Let him show. Do we not uniformly teach that not only must the individual confess that "Jesus Christ is Lord" or the Son of God, but that he must believe it from the *heart*, "that God has raised him from the dead," and must repent, in the full scriptural import and meaning of that term? Can he show that any more is required in the word of God as to faith and confession? What did Philip tell the Eunuch, when he inquired

what was necessary, or "what hinders me from being baptized?" "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." Believe what? "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And what then?—any thing more required?—will that do? "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." Does Paul say that any more was required? "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Did Peter require any more, when the Jews on the day of Pentecost inquired of him, "What shall we do?" What did he reply? "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Did our Lord require any more when he commissioned his apostles? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." To go on with Mr. H.'s illustration still farther. He says, "the individual goes down into the water," not trusting in Christ for pardon, but in his own obedience, and comes up out of the water, saying to God Almighty, "Pay me what thou owest!" Now I deny that this is the case in regard to any whom we baptize, as far as known to me; and repel the imputation, as false, slanderous, and, as far as I know, utterly groundless. Let him if he can, and here invite and challenge him to do it, bring up a single case of the kind from among all those we have immersed; or show where we have ever taught any thing of the kind, either directly or indirectly. Oh! the sins of this apostate generation, and the cloud of impending vengeance, that is gathering over them! No, gentle reader. We go down into the water trusting in Christ *alone* for pardon, and to be washed from our sins by his cleansing *blood*; and come out of it rejoicing and praising him for the *free* gift and the *unmerited* grace, which have been bestowed upon us. And we rejoice to know that our Saviour and Redeemer can "wash us from our sins in his own blood," as well and as easily in the water as out of it. And then we have his word for it. "This is *my BLOOD* which is *shed* for many FOR *the REMISSION of SINS*"—"Repent and be BAPTIZED every one of you in the name of JESUS CHRIST FOR *the REMISSION of SINS*." "The BLOOD of JESUS CHRIST CLEAN-

BETH US from ALL sin." "Arise and be BAPTIZED and WASH AWAY thy SINS, calling on the name of the Lord."—"We are buried with him by BAPTISM into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in NEWNESS of life." "Ye have obeyed from the HEART that FORM of doctrine which was delivered you. Being THEN made FREE from SIN, ye became the servants of RIGHTEOUSNESS."—"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having FORGIVEN you ALL TRESPASSES." Shall I cite any more passages? Are not the meaning of these as plain as any of the declarations in God's word? But Mr. H. will here have to part from Mr. Wesley, him whose "dying words" form the standing motto of the paper (Western Methodist) of which he is the junior Editor. Mr. W. says (note to Acts xxij. 16.); "Baptism administered to real penitents, is both a MEANS and SEAL of PARDON. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this [pardon] on any, unless THROUGH this MEANS." And again (note to Eph. v. 26.); "That he [Christ] might sanctify it [the church] through the word—the ordinary channel of all blessings, having cleansed it—From the GUILT and POWER of SIN, by the washing of water—In BAPTISM, if with the "outward and visible sign," we receive the inward and spiritual grace."—Should there be such an individual as the one Mr. H. describes above in the imputation he has endeavoured to cast upon us, I would say from my heart with him; "If such an one be reconciled to God, it is rather by immersion, than by the death of his Son; and the blood of Jesus has no more to do with his salvation than the blood of Julian the Apostate." But let Mr. H. show that Christian baptism is a work, at least of the person baptized. Let him point to a single passage in the New Testament where it is called a work. Take his own words in the illustration of it as a work which he at-

tempts to make, "suffer himself to be immersed," and do they make it a work? How call any thing the "work" of an individual which he permits to be done with him or upon him! Is not this a contradiction in terms? A person in being baptized is passive, and the one who does it is active; and it is therefore the action or work of the latter and not of the former. Were an individual to baptize himself it would be his action and his work. The baptism of a proper subject for that "ordinance" is no more his work than his burial would be were he dead, and it would be just as nonsensical and absurd to speak of it as his work in one case as in the other.

Passing over Mr. H.'s "externals," "grand conditions," "prerequisites," "concomitants," and all such theological stuff and useless parade of distinctions, let us observe, that none can attach more importance to faith than we do, not a mere, bare, blind "assent of the mind to a proposition," but a belief from the heart upon the evidence contained in prophetic and apostolic testimony; which leads the person to trust in Christ, and rely upon him for pardon and salvation. A faith that will not do this is not the faith of the Gospel. Mr. H. intimates that if faith is nothing more than the belief of testimony, that there can be no degrees in it,—no great faith or little faith, weak faith or strong faith. It will be a sufficient reply to this to observe, that degrees in faith do not depend upon the nature of faith or the manner in which any thing is believed; but upon the evidence in testimony, as every body ought to know who understands what faith is. In proportion as that is strong or weak, or vice versa, will faith be stronger or weaker.—Every individual who "believes with all his heart," is, in thus believing, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, as the testimony or "word of God" by which his "faith comes" is that of the Spirit and written under his inspiration, and has "the influence of the Holy Spirit upon his heart;" and when he is baptized and thus obeys "a given command of God," he is "born of water and of the Spirit," born again or regenerated. "The only way," says Mr. H., "in which we can become personally and savingly interested in the atonement of Christ, is in believing in him with the heart unto righteousness."

* Mr. Wesley's living words here would form an excellent motto with his dying words.

But did Paul say that this was *all*? No. If Mr. H. had let him speak out fully for himself he would have said; "with the heart man believes unto righteousness; and with the MOUTH CONFESSION is made unto SALVATION."

Mr. Hanner has presented us with some new divinity! Hear him. "There are degrees in faith; and every degree is saving. By believing there is a God, a man is saved from Atheism; that Jesus Christ is God, he is saved from Deism, or Arianism; and by believing in Jesus, with the heart unto righteousness, he is saved from the guilt of past offences." Here are three different salvations; and there must be at least three Heavens to correspond with them. Will Mr. H. be so good as to inform us where the Heavens are for these first two classes?—and what benefits they are to derive from their salvations? Will he show us where the Bible speaks of them and of saving degrees of faith? I must confess that I have never yet found the place or places!

Mr. H. says of the Phillippian Jailor, that "the probability is, this man had previously heard the Gospel, and believed it to be true," and, "doubtless believed he was lost; and that he had a Saviour," and, "notwithstanding this the Apostles told him to believe," and lastly, "if the Jailor was not saved by *faith only*, the promise of the Apostles was but a tantalizing falsehood." The Jailor "*believed*" that "he had a Saviour," and yet the Apostles told him to "*believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ," or on a Saviour! He *believed* already and was "*saved by faith only*" and yet had to *believe* and "*be saved*!"—*was* saved and yet had to *be* saved!! Not only had he believed, but "*had already repented*," and yet must believe over again!!!—We will now let our readers see who is guilty of a "tantalizing falsehood" in proclaiming salvation by "*faith only*," Mr. Hanner or the Apostles.

IALOGUE BETWEEN REV. JOHN W. HANNER AND JAMES, PAUL AND PETER.

Mr. Hanner.—Now if the Jailor was not saved by *faith ONLY*, the promise of the Apostles was but a tantalizing falsehood.

James.—"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can *faith* save him?"—"Faith if it hath not works, is DEAD, being ALONE."

Mr. Hanner.—Now if the Jailor was not

saved by *faith ONLY*, the promise of the Apostles was but a tantalizing falsehood.

Paul.—"We are *SAVED* by HOPE"—"brethren, I declare unto you the GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are *SAVED*, if ye keep in memory what I have preached unto you."—"By GRACE ye are *SAVED* through FAITH; and that [salvation] not of yourselves; it is the GIFT of God."—"NOT by WORKS of RIGHTEOUSNESS which we have done, but according to his MERCY he *SAVED* us, by the WASHING [bath] of REGENERATION and the RE-NEWING of the Holy Spirit."

Mr. Hanner.—Now if the Jailor was not saved by *faith ONLY*, the promise of the Apostles was but a tantalizing falsehood.

Peter.—"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. The like FIGURE whereunto, [of their salvation,] even BAPTISM doth also now *SAVE* us (not the putting away of the FILTH of the FLESH, but the ANSWER of a GOOD CONSCIENCE toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

And what did our Lord himself say in the commission to his Apostles! "He that *believeth* AND is BAPTIZED shall be *SAVED*"—Could they act in accordance with this their commission, and proclaim salvation by "*faith ONLY*!" Could they be guilty of "a tantalizing FALSEHOOD, if the Jailor was NOT *SAVED* by FAITH ONLY!"

In the economy of salvation which is comprehended by the Christian system, we are not saved by faith alone, grace alone, hope alone, baptism alone, the word alone, the spirit alone, or any one thing alone. We become the subjects of the concentrated energy of all these gracious means and heavenly influences. We could talk with as much propriety and reason of living upon *air* alone, as being "*saved by faith only*" or alone.

Mr. Hanner says; "The wickedness of the human heart is also exhibited by its enmity against the ORDINANCES of God's house. These are to man's *spiritual* life, what *food* is to his *natural* life. And as the body will *suffer* if *daily* food be not administered, so will the soul, if the MEANS of GRACE be neglected. For these, a *sinner* has no more *taste*, than a brute has for the high seasoned dishes of a royal table." "The *carnal mind* is not only enmity against God, but it *opposes* the church, both

in its *members and ordinances*." Of all this we do not for a moment doubt the truth. And it will account for much or all of the great opposition made against the real design and import of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, by our opponents. It is the *car-nality* of these "carnal professors" in the different "denominations," which is perhaps the great or principal cause of the repugnancies and oppositions to these two "ordinances" and the "members" who attend to and observe them in accordance with the precepts and examples in the New Testament.

EDITOR.

HEREDITARY TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

From Mr. Hanner's Sermon.

"The law [given to Adam in Eden] was suited to the nature, capacity, and condition of man. His moral nature was free from defilement, without any bias to evil, leading him to delight in those things which best accord with the will of his Creator, and the design of his being. His capacity enabled him to render unceasing obedience to the commands of God."

"The depravity of the human heart—its nature and effects. 1. ITS NATURE. It does not consist in actually transgressing a positive and known law, as did Adam, "but it is that which is engendered of his offspring," whereby man is deprived of original righteousness; and without divine aid, rendered incapable of pleasing God. It is that, by which every power of the soul is enervated, every faculty debased; and every affection corrupted. Hence the expression, "total depravity." The seeds that have ripened into overt crimes of rebellion against God, on earth or in hell, are sown by original sin, in every unregenerate heart."

Such a complete blending and confounding together of cause and effect as in the last of these two extracts, is rarely to be met with. The nature of "original sin" or "the depravity of the human heart," "does not consist in *actually* transgressing a positive and known law;" and yet "the seeds that have ripened into *overt* [or actual] crimes of rebellion against God" "are sown by original sin!!!" Original sin or total depravity is the *cause* of an overt crime of rebellion, or actual transgression, and yet the *effect* of it too!!! If this is not making the *same* thing both the cause and effect of *itself*, then we have no discernment! I would ask, where is the difference between "actually transgressing a

positive and known law" of God, and "overt crimes of rebellion against God?" If the actual transgression of such a law is not an overt crime of rebellion, *and vice versa*, then we must again confess that we possess no discrimination! We can see no difference. If the nature of "original sin" or "total depravity" does not consist in actual transgression, and overt crimes of rebellion are actual transgressions (as we have shown) then what becomes of "original sin?" Adam's transgression was as much an overt crime of rebellion against God, as that of any of his posterity, as all must acknowledge. And yet agreeably to the first of the above extracts, Adam's moral nature was "without any bias to evil." And according to the last, "the seeds that have ripened into overt crimes of rebellion against God, on earth or in hell, are sown by original sin." Now if Adam's "actually transgressing a positive and known law" is an "overt crime of rebellion against God," and Adam's "overt crime" is the cause of "original sin," and "original sin" is the cause of "overt crimes," what was the cause of Adam's transgression? Here is a great difficulty in the way of the advocates for hereditary total depravity! If the sinning of all men in every age is proof that we inherit a totally depraved nature from Adam, occasioned by his "actually transgressing a *positive and known law*," what does the sinning of Adam prove? "That he was totally depraved before he had sinned! As easily can we account for the sinning of all mankind, without the admission of a totally depraved nature derived from Adam, as they can account for the sin of Adam committed before he was at all depraved!! Let it be observed, however, that the sin of our first parents is not to be attributed to depravity of nature, but to the power of the serpent, to the subtlety and malignity of Satan! And has not the same cause to lead men into sin, existed from Adam to the present time? Has not Satan in every age, been pouring into the world and into the hearts of the children of men, whole showers of "*fiery darts*?" If this cause was sufficient to lead our first parents from the path of rectitude, what good reason can be shown, why the same cause should not to the present day; produce the same effect on their

posterity? The advocates for hereditary total depravity must, in order that their arguments should have any force, prove either: that the Devil left the world immediately after the first sin, or that from that time, he ceased to tempt the human family!!" But it is said, that "these seeds that have ripened into overt crimes of rebellion against God" "are sown in every *unregenerate* heart." But what does this prove? That Adam was regenerate? If Adam was ever regenerate he must have been *unregenerate* before; as the former always implies the previous state of the latter. So it does not change the case after all. Although without sin Adam was unregenerate; for he had never been "born of water and the Spirit," or born again, as it takes a rebirth to constitute regeneration. How could he be reborn when he had never been born at all, but only created as he was?

EDITOR.

Progress of Christianity.

The congregation of Roanes' creek, Carroll Co. Tenn. has been visited during the last fall and winter by brethren, Hooten of Hickman Co., Allen Kendrick of Madison, DeWitt of Smith, and myself. *Ten* were "baptized for the remission of sins" during these different visits, and added to the Lord. Among these was the Editor's aged relation and connexion, Mr. John Owen, whom he mentions here, as he is known to many, not only in Tennessee, but in North Carolina, Kentucky and other States. This congregation is in the neighbourhood of Pleasant Exchange and Hope-well (Baptist) Meeting House in Henderson Co. It numbers 40 or 50.—Bro. De Witt also immersed two on Reedy creek in Carroll, which congregation numbers about 20.

Ed. C. R.

At a three days meeting about the middle of October on Crooked creek in Carroll Co. *eight* confessed and obeyed the Lord. Brethren Hooten, Kendrick, Parkhill and Gibson of Ky. Gilleland of Carroll, and myself were present as proclaimers. Most of those immersed, were, like the Jailor and his family, "baptized the same hour of the night," in which they confessed the Lord. Like the Eunuch, they were baptized upon the confession that "Jesus Christ is the Son

of God," without the modern *invention* of telling an "experience,"—or some previous mystical and *non*—scriptural conversion. This Congregation also numbers 40 or 50.

Ed. C. R.

We were visited at Paris in February, by brother Tolbert Fanning of Nashville, on his return from Mississippi. He remained with us a few days, and delivered several able and interesting discourses to large and attentive audiences. So large were the congregations that our Meeting House could not contain them, and we had to use the spacious Court House. *Three* confessed and were baptized for remission of sins, one of whom was a very pious and respectable *Methodist* lady.

Ed. C. R.

October 13th, 1835.

At Versailles [Ky.] in the course of two weeks about ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY became obedient to the truth, many of whom were of the first citizens of the town and county. I was with bro. Johnson at Lawrenceburg, when we received the confession of *eleven*. At Lancaster or its immediate neighborhood, in the course of five days, bro. Creath (the junr.) received the confession of *nineteen*, besides some from the *Baptist* ranks. Two young men started to go on down to Mississippi, and while we were detained at Louisville on account of a boat, bro. Brown and Hodgen went over to the town of New Albany, where the Baptist church had lately divided on the subject of the Restoration. They, in conjunction with myself, spoke several times, and on this day week bro. Brown at night immersed *four*, the next day *three*, and in three days he had immersed *nineteen*, when I left. I concluded to let him tarry for awhile, and in the course of six weeks to come on. * * * * I expect to have brethren Hodgen, Brown and Spain as assistants in the field with me below this winter and next spring. Old father Creath will be down also, and probably some other brethren. We want to play all the artillery of truth in breaking down the strong holds of the world, the flesh and Satan. I hope you are still going on proclaiming the words of eternal life, and doing all you can to promote the cause of glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will among men. I rejoice to see the truth triumphing. Much has been done, and much more remains to be done. Let us move onward in the fear of the King of heaven, and we shall wear unfading laurels, when time shall be no more. Let this be our choice, and we shall

not envy kings, or desire earthly crowns, or seek the fame of earthly conquerors. May the good Lord make you faithful to death, with all the holy brethren. * * * Yours in the good hope, JOHN R. McCALL.

For the time, numbers and individuals, the Gospel has achieved one of the most splendid conquests at Versailles, that it has done in modern times. The statements in the above letter are abundantly corroborated by the following from the October No. of the Gospel Advocate:—

“A ten days meeting at Versailles has just closed. It commenced on Saturday, the 12th. of Sept. Jacob Creath, senr. presided, J. T. Johnson and J. Creath, junr. did the preaching until Wednesday following. During which time about sixty persons confessed the Lord Jesus, and were immersed for remission. Messengers were despatched for brethren J. Challen and B. F. Hall, who arrived on Wednesday. Brethren Herring and Lancaster joined us on Thursday evening. On Saturday the 19th. some of the brethren left to attend a two days meeting at Mt. Vernon and the Stamping Ground. The others continued until Monday evening the 21st. During the meeting about ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY FIVE persons were immersed for the remission of their sins.”

☞ We wish our brethren who write to us, to give us accounts of the progress of reform, and the state of the congregations, attended with such hints and remarks as they may think proper. Ed. C. R.

PROFESSION AND PRACTICE.

Men who profess themselves adepts in mathematical knowledge, in astronomy, or jurisprudence, are generally as well qualified as they would appear. The reason may be, that they are always liable to detection, should they attempt to impose on mankind—and therefore take care to be what they pretend. In religion alone a profession is often slightly taken up and slovenly carried on, because forsooth candour and charity require us to hope the best and to judge favorably of our neighbor; and because it is easy to deceive the ignorant, who are a great majority, upon this subject. Let a man attach himself to a particular party, contend furiously for what are properly called evangelical doctrines, and enlist himself under the banner of some popular preacher, and the business is done: Behold a *Christian a Saint a Phenix!* In the mean time, perhaps his heart and his temper

and even his conduct is unsanctified—possibly less exemplary than some avowed Infidels!! No matter—he can talk—he has the shibboleth of the true church—the Bible in his pocket, and a head well stored with notions. But the quiet, humble, modest, and peaceable person, who is in his practice what the other is only in his profession; who hates noise, and therefore makes none; who, knowing the snares that are in the world, keeps himself as much out of it as he can, and never enters it but when duty call, and even then with fear and trembling, is the Christian that will stand highest in the estimation of those who bring all characters to the test of true wisdom, and judge of the tree by its fruit.—*Cowper.*

PROSPECTUS OF

The Evangelist, for 1836.

A VOLUME of unbroken discourse of the True Gospel is yet a desideratum in this Reformation. Since 1827, it has floated through our periodicals in Essays and fragments of Essays, very unlike the living orations in which it was originally set forth to society for acceptance. Those Essays are scattered over a wide field and necessarily apart from each other; so that if a person would invite a relative, or friend, or fellow-professor to a perusal of what has been written of the Gospel by us who profess to hold it in primeval simplicity, he must invite him to the review of numerous large volumes, a task by no means acceptable to readers generally.

The Evangelist for 1836, consisting of a connected discourse of the True Gospel, containing much new matter, and written by earnest desire of many intelligent brethren, is intended to supply this deficiency. The task might have fallen to some one more able to perform it, but as the writer has long contemplated such a work and has for a long time been paving the way for its appearance, and as no other has as yet appeared to assume this precise ground, he has yielded finally to the wishes of those who perhaps had a right to be judges in the case, and has put his Book to the press.

As the volume is written on the Gospel, the distribution of it to our subscribers monthly and by single numbers, is hereby rendered unnecessary. The printer is bound by article to have the whole volume ready for mailing against a certain day, and therefore no single numbers will be forwarded to any one unless by request. All the numbers of each volume with an appropriate Title Page, a Dedication, and a Preface, will be stitched together by the Book-Binder, and mailed in that form. It will be printed on new type,

so large that old and young shall be able to read it with equal facility; and as it will form a volume like the *Millennial Harbinger* and contain an equal number of pages, (576) it will be distributed to subscribers on the same terms, namely, \$2 per volume, if paid within the year 1836, and \$250 if payment is delayed till after that time.

Those who will forward us the names of five subscribers and become responsible for their volumes shall have one gratis. Those of our subscribers who do not wish to take the *Evangelist* on these terms therefore, will confer a real favor on us by notifying us of the same by the Post Master of their respective residences, who will order a discontinuance if requested. We do not desire and do not intend to forward a single volume to any one who does not wish to possess it. The book contains much interesting matter; and though it would not become us to praise it, we may be allowed to hope that it will be such a one as that our brethren will neither be afraid nor ashamed to put it into the hands of their relatives and friends, for the purpose of informing them, at one reading, what is the ancient, original and true Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Monies forwarded, in payment, before publication, will be receipted in the end of the volume. Those in arrears for the preceding volumes of the *Evangelist*, are respectfully urged to settle up immediately.

Each volume will be mailed separately, in stout wrapping paper.

Address WALTER SCOTT,
CARTHAGE, Hamilton County, OHIO.

PROSPECTUS.

The CHRISTIAN PREACHER will be a monthly, containing one or two Sermons or Essays, from living writers of the present reformation. The first Sermon is to be by Mr. Alexander Campbell. Notwithstanding this difference in structure, the work will accord with our other periodicals in general sentiments, while it cannot interfere with any of them. Its sphere will be different. During the year it will present every variety of style and topic, will favorably introduce to the public many writers who hitherto have spoken only over anonymous signatures, and will afford the reader not less than twelve or more than twenty discourses on separate and important topics with all the latitude any author can desire. In common papers, essays have to be restricted to two or three pages, or suffer violent fracture to accommodate the monthly publication. The *Christian Preacher* will hold on long enough to satisfy both himself and

his audience if he can. The re-publishing propensity of editors will be no fault of the *Preacher*. He will borrow from none, and subscribers of other papers who attend upon his ministrations will not pay twice for the same matter, at least in the same dress.— Each contributor may have a whole number to exhaust his magazine of matter, and an opportunity to say all he can say on the subject of his choice. In a work of this kind, matter and style merit, and shall receive, equal attention. The subjoined pages, which are a specimen of the paper, type and execution, show that the work will be got up at a greater expense than any periodical of the same size in the Great Valley. At the end of the year the numbers accompanied with an index and title page, if bound, will make one of the neatest volumes issued from the American press. As the writers will be numerous and the subjects various, the readers cannot fail to be pleased and instructed with the combined light of a constellation of intellect.

TERMS.

The *Christian Preacher* will be printed in octavo form, on paper of superior quality, from new type, and will be neatly stitched and enclosed in a printed cover.

2. Any person enclosing \$5, in advance, post paid, shall have six copies sent to any address. He shall have thirteen copies for \$10, or twenty-eight for \$20.

3. These offers being so liberal, payment upon the receipt of the first No. will be required of all persons, except city subscribers and such responsible agents as shall become liable for five or ten copies: in such cases, within three months will be considered in advance. It will be optional with the editor to stop the paper of any one who fails to pay as above.

4. All subscriptions must commence with the first of a volume. Later subscribers can be furnished with the back numbers.

5. All communications on business, must be post paid to receive attention.

Agents for our other papers, may be agents for this. Lists of subscribers should be returned as early as December 1st, and before if practicable.

D. S. BURNET.

Cincinnati, Sept. 24, 1835.

THE DISCIPLE.

The disciple is not above his teacher; but every finished disciple shall be as his teacher. If you persevere in my doctrine, you are my disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

JESUS CHRIST.

A contrast between primitive and modern Christianity will show the excellence of the former. The spirit of prophecy predicted, and the pen of history has recorded a shameful departure from the simplicity and purity of Apostolic Doctrine and Practice. Professed disciples of Christ are turned away from the truth and the favor which came by him, and are following opinions and schemes of human origin.

No discipline can be so salutary as the New Testament, and no society so great a blessing to mankind as a Christian congregation. No civil calamity, no single vice however prevalent and destructive, is to be so much deprecated as the forfeiture of God's philanthropy and protection by a general irreverence to His word.

It is proposed by JAS. A. BUTLER and A. GRAHAM, to publish a periodical under the above title, which will advocate a restoration of the primitive Christian Faith, Worship and Morals.

The DISCIPLE will be purely a religious work. It will carefully avoid any interference in politics, and will countenance none of the y'clept benevolent societies of the day, considering the undefiled, unmixed religion of Christ a subject of importance meriting its undivided attention.

The matter will be, generally, selected and original essays, developing the principles of the religious reformation, which we have been pleading, for some time, in this State. Well written pieces for or against our sentiments, will be admitted on our pages.

The doctrine of Jesus Christ, as taught in the writings of his Evangelists and Apostles, will be contended for, in opposition to the "doctrines and commandments of men," or the theory of any man. The square shall not be altered to the timber, but the timber to the square. No human creed shall have the precedence of the Bible; but the Word of God shall be the standard.

It is hoped that the liberal citizens of Alabama will not condemn unheard, but give us that patronage which will secure the continuance of the work for several years.

TERMS.—The DISCIPLE will be published monthly at the Office of the Flag of the Union, Tuscaloosa. It will be neatly printed on good paper, with small type, and contain 24 pages in each number, making in the year a volume of 288 pages. The subscription price will be \$2.00, paid within the year, which will be cheap for the size and quality of the work. Any person paying for ten copies shall have the eleventh gratis. The first number will appear in January, 1836. Communications addressed to Gra-

ham and Butler, Tuscaloosa, *post paid*, will receive attention:

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE PERIODICALS.

We shall make a few remarks on the three periodicals above.

Of the "Evangelist" it is unnecessary to say much. That bro. Walter Scott is its Editor is commendation sufficient. It has enjoyed, we believe, an extensive popularity and circulation for several years; and the forthcoming volume will, we expect, be superior in interest to any that has preceded it, as its prospectus indicates and as the well known abilities and attainments in Christian knowledge of its Editor will insure.

The "Christian Preacher" as far as it has gone is excellent, elegantly printed on excellent paper with a handsome cover, promises to be a most useful work, and will, we doubt not, increase in interest and the quality of its matter. The first discourse is from bro. A. Campbell on the "*True riches of Christ*," and is among his best efforts. Bro. Burnet has exceeded the promises made in his prospectus. In the first no. he says; "It will be perceived that the page is the full size of the "Harbinger," and the number has been increased from the sixteen proposed to twenty four * * * one instance of the proposals being exceeded by the publication." We feel anxious for the success of this work. Let the brethren exert themselves for it. We intend noticing it from time to time.

We have also received the first nos. of "The Disciple." Each no. contains 24 pages as large or larger than those of the Harbinger. The matter, original and selected, is excellent as far as it has gone. Bro. Butler wields an able pen. The "Introduction" and article on the "Crisis," in the first no. are powerfully written, and contain forcible and interesting views and sentiments. Bro. A. Graham, the other Editor, was for a few years a resident of this county, and known to many of its citizens. He likewise writes well.

In our next we intend noticing some of our other periodicals.

While on the subject of other periodicals we hope our brethren will not forget ours.

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME 1.]

PARIS, TENN. APRIL, 1836.

[NUMBER 4

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and IS BAPTIZED shall be SAVED; but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark xi. 15, 16.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS. Jude, 3.

Importance of good Education.

[The following contains the principal part of an article on "Woodbridge's *Annals of Education*," in the November No. of the Boston "CHRISTIAN EXAMINER," for 1833; and nearly all the article not immediately connected with the periodical reviewed and local circumstances. It is generally understood, we believe, to be from the pen of Dr. CHANNING of Boston; and is on a subject which, from its great importance, should be mostly deeply interesting to all. We have been in favour of the leading principles advocated in this article, ever since we knew what education really is; and we believe that all the really intelligent on that subject unite with us in advocating the same. The writer shows that one of the chief ends of education is to prepare the mind for discriminating and distinguishing between truth and error; which makes it very essential in a religious point of view. Let not its length deter the reader from giving it a careful and attentive perusal.—It will afford him gratification as well as instruction. Our *periodical papers*, political and religious, could not perhaps do a better thing to excite the minds and stir up the attention of their readers, on the subject of good education, than by giving it a place in their columns. It would fill them much better than the trash with which they too often abound.—We intend from time to time, as opportunity may offer and occasion require, to give a place to similar good ar-

ticles on this subject with which we may meet.]

EDITOR.

CHANNING ON EDUCATION.

We are aware, that there are some, who take an attitude of defence, when pressed with earnest applications on the subject of education. They think its importance overrated. They say, that circumstances chiefly determine the young mind, that the influence of parents and teachers is very narrow, and that they sometimes dwarf and distort, instead of improving the child, by taking the work out of the hand of nature. These remarks are not wholly unfounded. The power of parents is often exaggerated. To strengthen their sense of responsibility, they are often taught, that they are competent to effects, which are not within their reach, and are often discouraged by the greatness of the task to which they are summoned. Nothing is gained by exaggeration. It is true, and the truth need not be disguised, that parents cannot operate at pleasure on the minds and characters of the young. Their influence is limited by their own ignorance and imperfection, by the strength and freedom of the will of the child, and by its connexion, from its first breath, with other objects and beings. Parents are not the only educators of their offspring, but must divide the work with other and numerous agents; and in this we rejoice; for, were the young confined to domestic in-

fluences, each generation would be a copy of the preceding, and the progress of society would cease. The child is not put into the hands of parents alone. It is not born to hear but a few voices. It is brought at birth into a vast, we may say, an infinite school. The universe is charged with the office of its education. Innumerable voices come to it from all that it meets, sees, feels. It is not confined to a few books anxiously selected for it by parental care. Nature, society, experience, are volumes opened every where and perpetually before its eyes. It takes lessons from every object within the sphere of its senses and its activity, from the sun and stars, from the flowers of spring and the fruits of autumn, from every associate, from every smiling and frowning countenance, from the pursuits, trades, professions of the community in which it moves, from its plays, friendships, and dislikes, from the varieties of human character, and from the consequences of its actions. All these, and more than these, are appointed to teach, awaken, develop the mind of the child: It is plunged amidst friendly and hostile influences, to grow by cooperating with the first, and by resisting the last. The circumstances in which we are placed, form, indeed, a most important school, and by their help some men have risen to distinction in knowledge and virtue, with little aid from parents, teachers, and books.

Still the influence of parents and teachers is great. On them it very much depends, whether the circumstances which surround the child shall operate to his good. They must help him to read, interpret, and use wisely the great volumes of nature, society, and experience. They must fix his volatile glance, arrest his precipitate judgment, guide his observation, teach him to link together cause and effect in the outward world, and turn his thoughts inward on his own more mysterious nature. The young, left to the education of circumstances, left without teaching, guidance, restraint, will, in all probability, grow up ignorant, torpid in intellect, stranger to their own powers, and slaves to their passions. The fact, that some children, without aid

from parents or schools, have struggled into eminence, no more proves such aid to be useless, than the fact, that some have grown strong under physical exposures which would destroy the majority of the race, would prove the worthlessness of the ordinary precautions which are taken for the security of health.

We have spoken of parents, as possessing, and as bound to exert, an important influence on the young. But they cannot do the whole work of education. Their daily occupation, the necessity of labors for the support of their families, household cares, the duty of watching over the health of their children, and other social relations, render it almost impossible for parents to qualify themselves for much of the teaching which the young require, and often deny them time and opportunity for giving instruction to which they are competent. Hence the need of a class of persons, who shall devote themselves exclusively to the work of education. In all societies, ancient and modern, this want has been felt; the profession of teachers has been known; and to secure the best helps of this kind to children, is one of the first duties of parents, for on these the progress of their children very much depends.

One of the discouraging views of society at the present moment is, that whilst much is said of education, hardly any seem to feel the necessity of securing to it the best minds in the community, and of securing them at any price. A juster estimate of this office begins to be made in our great cities; but generally it seems to be thought, that any body may become a teacher. The most moderate ability is thought to be competent to the most important profession in society. Strange, too, as it may seem, on this point parents incline to be economical. They who squander thousands on dress, furniture, amusements, think it hard to pay comparatively small sums to the instructor; and through this ruinous economy, and this ignorance of the dignity of a teacher's vocation, they rob their children of aid, for which the treasures of worlds can afford no compensation.

There is no office higher than that of a teacher of youth, for there is nothing on earth so precious as the mind, soul, character of the child. No office should be regarded with greater respect. The first minds in the community should be encouraged to assume it. Parents should do all but impoverish themselves, to induce such to become the guardians and guides of their children. To this good, all their show and luxury should be sacrificed. Here they should be lavish, whilst they straiten themselves in every thing else.—They should wear the cheapest clothes, live on the plainest food, if they can in no other way secure to their families the best instruction. They should have no anxiety to accumulate property for their children, provided they can place them under influences, which will awaken their faculties, inspire them with pure and high principles, and fit them to bear a manly, useful, and honorable part in the world. No language can express the cruelty or folly of that economy, which, to leave a fortune to a child, starves his intellect, impoverishes his heart. There should be no economy in education. Money should never be weighed against the soul of a child. It should be poured out like water, for the child's intellectual and moral life.

Parents should seek an educator for the young of their families, who will become to them a hearty and efficient friend, counselor, coadjutor, in their work. If their circumstances will allow it, they should so limit the school, that the instructor may know intimately every child, may become the friend of each, and may converse frequently with them in regard to each. He should be worthy of their confidence, should find their doors always open, should be among their most welcome guests, and should study with them the discipline which the peculiarities of each pupil may require. He should give the parents warning of the least obliquity of mind which he discovers at school, should receive in return their suggestions as to the injudiciousness of his own methods in regard to one or another child, and should concert

with them the means of arresting every evil at its first manifestation. Such is the teacher we need, and his value cannot be paid in gold. A man of distinguished ability and virtue, whose mind should be concentrated in the work of training, as many children as he can thoroughly guide, would shed a light on the path of parents for which they often sigh, and would give an impulse to the young, little comprehended under our present modes of teaching. No profession should receive so liberal remuneration. We need not say how far the community fall short of this estimate of the teacher's office. Very many send their children to school, and seldom or never see the instructor, who is operating daily and deeply on their minds and characters. With a blind confidence, perhaps they do not ask how that work is advancing, on which the dearest interests of the family depend. Perhaps they put the children under the daily control of one, with whom they do not care to associate. Perhaps, were they told what they ought to pay for teaching, they would stare as if a project for robbing them were on foot, or would suspect the sanity of the friend, who should counsel them to throw away so much money in purchasing that cheapest of all articles, that drug in every market, instruction for their children.

We know not how society can be aided more than by the formation of a body of wise and efficient educators. We know not any class which would contribute so much to the stability of the state, and to domestic happiness. Much as we respect the ministry of the gospel, we believe that it must yield in importance to the office of training the young. In truth the ministry now accomplishes little for want of that early intellectual and moral discipline, by which alone a community can be prepared to distinguish truth from falsehood, to comprehend the instructions of the pulpit, to receive higher and broader views of duty, and to apply general principles to the diversified details of life. A body of cultivated men, devoted with their whole hearts, to the improvements of education

and to the most effectual training of the young, would work a fundamental revolution in society. They would leaven the community with just principles. Their influence would penetrate our families. Our domestic discipline would no longer be left to accident and impulse. What parent has not felt the need of this aid, has not often been depressed, heart-sick, under the consciousness of ignorance in the great work of swaying the youthful mind!

We have spoken of the office of the education of human beings, as the noblest on earth, and have spoken deliberately. It is more important than that of the statesman. The statesman may set fences round our property and dwellings; but how much more are we indebted to him who calls forth the powers and affections of those for whom our property is earned, and our dwellings reared, and who renders our children objects of increasing love and respect. We go further. We maintain, that higher ability is required for the office of an educator of the young, than for that of a statesman. The highest ability is that, which penetrates farthest into human nature, comprehends the mind in all its capacities, traces out the laws of thought and moral action, understands the perfection of human nature and how it may be approached, understands the springs, motives, applications, by which the child is to be roused to the most vigorous and harmonious action of all its faculties, understands its perils, and knows how to blend and modify the influences which outward circumstances exert on the youthful mind. The speculation of statesmen are shallow, compared with these. It is the chief function of the statesman to watch over the outward interests of a people; that of the educator to quicken its soul. The statesman must study and manage the passions and prejudices of the community; the educator must study the essential, the deepest, the loftiest principles of human nature. The statesman works with coarse instruments for coarse ends; the educator is to work by the most refined influences on that delicate, e-

thereal essence, the immortal soul.

Nothing is more common than mistakes as to the comparative importance of the different vocations of life. Noisy, showy agency, which is spread over a great surface, and therefore seldom penetrates beneath the surface, is called glory. Multitudes are blinded by official dignity, and stand wondering at a pigmy, because he happens to be perched on some eminence in church or state. So the declaimer, who can electrify a crowd by passionate appeals, or splendid images, which give no clear perceptions to the intellect, which develops no general truth, which breathe no firm, disinterested purpose, passes for a great man. How few reflect, that the greater man is he, who, without noise or show, is wisely fixing in a few minds broad, pregnant, generous principles of judgment and action, and giving an impulse which will carry them on forever. Jesus, with that divine wisdom which separates him from all other teachers declared that the first requisite for becoming "great in his kingdom," which was another phrase for exerting a great moral influence, was Humility; by which he meant a spirit opposed to that passion for conspicuous station with which he saw his disciples inflamed, a spirit of deep, unpretending philanthropy, manifested in sympathy with the wants of the mind, and in condescension to any efforts by which the ignorant and tempted might be brought to truth and virtue. According to these views, we think it a greater work to educate a child, in the true and large sense of that phrase, than to rule a state.

Perhaps the direction which benevolence is taking at the present day, has some influence in turning from the office of education the high honour which is its due. Benevolence is now directing itself very much to public objects, to the alleviation of misery on a grand scale, to the conversion of whole nations, to the instruction of large bodies, and in this form it draws the chief notice and admiration of multitudes. Now we are far from wishing to confine this action of charity. We respect it, and recognise in it one

of the distinctive fruits of Christianity. But it must not be forgotten, that the purest benevolence is that which acts on Individuals, and is manifested in our particular, social, domestic relations. It requires no great improvement in charity, to sympathise with the degradation and misery, into which the millions of India are sunk by the worship of Juggernaut, and other superstitions. It is a higher action of the intellect and heart, to study and understand thoroughly the character of an individual who is near us, to enter into his mind, to trace his defects and sufferings to their true springs, to bear quietly and gently with his frowardness, and relapses, and to apply to him patiently and encouragingly the means of intellectual and moral elevation. It is not the highest attainment, to be benevolent to those who are thousands of miles from us, whose miseries make striking pictures for the imagination, who never cross our paths, never interfere with our interests, never try us by their waywardness, never shock us by their coarse manners, and whom we are to aid by an act of bounty, which sends a missionary to their aid. The truest mode of enlarging our benevolence, is not to quicken our sensibility towards great masses, or wide-spread evils, but to approach, comprehend, sympathize with, and act upon a continually increasing number of individuals. It is the glory of God to know, and act on every individual in his infinite creation. Let us, if we can, do good far and wide. Let us send light and joy if we can, to the ends of the earth. The charity which is now active for distant objects, is noble. We only wish to say, that it ranks behind the obscure philanthropy, which, while it sympathises with the race, enters deeply into the minds, wants, interests of the individuals within its reach, and devotes itself patiently and wisely to the task of bringing them to a higher standard of intellectual and moral worth.

We would suggest it to those who are anxious to do good on a grand and imposing scale, that they should be the last to cast into the shade the labors of the retired teacher of the young; because education is the germ of all other improvements, and because all their schemes for the progress of society must fail without it. How often have the efforts of the philanthropist been foiled, by the preju-

dices and brutal ignorance of the community which he has hoped to serve, by their incapacity of understanding him, of entering into and co-operating with his views. He has cast his seed on the barren sand, and of course reaped no fruit but disappointment. Philanthropists are too apt to imagine, that they can accomplish particular reformations, or work particular changes in a society, although no foundation for these improvements has been laid in its intellectual and moral culture. They expect a people to think and act wisely in special cases, although generally wanting in intelligence, sound judgment, and the capacity of understanding and applying the principles of reason. But this partial improvement is a vain hope. The physician who should spend his skill on a diseased limb, whilst all the functions were deranged, and the principle of life almost extinguished, would get no credit for skill. To do men permanent good, we must act on their whole nature, and especially must aid, foster and guide their highest faculties, at the first period of their development. If left in early life to sink into intellectual and moral torpor, if suffered to grow up unconscious of their powers, unused to steady and wise exertion of the understanding & strangers to the motives which ought to stir and guide human activity, they will be poor subjects for the efforts of the philanthropist. Benevolence is short-sighted indeed, and must blame itself for failure, if it do not see in education the chief interests of the human race.

One great cause of the low estimation in which the teacher is now held, may be found in narrow views of education. The multitude think, that to educate a child, is to crowd into its mind a given amount of knowledge, to teach the mechanism of reading and writing, to load the memory with words, to prepare a boy for the routine of a trade. No wonder, then that they think almost every body fit to teach. The true end of education, as we have again and again suggested, is to unfold and direct aright our whole nature. Its office is to call forth Power of every kind, power of thought, affection, will, and outward action; power to observe, to reason, to judge, to contrive; power to adopt good ends firmly, and to pursue them efficiently; power to govern ourselves, and to influence others; power to gain and to spread happiness. Reading is but an instrument; edu-

cation is to teach its best use. The intellect was created, not to receive passively a few words, dates, facts but to be active for the acquisition of Truth. Accordingly, education should labor to inspire a profound love of truth and to teach the processes of investigation. A sound logic, by which we mean the science or art, which instructs us in the laws of reasoning and evidence, in the true method of inquiry, and in the sources of false judgment, is an essential part of good education. And yet how little is done to teach the right use of the intellect, in the common modes of training either rich or poor.

As a general rule, the young are to be made, as far as possible, their own teachers, the discoverers of truth, the interpreters of nature, the framers of science. They are to be helped to help themselves. They should be taught to observe the world in which they live, to trace the connexions of events, to rise from particular facts to general principles, and then to apply these in explaining new phenomena. Such [is a rapid outline of the intellectual education, which, as far as possible, should be given to all human beings; and with this, moral education should go hand in hand. In proportion as the child gains knowledge, he should be taught how to use it well, how to turn it to the good of mankind. He should study the world as God's world, and as the sphere in which he is to form interesting connexions with his fellow creatures. A spirit of humanity should be breathed into him from all his studies. In teaching geography, the physical and moral condition, the wants, advantages, and peculiarities, of different nations, and the relations of climate, seas, rivers, mountains, to their characters and pursuits, should be pointed out, so as to awaken an interest in man, wherever he dwells. History should be constantly used to exercise the moral judgement of the young, to call forth sympathy with the fortunes of the human race, and to expose to indignation and abhorrence, that selfish ambition, that passion for dominion which has so long deluged the earth with blood and woe. And not only should the excitement of just moral feeling be proposed in every study. The science of morals should form an im-

portant part of every child's instruction. One branch of ethics should be particularly insisted on by the government. Every school, established by law, should be specially bound to teach the duties of the citizen to the state, to unfold the principles of free institutions, and to train the young to an enlightened patriotism. From these brief and imperfect views of the nature and ends of a wise education, we learn the dignity of the profession to which it is entrusted, and the importance of securing to it the best minds of the community.

On reviewing these hints on the extent of education, we see that one important topic has been omitted. We have said, that it is the office of the teacher to call into vigorous action the mind of the child. He must do more. He must strive to create a thirst, an insatiable craving for knowledge, to give animation to study and make it a pleasure, and thus to communicate an impulse which will endure, when the instructions of the school are closed. The mark of a good teacher is, not only that he produces great effort in his pupils, but that he dismisses them from his care, conscious of having only laid the foundation of knowledge, and anxious and resolved to improve themselves. One of the sure signs of the low state of instruction among us is, that the young, on leaving school, feel as if the work of intellectual culture were done, and give up steady, vigorous effort for higher truth and wider knowledge. Our daughters at sixteen and our sons at eighteen or twenty have finished their education. The true use of school is to enable and dispose the pupil to learn through life; and if so, who does not see that the office of teacher requires men of enlarged and liberal minds, and of winning manners, in other words, that it requires as cultivated men as can be found in society. If to drive and to drill were the chief duties of an instructor, if to force into the mind an amount of lifeless knowledge, to make the child a machine, to create a repugnance to books, to mental labor, to the acquisition of knowledge, were the great objects of the school-room, then the teacher might be chosen on the principles which now govern the school-committees in no small part of our country. Then a man who can read, write, cypher, and whip, and will exercise his gifts at the

lowest price, deserves the precedence which he now too often enjoys. But if the human being be something more than a block or a brute, if he have powers which proclaim him a child of God and which were given for noble action and perpetual progress, then a better order of things should begin among us, and truly enlightened men should be summoned to the work of education.

Leaving the subject of instruction, we observe that there is another duty of teachers, which requires that they should be taken from the class of improved, wise, virtuous men. They are to govern as well as to teach. They must preserve order, and for this end they must inflict punishment in some of its forms. We know that some philanthropists wish to banish all punishment from the school. We would not discourage their efforts and hopes; but we fear, that the time for this reform is not yet come, and that as long as the want of a wise discipline at home supplies the teacher with so many lawless subjects, he will be compelled to use other restraints than kindness and reason. Punishment, we fear, cannot be dispensed with; but that it ought to be administered most deliberately, righteously, judiciously, and with a wise adaption to the character the child, we all feel; and can it then be safely entrusted, as is too much the case, to teachers undisciplined in mind and heart? Corporal punishment at present has a place in almost all our schools for boys, and perhaps in some for girls. It may be necessary. But ought not every parent to have some security, that his child shall not receive a blow, unless inflicted in wisdom, justice, and kindness? and what security can he have for this, but in the improved character of the instructor? We have known mournful effects of injudicious corporal punishment. We have known a blow to alienate a child from his father, to stir up bitter hatred towards his teachers, and to indispose him to study and the pursuit of knowledge. We cannot be too unwilling to place our children under the care of passionate teachers, who, having no rule over their own spirits, cannot of course rule others, or of weak and unskilful teachers, who are obliged to supply by severity the want of a wise firmness. It is wonderful how thoughtlessly parents

expose their children to corporal punishment. Our laws have expunged whipping from the penal code, and the felon is exempted from this indignity. But how many boys are subjected to a whipper in the shape of a school-master, whose whole mystery of discipline lies in the ferule? The discipline of a school is of vast importance in its moral influence. A boy compelled for six hours each day to see the countenance and hear the voice of an unfeeling, petulant, passionate, unjust teacher, is placed in a school of vice. He is all the time learning lessons of inhumanity, hard-heartedness, and injustice. The English are considered by the rest of Europe as inclined to cruelty. Their common people are said to be wanting in mercy to the inferior animals and to be ferocious in their quarrels, and their planters enjoy the bad preeminence of being the worst; masters in the West Indies, with the exception of the Dutch. It is worth consideration, whether these vices, if they really exist, may not be ascribed in part to the unrestrained, barbarous use of whipping in their schools. Of one thing we are sure, that the discipline of a school has an important influence on the character of a child, and that a just, mild, benevolent teacher, who procures order by methods which the moral sense of his pupils approves, is perpetually spreading around him his own virtues. Should not our teachers then be sought from the class of the most enlightened and excellent men?

Our limits allow us to add but one more remark on the qualifications of teachers. It is important, that they should be able to co-operate with parents in awakening the religious principle in the young. We would not of course admit into schools the peculiarities of the denominations which divide the Christian world. But religion in its broadest sense should be taught. It should indirectly mix with all teaching. The young mind should be guided through nature and human history to the Creator and Disposer of the Universe; and still more, the practical principles and spirit of Christianity should be matters of direct inculcation. We know no office requiring greater wisdom, and none but the wise and good should be invited to discharge it.

Handwritten signature

We know that it will be objected to the views now given, that few, very few will be able to pay for such teachers as we recommend. We believe, however, that there is a large class, who if they had the will, and would deny themselves as they ought, might procure excellent instructors for their children; and as for the rest, let them do their best, let them but throw their hearts into this cause, and improvements will be effected, which have not been anticipated, perhaps not conceived. We acknowledge, however, that our remarks have been intended chiefly for the opulent. Let an interest in education be awakened in this class, and let more generous means for its promotion be employed, and we are satisfied that the teaching of all classes will be advanced. The talent of the country will be more & more directed to the office of instruction, and the benefit will spread through the whole community.

Essay on the Christian Name.

The DISCIPLES were called CHRISTIANS first in Antioch.—LUKE in *Acts xi. 26.*

There is none other NAME [JESUS CHRIST of Nazareth] under heaven given among men whereby we must be SAVED.—PETER in *Acts iv. 12.*

A CHRISTIAN is the highest STYLE of MAN.—YOUNG

We intend to write an essay on a name, which, when considered in connexion with the character it represents, is the most important, dignified and full of import, which man can assume or which can be named upon him. It is the name CHRISTIAN; a name more highly regarded and appreciated than any other, by all really intelligent and obedient disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Names, when considered abstractedly, are, in themselves, of no importance.—When detached from what they represent, they are empty, unmeaning sounds. It is only when they become the distinctive appellations of a party, and thus come to comprehend or stand for, the distinguishing principles or tenets of that party, rearing up walls of division and separation around it, that they assume consequence. And as far as they are unauthorised, and thus become ~~found~~ a common cause, to which those who wear them, claim to be

attached, they are injurious and should be abolished.

It is often said by those who wear names, that a name is *nothing*; and this too in excuse or by way of apology, for wearing them! If *nothing*, why wear them? If a name is so unimportant as to be termed nothing, why acknowledge to it at all? And yet this is done by those who seem to be more zealous for, and to attach more importance to, names than any others! But names are *something* or they would not be used. The world is said to be ruled or governed by names, and just and true is the observation.

We have said that it is when considered in connexion with the character for which it stands, that the *Christian* name becomes so important. It represents *character*, and none are entitled to this sacred appellation but those who have that character. None are entitled to it *before*, let them assume it under whatever circumstances they may.

To illustrate this we will take the case of some of the learned *professions* of the country. We have among us two classes of characters called Physicians and Lawyers, with which we are all well acquainted.—A man in order to become a member of one of these professions, has a certain course of discipline and preparation to go through, which qualifies him for membership. This is actually necessary, and without it no man can become a good Physician or Lawyer. But a man may be in possession of all this, and yet be neither. He must obtain *licens* before he can be a Lawyer, and a *diploma* before he can be a Physician. We use these cases in reference to the laws and customs of the country. Neither obtaining the *licens* or the *diploma* is the man's own action or work. They are bestowed upon him on conditions of his qualifications.—But a man may obtain both, without all the qualification, or perhaps any of it; but then he is not *really* the one or the other, and is a hypocrite or a quack. He wears the *name* without the *character*. And it would be very inconsistent and absurd, for a man to claim the character and name of Physician or Lawyer, because he is a very good farmer, or carpenter, or smith!—His claims on these grounds would not be good, and not entitle him to the character,

hurtful

name, offices or emoluments and rewards of either. We will make use of another illustration. An Englishman wishes to become an American citizen. He has to reside a certain length of time in the United States, and then take the *oath of allegiance*. All this time while in our country, however well qualified he may be, he is not a citizen. The oath of allegiance is necessary. Taking this oath is not his action or work. It is administered to him by others.

The analogies are excellent. There are certain qualifications, a certain course of preparation, necessary in order that a man may become a *Christian*, and thus entitled to all the privileges and promises connected with that character and name. They are all comprehended by two general terms;—*faith*, and *repentance* or *reformation*. Paul, in his epistle to the Roman Christians, has very aptly and beautifully illustrated the case of persons becoming Christians, by a figure drawn from the institution of marriage. He is arguing the abolition of the Mosaic law; its consequent want of authority over those under it, and their freedom from its obligations and bondage. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. * * * * * Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Marrying, strictly speaking, is not the action or work of the woman. She is passive in it, and hence we say she is married. An officer commissioned by the highest authority in the land, issues the licens, and another one properly authorised by the laws of the land, performs the ceremony. The analogy, which is particularly fit in representing the case of becoming a Christian, is perhaps the most appropriate of any which we could select. Its fitness is the obvious reason why the Spirit of inspiration suggested it to Paul. And this will appear still more evident, when we consider that as the bride or woman in becoming a wife takes the name of her husband to the exclusion of her former and all other names, so he who really becomes a *Christian* takes the name of CHRIST.

None, we, have observed, are entitled to this name, but those who are properly qualified and prepared, and who acquire the character which it represents. Paul in his epistles refers to the time, the action and the manner, in as definite terms as they could be expressed. "*Buried* with him [Christ] in *baptism*, wherein also ye are *risen* with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath *raised* him from the dead." "Know ye not that so many of us as were *baptized* into Jesus Christ were *baptized* into his death? Therefore we are *buried* with him by *baptism* into death; that that like as Christ was *raised up* from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should also walk in newness of life. For if we have been *planted together* in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." "Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ; that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have *put on Christ*." The consequence of this was the abolition of all previous distinctions and party distinctive appellations. "There is neither Jew nor Greek," continues the Apostle, "there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." That Paul in the first quotation which we made from Romans, had an allusion to *baptism*, is very evident from these last ones which we have made from him, where he is as in Rom. commenting on the law and Gospel. Hence in the commission which our Saviour gave his Apostle, he commanded them; "Go ye therefore, and teach [or convert] all nations, *baptizing* them in [Greek *eis to onoma*, into the NAME] the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And hence in the fulfilment of that commission; Acts viii 16; "they were *baptized* in [*eis to onoma*, into the NAME] of the LORD JESUS;" and again, Acts xix. 5; "they were *baptized* in [*eis to onoma*, into the NAME] of the LORD JESUS." As no one has the character, however well prepared for it he may be, before he is in-

m. rsed, he is not entitled to the sacred name of *Christian*, if *immersion* is the only action of baptism. Hence the great importance also attached to this name. Through it we receive remission of sins and in it we are justified. "Through *his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." "Be baptized every one of you in the name of *JESUS CHRIST* for the remission of sins." "Ye are washed, * * ye are sanctified, * * ye are justified in the name of the *LORD JESUS*, and [sanctified] by the Spirit of our God." In this name the Apostles performed their mighty miracles and wonderful works. In the promise in the commission, our Lord says; "And 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;" &c. And in the fulfilment of that commission; "In the name of *JESUS CHRIST* rise up and walk;" and "*his name*, through *faith* in his name, hath made this man strong;" "by the name of *JESUS CHRIST* of Nazareth, * * * by him doth this man stand here before you whole." For his name's sake, the Apostles received favor and the apostolic office for the obedience of faith. "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations for *his name*." It is in his name that we are to assemble together. "Where two or three are gathered together in *my name*, there am I in the midst of them." To his name we are to offer praise and thanksgiving. "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to *his name*." In his name we are in every thing to act and speak. "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." In no other name is there salvation. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given amongst men whereby we must be saved." At his name every knee shall bow and every tongue confess. "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: 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 con-

fess that *Jesus Christ* is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Thus we see the great importance of this name, and its superiority to every other.

We find several epithets in the Acts and Epistles by which Christians were designated. These are "disciples," "saints," and "brethren." But none of these carry in them the same import as that of "Christian." All are relative terms, but the first three imply different and particular relations. The term *disciple* implies a scholar or learner and relates to teacher. There were disciples before the coming of our Saviour. Moses had disciples. John the baptizer, who was beheaded before the Reign of Heaven-commenced, had his disciples. The Roman and Grecian philosophers had their disciples. The term *saint* implies separation and sanctification. All the really pious and holy men, before the coming of the Lord, were saints, and accordingly have the appellation applied to them. The term *brethren* implies those who are united together in one family under one head. There were brethren before the coming of Christ. The Jews were all brethren belonging to the family of their father Abraham. The term *church* or congregation can also be appropriately applied to assemblies before the advent of the Messiah. The Jews are called in the New Testament, "the church in the wilderness." As men were disciples, saints and brethren before the advent of our Saviour, none of these epithets therefore imply as much as that of *Christian*. It is the crowning epithet which comprehends all the others, but cannot be comprehended by any one of them. Hence its appropriateness to designate those to whom it is applied.

Not only is the name *Christian* the most appropriate which the disciples of the Messiah can wear, but it is thought by many eminent critics and commentators to have been given by divine appointment. "And the disciples [*chreematisai*, Greek] were called Christians first at Antioch." *Chreematisai* is from *chreematizo*, some of the definitions of which are as follows: "To give an intimation of the divine will—(from the s. 'to transact business') to assume a name, or denomination, Polyb. 5, 57. and N. T. Acts. c. 11. and ep. Rom. c. 7, 3. Plut. 7, p. 20. Wyttenb." "Pass. to

receive an oracular response; to receive an intimation of the divine will, N. T. *Matt.* 2, 12, and 22. *Acts* 10, 22."—DONNEGAN. "To decide, sentence, decree, award; * * * to sanction, enact, make to be, call, name; to answer, give oracles, prophecy, foretell; * * * to consult an oracle, receive an answer, be warned."—GROVE. "To give an oracle, to answer; *pas.* to receive an oracle, to receive a divine admonition."—SCHREVELIUS. Dr. DODDRIDGE in his, "Family Expositor," translates the above sentence from Acts; "and the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch." Let it be noticed, that this name was given first at Antioch, immediately after Peter, (*Acts* 10 chap.) by virtue of the special commission given to him by our Lord, opened the kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles; and that Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles was at Antioch to confer the name by divine direction.

We add to these remarks, the following very appropriate extracts, which are ready to our hands:

"THE distinguished subjects of this essay were, by their historian Luke, denominated "the disciples" and "the saints," and both with a manifest reference to the Lord Jesus. The same author also informs us that they were accustomed to consider and address each other as brethren; wherefore he likewise uses this epithet in speaking of the characters under consideration. He also styles the aggregate or assemblage of those collected and dwelling together in any place, "the church in," or "at," such a place; or simply "the church;" and in the plural, "the churches." For the authenticity of these remarks, as well as for a variety of other important items respecting the subjects of our present inquiry, the reader is humbly and earnestly requested to peruse with attention the first twelve chapters of the history of these people, with the first three verses of the xiiiith; viz. of the Acts of the Apostles.

Now, as descriptive epithets are always intended to convey to us some knowledge of the thing described, let us advert a little to the import of the above epithets which were given to those people individually and collectively considered; and also how they

came by those epithets, or on what account they received them. As to the first, namely, "disciple," we know it signifies scholar or learner; that is one who subjects himself to, or under the teaching of, a certain master, that he may learn and practise his instructions for the very purpose they were given. Now, when any person puts himself thus under the guidance and direction of another, he actually becomes his disciple. It has been already observed, that the members of this ancient sect received the appellations both of *disciples* and *saints* in relation to the Lord Jesus: it therefore necessarily follows, that they acknowledge *him* their *only* Master; for this was one of his primary injunctions, that his disciples should acknowledge no master but himself. *Matt.* xxiii. 8—10. Again, addressing his disciples, he saith, "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am," *John* xiii. 13. These, then, were his exclusive claims upon his disciples, that they should acknowledge *him exclusively* their immediate and only Lord and Master, or Teacher, under God the Father, who had delivered all things into *his* hand. And here let it be noted that it was in direct opposition to him in these his righteous claims, that the Jews cleave to Moses, as *their* only Teacher unto God; saying to one of his followers; "Thou art *his* disciple; but we are *Moses'* disciple." *John* ix. 28.

We have found, then; the first grand distinguishing peculiarity of that ancient sect of religionists; viz. that in all matters of a religious nature; that is, all matters of faith and obedience, or whatsoever respected the conscience; they acknowledged but one Lord and Master, one divine authoritative teacher, even Christ. Wherefore, in compliance with this leading principle, we find the apostles, those prime ministers of the gospel, always addressing their disciples in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, whether they command or exhort. Moreover, in order to substantiate their claim to the discipleship, it was indispensably necessary that they should not only *profess* to receive Christ as their *only* Master and Lord, but they must also abide

in him by abiding in his word, and his word abiding in them: John xv. 7—10. If ye continue in my word, said he to those Jews that believed in him, ye are my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth; and the truth shall make you free. John viii. 31, 32. Under this particular we shall notice at present but one item—one primary clause; to which all that would become his disciples must heartily submit. See Luke ix 23. And he said to all, if any one will come after me; (that is, if any one will become my follower—will put himself under my guidance and direction,) let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me; that is, and then follow me; for no one, as if he had said, can become my follower upon any other terms. For this see also Luke xiv. 26—30. Thus we may rest assured (as appears from their history) did those who were afterwards called christians at Antioch, come to enjoy the distinguishing and blissful privilege of discipleship.

But before they were called christians, we find they had been also called *saints*; that is, according to the real import of the term, holy persons; for all persons or things that are in some peculiar or special manner—for some peculiar or special purpose—separated to the service of God, are, in fixed style of the Holy Scriptures, termed sanctified or holy. Now we may clearly perceive in the foregoing items respecting the persons under consideration, that they were justly entitled to *this* epithet; and also upon what account they were so. They had professedly received Christ in his proper character; had manifestly complied with the terms of discipleship as above, “had purified their souls in obeying the truth through the spirit,” and thus had become sanctified through the truth, according to John xiii. 17, and were actually manifesting the truth of their discipleship by walking in love, according to John xiii. 35. “But this shall all know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love to another.” Now being affected thus with the truth, they had manifestly become “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar

people; to shew forth the praises of God, who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light.” They were, therefore, upon the highest considerations amongst men, properly called *saints*. What a beautiful gradation in the process of the divine economy towards this ancient and highly distinguished people! First called *disciples*, being really made such by divine teaching; that is, by the truth of the gospel; next called *saints*, being sanctified through the truth believed; then, *brethren*, being united in and by the truth under one head, name by Christ; the head of the redeemed family of mankind, under his Father; for “the head of Christ is God,” “of whom (as the Great Father of All) the whole family in heaven and earth is named.” Put these together, and we shall find those favored people at length rightly called Christians, who were first by an orderly succession and concatenation of effects, the disciples, the *saints*, & the brethren of Christ. The propriety of this *crowning* epithet will appear conspicuously evident if we consider its import. “Christian” is a derivative from Christ. Now the term “Christ” signifies *anointed*, or the *Anointed One*; of course the term “Christian” naturally and necessarily signifies a partaker of the same anointing by derivation and communication, but in a lower & subordinate degree; as derivatives are also frequently diminutives, both in the ancient and modern languages. Upon this interpretation of the import and relation of the terms, let us advert to divine declarations upon this subject. John i. “We beheld his glory, the glory as of an only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and of his fulness have we all received, even grace for grace.” “For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.” Col. ii. 19; “Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things. The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you. The same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth,” &c. John ii. 29—25. Hence we see the above interpretation fully established. In this epithet we may perceive the accomplishment of ancient prophecies. “For thus saith the Lord God, (speaking of Messiah’s people in the aggregate, under the ancient

terms of Zion and Jerusalem.) "The Gentiles shall see thy righteousness [and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a *new name* which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Again, in relation to this *new name*, speaking of the same people, in contradistinction to the unbelieving, stiff-necked, and rebellious Jews, (those obstinate adherents to Moses to the rejection of Jesus,) he saith, "Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, my servant shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall have your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by *another name*. For behold, I create a new heaven, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."—And, "as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall *your seed* and *your name* remain." Isaiah lxii. 2. lxii 13—15. 17. lxvi. 22.

How completely verified these ancient predictions, both in Messiah's people, and in the Jews that rejected him, no one, who has attentively read the New Testament as an authentic record, can be at a loss to determine. Those especially who have read Josephus' account of the final destruction of Judea and Jerusalem by the Romans, can be at no loss to perceive the awful verification of the above predictions in relation to the latter. It farther appears from the above citations, that the *new name* of *Christian*, first given to the primitive disciples at Antioch, was of divine original, and not merely by accident, or of man's devising. See Isaiah lxii. 2. as also the common use of the word "*chrematisai*," (called) seems to signify. This will also appear reasonable, both from the character of the subjects so called, its perpetuity and extent, and the important ends to be answered by it. Indeed all these things are recognized in the documents before us. It was to be the name, the only distinguishing name of the Messiah's people; therefore, it was meet that it should be imposed by him—that "the mouth of the Lord" should name it. Again,

its perpetuity was to be equal to its extent; for as this important name was to cover or include the whole of Christ's people co-existing upon earth at any one time, so it was to continue to the end of time—"so shall your seed and your name remain." Again, it was to answer the most important ends to the subjects; it was to absorb and obliterate for ever all names of partial distinction in the grand republic of religion and morals; and thus to unite in one grand religious community, without distinction, the whole human family under Christ—we mean as many of all nations as should believe in his name. Accordingly we find this name first given to the disciples at Antioch, in Syria, shortly after the gospel had been first preached to mere Gentiles, in Cesaria, in the house of Cornelius; the immediate consequence of which, as appears, was the exhibition of the gospel to the citizens of Antioch, without distinction of Jew or Gentile; and that with great success amongst the latter. See Acts xi. 19.—24. Now for the first time, a great and mixed multitude, but chiefly Gentiles, were converted in the same city, and became together disciples of the same Lord. Now was the time, the *precise* time, when a new and appropriate name became necessary in order to unite these hitherto dissociated and jarring characters into one associated body: a name, too, of such powerful import, as might supersede and bury for ever all offensive recollections of former hateful distinctions. Now we see that it was at this critical juncture, this precise point of time, and not before, that the *new name* was given. Indeed, it had never been necessary before, while discipleship was confined to the Jews, and their religious proselytes only; for these were already united in the religion of Moses. See, reader, the wise and gracious management of the divine economy! and that the Lord hath nothing in vain! Well might the apostle say, that, "in the exceeding riches of his grace, he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence." We come now to the last of those descriptive epithets by which the sacred his-

torian denominates the aggregate of the Christians dwelling together in the same vicinity, and stately assembling together in the same place for religious purposes, viz. the church in or at such a place; and speaking of a number of such assemblies in any country, province, or district, he calls them the churches within such limits. See Acts ix. 31. &c.

If we advert to the literal and intrinsic force or meaning of the original term which we translate *church*, we will find it equivalent called or chosen out of. Now the propriety of this epithet to a society or association of such characters as we have been considering, is sufficiently manifest from the whole of the premises before us taken together. Considered as disciples, they were separated from the authoritative teaching of all others in religious matters, to the *One Master*: in consequence of receiving *him* and *his* doctrine, they became saints, *i. e.* separated to God. Thus united under one head, they became brethren; and, as such, associated for religious purposes, they became manifestly the called or chosen out of the rest of mankind, to the worshipping of God according to Christ Jesus.

We have already observed that their prime original epithet was simply that of "*disciples*" in relation to Christ, whom they considered as the only authoritative teacher under God, to whom only they were to hearken in matters of religion, according to the voice that proceeded from the Excellent Glory at his baptism and transfiguration—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased—*hear ye him.*" But, upon this, it will naturally occur, that it was the privilege of a few only of those who were afterwards called "*disciples.*" to have been personally acquainted with Christ, and, of course, to have been under his immediate teaching, and probably none of those at Antioch who first received the christian name. How, then, did they become *his* disciples, in the strict and proper sense of the term, as we have scripturally understood and considered? the answer is obvious. It was in consequence of

the commission given to the apostles after his resurrection, and shortly before his ascension, "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; and make disciples of all nations," &c. We say, then, that the principle which originated their discipleship, and that of *all others* from the day of Pentecost and afterwards, to the end of the world, was laid in the above commission—can be found no where else, and must be traced up to that source."

That the disciples were in the habit of wearing the Christian name and no other, we infer from the mention made of it in the Scriptures and the allusions to it and the name of Christ. "Almost thou persuadest me to be a *Christian.*" "If any man suffer as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf." "God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his *name.*" "All the Gentiles upon whom my *name* is called." "Thou holdest fast my *name* and hast not denied my faith." "Thou hast kept my word, and hast not denied my *name.*" "Let every one that *nameth* the name of CHRIST depart from iniquity." "Do they not blaspheme that worthy *name* by the which ye are called?" "If ye be reproached for the *name* of CHRIST, happy are ye." Besides, what else could they have been called in those primitive times? There were then no such distinctive appellations as Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, &c. as all are compelled to acknowledge who are acquainted with the New Testament Scriptures.

The great importance which men attach to party names, is argued from their wearing them, their great attachment to them, glorying in them, &c.; and from their being a bond of union to hold sects together.

Being friends and advocates of Christian union, we are opposed to sectarian and party names, because they *divide* Christians and keep them apart. A mere name and odium, or whatever else may be attached to it, frequently keep them divided, and prevent union, where agreement of principles and practice otherwise would not. All cannot be united under any one sectarian or party name. The Baptist will not give

up his name and take that of Methodist, nor the Presbyterian, that of Baptist. All parties are not willing to take the name of any *one* party, but all are willing to take the name of *Christian*, as they all claim the character for which it stands, while they will not own all of any other character; therefore this is the only name under which all can be united. The union of Christians is necessary for the conversion of the world, which cannot be accomplished while sectarian names keep them apart. It was for this that our Saviour prayed for union among his apostles and disciples. The disciples must all be united for this purpose, and in order to this, there must be agreement in the testimony of the Apostles.

"Holy Father, keep through thine own name those [apostles] whom thou hast given me, that they may be *one* as we are. While I was in the world I kept them in thy name.

* * * * * Neither pray I for these alone, but for them [disciples] also which shall believe on me through *their* word; that they all may be *one*; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us; that the *world* may BELIEVE that thou hast sent me." As our Lord knew what to pray for, and as his Father will answer all his prayers, we find from apostolic and prophetic declaration, that all are to be united and the whole world to believe. "At the NAME of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and are in earth." We see then that it is the will and determination of God, that all shall be united, and that *Christian* is the only name under which this can be accomplished, it is under this name therefore that this union is to be effected, to the exclusion of all other appellations, which are to be abolished. And good reason for it too. It is the name of the Christian's head and lawgiver. God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the *head* over all things to the church, which is his body." "He is the *head* of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead;

that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." "The *head* of every man is Christ." "Christ is the *head* of the church; and he is the Saviour of the body." "The *head* of all principality and power." "There is one *Lawgiver*, who is able to save and to destroy." Hence; "There is *one* body and *one* SPIRIT, even as ye are called in *one* NOPE of your calling; *one* LORD, *one* FAITH, *one* BAPTISM. *One* GOD and FATHER of all, who is above all, through all and in you all." Moreover, as all "professors" profess to wish and labor for the conversion of the world, and as names prevent this great object, by holding them they retard that for which they are labouring and praying!

No one will be saved because he is a Methodist, Baptist or Presbyterian, for very obvious reasons. If any one be saved because he is a Methodist, it will exclude all the Baptists and Presbyterians, and if any one be saved because he is a Presbyterian, it will exclude the others. But all will be saved because they are Christians, as all must acknowledge. Why then have or own to these names?—and why not prefer that of *Christian*? When they have to appear before the judgement seat of Christ, they will not be questioned about these names which they have here. It will not be asked, were you a Baptist, Presbyterian or Methodist?—but, were you a *Christian*?—did you BELIEVE *my* words, and DO *my* commandments? What are we to appear there for? "That every one may receive the things DONE in his body, according to that he hath DONE, whether it be *good* or *bad*." "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have DONE GOOD, unto the resurrection of LIFE; and they that have DONE EVIL, unto the resurrection of damnation." "Who will render to every man according to his DEEDS." "My reward is with me, to give to every man according as his WORK shall be." It will not be inquired, what has been your sectarian name?—but, what have you done, and what has been your character? What is the use of these names then? And if the Christian name be one of *divine* origin, and God has never commanded any other, are we not disobeying him and doing what we ought not, if we wear another in

preference to wearing this *alone*? Cannot a man be a Christian without being either a Baptist, Methodist or Presbyterian? We must answer in the affirmative. This is obliged to be acknowledged, or all these sects but one will be excluded. Well then, where is the use or advantage, in a heavenly point of view, of being any of these?

But we will shew from Apostolic testimony that these sectarian names are displeasing to God. That which is *carnal* does not please Him, and these names are so. "They that are in the flesh [or *carnal*] cannot please God." Paul reproves the Corinthians for their divisions and sectarian names. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the NAME of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be *no divisions* among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me, of you, my brethren, * * * that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you [or each of you] saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in [or *eis*, into] the *name* of Paul?" He does not say here which are *carnal*, but merely speaks of the existence of division. He says again; "For whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not *carnal* and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of *Paul*; and another, I am of *Apollos*; are ye not *carnal*?" Let it be noticed here that he does not call those *carnal* who said they were of *Christ*. Now what is the consequence of this carnality? "For to be *carnally minded* is *DEATH*; but to be spiritually minded is *life* and peace: because the *carnal mind* is *enmity* against God; for it is not subject to the *law* of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are *in the flesh* cannot please God." And what is to be the end of those who incur the displeasure of God? Search the Scriptures and see!

Would any man have been received into any of the congregations or churches of Christ in the days of the Apostles, in consequence of being a Methodist, Baptist or Presbyterian, or having any other sectarian name? Would he have been accepted as a member on the ground of being any

of these? Let us suppose a case occurring in which one from each of the different sects presents himself for membership. The congregation at Phillippi assemble together to Break the Loaf or observe the Lord's supper, according to custom in accordance with apostolic precept and injunction: An invitation is given to persons who wish to unite. An Episcopalian presents himself.

BISHOP.—You wish to unite with this congregation to worship the Lord, assist in bearing one another's burdens, and observe his commandments?

EPISCOPALIAN.—I do.

BISHOP.—Have you a letter of commendation, or any other testimonial to offer?

EPISCOPALIAN.—I am an Episcopalian,* sir.

BISHOP.—Is this the condition on which you desire to unite with us?—because you are a bishop and can oversee or govern a congregation? This is not the ground on which we receive members, sir: We cannot receive you.

Bishop.—Another has presented himself. Have you a letter!

PRESBYTERIAN.—I am a Presbyterian.†

BISHOP.—You look too young entirely to be an *Elder*. Besides, we do not receive persons into this congregation because they are *Elders*. You cannot be received.

Bishop.—Another offers himself for admission into this body. Where is your letter?—what is your recommendation!

BAPTIST.—I am a Baptist.‡ sir.

* EPISCOPALIAN is from (Greek) *Episkopos*.—"An overseer, an inspector, one who hath the inspection or oversight, a superintendent, a bishop. It is once applied to Christ, 1 Pet. ii. 25; but in every other passage of the N. T. is spoken of men who have the oversight of Christ's flock"—PARKHURST.

† PRESBYTERIAN is from *Presbyteros*.—"An old man, elder, one advanced in life." An *Elder* or *Presbyter* in the Christian church."—PARKHURST.

‡ BAPTIST is from *Baptistes*.—"from baptizo.—A baptizer, "a title from John's office, not a proper name." Dr. Geo. Campbell, whom see. An agnomen or surname of John, the forerunner of our B Lord, taken from the office committed to him by God."—PARKHURST. John was a baptizer or immerser. "Jesus is the Bridegroom and has the bride, and John is only his friend or waiter sent before him, to make preliminary arrangements for the arrival of the groom

Bishop.—We cannot receive you, sir, merely because you can baptize! There are other more important requisitions. You cannot be received.

Bishop.—Here is also another. Do you desire to unite with us of this congregation?

METHODIST.—That is my wish, sir.

Bishop.—Where is your commendation?

Methodist.—I am a Methodist*. Is not that commendation enough?

Bishop.—You cannot be received by us, sir. We do not make it a condition of receiving any one because they are good at contriving or devising.

This is the sum of about what would have actually taken place in the cases above, could such have happened in Apostolic times.

The figure of marriage is used by Paul, as we have seen, to represent the union which takes place between the believer and Christ, when the former becomes a Christian. As the bride is to wear the bridegroom's name, so the Church is to wear Christ's. Were a husband to take a long journey, but to *certainly* return at some distant time, and were his wife in his absence to take the name of another or another name, could he own and claim her as his bride when he returned? Now Christ has left the earth, but is certainly to return the *second* time, as the scriptures plainly declare. If the Church when he comes (and who knows when or how soon?) is found wearing another name or other names, which he has never authorized, but forbidden, can he claim her as his bride?

If those who wear other names have no other tenets but those that are Christian, why have any other names to distinguish them? Having other names furnishes a strong presumption that they have other tenets, which require other names to distinguish those who hold them. It is a remark worthy of attention, that if the name be not in the Scriptures, the thing or doc-

John iii. 29. Whether the bride, the church, ought to wear the name of the Bridegroom himself or of his friend, I will now leave you awhile to reflect."—*The Disciple*.

* *METHODIST* is from *Methodos*.—*A way, method, device;* from which comes "*METHODOUS* to contrive, devise;" and from that *methodeia*, "*a device, artifice, art, artificial method, a wile,* occ. Eph. iv. 14 iv. 11."—PARKHURST.

trine for which it stands is not apt to be there. And we have seen it the case, (witness the present reformation,) that those who rejected names and teaching of human invention, devising and authority, were more open to receive truth, and learned and obeyed it, more readily and quickly than others.

Who would wear the name of any man on earth in preference to the name of him who "spake as never man spake," "the Lord from heaven?" Who would prefer wearing a *human name*, of human invention, to one of *divine* appointment or sanction?

We will conclude this Essay with an elegant extract from Barnes' Notes on Acts, note on chap. xi. 26. "It soon became a name of reproach; and has usually been in all ages since, by the wicked, the gay, the licentious, and the ungodly. It is, however, an honoured name; the *most* honorable appellation that can be conferred on a mortal. It suggests at once to a Christian the name of his great Redeemer; the idea of an intimate relation to him; and the thought that we receive him as our chosen Leader, the source of our blessings, the author of our salvation, the fountain of our joys. It is not that we belong to this or that denomination; it is not that our names are connected with high and illustrious ancestors; it is not that they are recorded in the books of heralds; it is not that they stand high in courts, and among the gay, and the fashionable, and the rich, that true honor is conferred on men. These are not the things that give *distinction* and *peculiarity* to the followers of the Redeemer. It is that they are *Christians*; that this is their peculiar name; that by this they are known; that this at once suggests their character, their feelings, their doctrines, their hopes, their joys. This binds them all together—a name which rises above every other appellation; which unites in one the inhabitants of distant nations and tribes of men; which connects the extremes of society, and places them in most important respects on a common level; and which is a bond to unite in one family all those who love the Lord Jesus, though dwelling in different climes, speaking different languages, engaged in different pursuits in life, and occupying disant

graves at death. He who lives according to the import of this name is the most blessed and eminent of mortals. The name shall be had in remembrance when the names of royalty shall be remembered no more, and when the appellations of nobility shall cease to amuse or to dazzle the world."

EDITOR.

Note to preceding Essay.

It will not be uninteresting to the reader, to see what the most eminent critics and commentators have said on the subject of the preceding Essay, in their notes and criticisms on Acts xi. 26. We shall adduce Henry, Scott, Dr. Adam Clarke, Doddridge and others, whose observations are the more valuable as they all are themselves members of some one of the different sects. We shall begin with Brown and Calmet in their Dictionaries of the Bible.

EDITOR.

BROWN.*—The saints are called CHRISTIANS, because they belong to, obey, and imitate Jesus Christ; and are anointed with the same Spirit of God. To constitute one a true Christian, he must be united to Christ as his head and husband, have Christ and his Spirit dwelling in his heart, have Christ's graces implanted in all the faculties of his soul, and must believe, profess, and practice Christ's truths, in conformity to Christ's commands and examples. They, by divine direction, first received this designation at Antioch, in the apostolic age, and still retain it. Acts xi. 26.

CALMET.†—CHRISTIAN, a name given at Antioch to those who believed Jesus to be the Messiah, Acts xi. 26. They generally called themselves brethren, faithful, saints, believers; and were named by the Gentiles, Nazarenes and Galileans. * * * * * Tertullian says, "The name of Christian comes from the unction received by Jesus Christ."

ROBERT HALL.‡—Their enemies, by way of contempt, styled them Nazarenes; thus Tertullus accuses Paul of being "a ring leader of the sect of Nazarenes." Of similar import to this was the appellation of Galileans, and the term *aircesis*, or sect, meaning by that a body of men who had embraced a religion of their own in opposition to that established by the law. And this appellation of Galileans was continued to be employed by the enemies of Christ as a term of re-

proach, as late as the time of Julian, who reigned about the middle of the fourth century, and used it incessantly in his invectives against Christians. The followers of Christ were also styled "men of this way." "And I persecuted *this way* unto the death."

Another question naturally here occurs,—Was this name given by human or divine authority? On this the scriptures offer no certain information, nor can any thing be affirmed with confidence. It is not at all probable an appellation so inoffensive, and even so honorable, originated with their enemies; they would have invented one that was more opprobrious. But supposing it to have been assumed first by the disciples themselves, we can scarcely suppose they would have ventured to take a step so important as that of assuming an appellation by which the church was to be distinguished in all ages, without divine direction; especially at a time when the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were so common, and in a church where prophets abounded. For "there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul." Is it to be supposed that they would assume a new appellation without recourse to the prophets for that direction; or that, supposing it to have had no other than a human origin, it would have been so soon and so unanimously adopted by every part of the Christian church? This opinion receives some countenance from the word here used, which is not in any other instance applied to the giving a name by human authority. In its genuine import, it bears some relation to an oracle. Names, as they are calculated to give just or false representations of the nature of things, are of considerable importance; so that the affixing one to discriminate the followers of Christ in every period of time seems to have not been unworthy of divine interposition.

DODDRIDGE.*—They were before this called by the Jews, Nazarenes, or Galileans, and by each other, disciples, believers, brethren, or saints. But they now assumed the name of their great Leader, as the Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans, &c. with much less reason had done the name of theirs. I think, with Dr. Benson, that the use of the word *chreemutisia* implies that it was done by divine direction, and have translated it accordingly: (compare Matt. ii. 12, 22.—Luke ii. 26. Acts x. 22. Heb. viii. 5. xi. 7. xii. 25.)

* Presbyterian.

† Roman Catholic.

‡ Baptist.

* Congregationalist.

SCOTT.*—Were called Christians. (Acts xi 26) "It came to pass that they" (Paul and Barnabas) "called the disciples Christians." This is indisputably the natural construction of the verse.—But the word implies that this was done by divine revelation: for it has generally this signification in the New Testament, and is rendered "warned from God" or "warned of God," even when there is no word for God in the Greek. "The believing Jews and Gentiles, being made one church, that the name of Jew and heathen might no more continue the distance that was between them, this new name was given to them both; as some conceive according to the prophecy mentioned, *Is. 65. 15.*—*Whitby.* Their enemies had hitherto called them Nazarenes, or Galileans: and if they had devised some other opprobrious name, they would, probably, have derived it from the word *JESUS*, rather than from *CHRIST*, or the *MESSIAH*, which they would never allow the crucified Nazarene to be. On the other hand, the disciples had called each other "brethren," "believers," and "saints," which names were not sufficiently distinguishing; but the word *Christian*, aptly denoted their reliance on that anointed Prince and Saviour, who was generally rejected with disdain by Jews and Gentiles: it also implied, that they were partakers of *unction* by the Holy Spirit. Doubtless it was afterwards used as a term of reproach by their persecutors, though it was so honorable in its meaning and original.

CLARKE.†—*And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*] It is evident they had the name *Christians* from *CHRIST* their master; as the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* had their name from their masters, *Plato* and *Pythagoras*. Now, as these had their names from their great masters, because they attended their teaching and credited their doctrines; so the disciples were called *Christians*, because they took *Christ* for their teacher, crediting his doctrines, and following the *rule of life* laid down by him. It has been a question, by whom was this name given to the disciples? Some think they assumed it; others, that the *inhabitants* of *Antioch* gave it to them; and others, that it was given by *Saul* and *Barnabas*. This latter opinion is favoured by the *Codex Beza*, which reads the 25th and 26th verses [Acts xi] thus: *And hearing that Saul was at Tarsus, he departed, seeking for him; and having found him he besought him to come to Antioch; who, when they were come, assembled with the church a whole year, and in-*

structed a great number; and there they first called the disciples at Antioch, Christians.

The word *chreematisai*, in our common text, which we translate *were called*, signifies in the New Testament, to *appoint*, *warn*, or *nominate* by *divine direction*. In this sense the word is used *Matt. ii. 12.* *Luke ii. 26* and in the preceding chapter of this book, *ver. 22.* If therefore the name was given by *divine appointment*, it is most likely that *Saul* and *Barnabas* were directed to give it; and that, therefore, the name *Christian* is from *God*, as well as that *grace* and *holiness* which are so essentially required and implied in the character. Before this time, the Jewish converts were simply called, among themselves, *disciples*, i. e. scholars; *believers*, *saints*, *the church*, or *assembly*; and by their enemies, *Nazarenes*, *Galileans*, and the *men of this way*, or *sect*; and perhaps by other names, which are not come down to us. They consider themselves as *one family*; and hence the appellation of *brethren* was frequent among them. It was the design of *God* to make all who believed of *one heart*, and *one soul*, that they might consider him as their *Father*, and live and love like children of the same household. A *Christian*, therefore, is the highest character which any human being can bear upon earth; and to receive it from *God*, as those appear to have done, how glorious the title!

HENRY.*—Hitherto they who gave up their names to *Christ*, were called *disciples*, *learners*, *scholars* trained up under him, in order to their being employed by him; but from henceforward they were called *Christians*. *First*, Thus the reproachful names which their enemies had hitherto branded them with, would, perhaps, be wiped away and disused. They called them *Nazarenes*, (*ch. 24. 5.*) *the men of that way*, *that by-way*, which had no name; and thus they prejudiced people against them, to remove which prejudices they gave themselves a name, which their enemies could not but say was proper. *Secondly*, Thus they, who before their conversion had been distinguished by the names of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, might after their conversion be called by one and the same name; which would help them to forget their former dividing names, and with them the seeds of contention, into the church. Let not one say, "I was a *Jew*;" nor the other, "I was a *Gentile*;" when both the one and the other must now say, "I am a *Christian*." *Thirdly*, Thus they studied to do honor to their master, and showed that they were not ashamed to own their re-

* Presbyterian.

† Methodist.

* Presbyterian.

lation to him, but gloried in it; as the scholars of Plato called themselves *Platonists* and so the scholars of other great men. They took their denomination not from the name of his person, *Jesus*, but of his office, *Christ*—Anointed; so putting their creed into their name, *that Jesus is the Christ*; and they are willing all the world should know that this is the truth they will live and die by. Their enemies will *turn this name to their reproach*, and impute it to them as their crime, but they will glory in it; *If this be to be vile, I will yet be more vile.*—*Fourthly*, Thus they now own their dependence on Christ, and their receivings from him; not only that they believed in him who is *the Anointed*, but that through him they themselves had *the anointing*, 1 John 2, 20, 27. And God is said to have *anointed us in Christ*, 2 Cor. 1. 21. *Fifthly*, Thus they laid upon themselves, and all that should ever profess that name, a strong and lasting obligation to submit to the laws of Christ, to follow the example of Christ, and to devote themselves entirely to the honor of Christ; *to be to him for a name, and a praise*. Are we Christians? Then we ought to think, and speak, and act, in every thing as becomes Christians, and to do nothing to the reproach of that worthy name by which we are called; * * * * And as we must look upon ourselves as Christians, and carry ourselves accordingly, so we must look upon others as Christians, and carry ourselves toward them accordingly. A Christian, though not in every thing of our mind, should be loved and respected for his sake whose name he bears, because he belongs to Christ. *Sixthly*, Thus *the scripture was fulfilled*, for so it was written, (Is. 62. 2,) concerning the Gospel church, *Thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name*. And (Is. 65. 15,) it is said to the corrupt and degenerate church of the Jews, *The Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name*.

No comment on the following is necessary, as it sufficiently explains itself. It is from bro. Alexander Graham, co-editor of "The Disciple," published at Tuscaloosa, Ala.; the Prospectus of which we inserted in our last, accompanied with some remarks upon it. The reader can see in this, a specimen of bro. G.'s writing, as to matter and style. Like ourselves he is a *young* writer, and capable of still greater improvements and attainments.

EDITOR C. R.

[From the March No. of "The Disciple."] **DENYING THE OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.**

PARIS, Henry Co., Tenn., Feb. 29th, 1836.
BROTHER GRAHAM—

You have been accused over at Concord, Calloway Co. Kentucky, of denying the operation of the Holy Spirit. Can you not give a refutation to the charge in the Disciple? If so you are welcome to use my name and this paragraph.

JOHN R. HOWARD.

TUSCALOOSA, March 10th, 1836.

BROTHER HOWARD—

Your request makes it obligatory upon me to notice the charge alledged against me. The Disciples at Paris know me. I lived in your county two years, and was numbered with the Baptists. You remember my labors among that people, and how, when I visited the despised and persecuted young people who had been baptized by Dr. McCall, I was treated with coldness by my former religious associates, and gradually debarred from their society by their forbidding department. You was with me at Bird's Creek, when he, who had been my affectionate brother McGowen refused me the pulpit and took with him into it a Cumberland Presbyterian Preacher. Whether, he had more fellowship for the rantism of unconscious and unbelieving babes in order to initiate them into the Church, than the immersion of a believer into the name of the Lord for the remission of sins, I did not enquire, but am left to presume in the affirmative.

You and the Disciples at Paris are witness of my conduct and doctrine among them. It is not so much for you as for others that I write. I have learned much since I left you, but I have not learned to speak lightly of the Holy Spirit. If my mind had not been illumined by its teaching, if my heart had not been softened and bettered by its mighty influence, I might revile God's grace. But dear brother, sooner would I give up my existence than speak a word knowingly against the operation of God's Spirit.

I have frequently spoken at Concord Caloway Co. Kentucky, but several years have elapsed and I cannot recollect what I have taught. I venture however that no one ever heard me deny a single saying or act of the Holy Spirit. If such a denial can be specified and proven, the Disciple will publish it to the world with the necessary acknowledgements and recantations, and thus endeavor to repair the injury done to the cause of his master! Jesus promised while on earth that the Spirit should come to his disciples after his return to his father, and I believe and teach that Jesus was a true prophet and none of his promises concerning the Spirit have failed.

But you know how it is. The Spirit in whose operations I believe, has spoken expressly of seducing spirits, lying Spirits.—Seducers do not deal in plain language so much as in impressions on the feelings, and in innuendos. To oppose and expose the workings of false spirits is certainly different from denying what the Spirit of truth has said and done. When I hear of a class of men living in gluttony and drunkenness, hating and back biting one another, grasping at wealth and grinding the face of the poor, talking of orthodoxy, and Christian experiences, and fundamental doctrines of grace, and operations of God's Spirit upon their hearts; verily I do not hesitate to deny that they know any thing of the Spirit of holiness. I judge of the operation in the heart by the works of the members. The spirit which from within turns the foot to the cottage of the poor; unclinch the fist, not to the call of the hireling Missionary but to the necessities of a neighbor; bridles the tongue in the path of truth, the defense of the innocent and the widow, and from all unprofitable prattling; the spirit that operates through the members to the doing of all righteousness, is the Holy Spirit; and I do deny that a holy spirit dwells in an unholy heart, or that the spirit of God is within, when the works of the devil are without, just as confidently as I deny that a living, animal spirit is in a motionless body or an inanimate piece of matter.

As we design immediately to commence a series of publications on the Holy Spirit, I will not enter at present into a full investigation of this subject, but supposing that the charge alludes to the popular notion that the Holy Ghost enters the heart of an unbeliever and produces some ineffable and inconceivable something called in modern Theological techniks, divine operations, which something is previous to faith, knowledge, love, repentance or obedience; and preparatory to a reception of the gospel, I will even now examine one quotation.

The Spirit will reprove the world of sin—John xvi, 8.

FACT 1. The Holy Spirit was not given till Jesus was glorified and then to believers only.—John vi, 38, 39.

2. The Holy Spirit was promised to the disciples and the world was not to receive him.—John xiv, 15-17.—xv, 26-27.—xvi 7.

3. He was to commence his operations when he came and not before.

4. Some believed without knowing that the Holy Spirit had come.—Acts xix, 2.

The Jewish world had sinned in rejecting and crucifying the Savior. The Spirit was to reprove or convince the world of the sin of unbelief. The sin must have been committed before the reproof or conviction. The quotation shows that the Spirit was not to help the world to believe or to give the unbelievers faith, but to make evident the guilt of their unbelief.

A man has been arraigned, condemned and executed. During his trial twelve men testified to his innocence, but the populace were enraged; popular feelings was against him, and he and his friends were derided.—Before his death he informed his friends that according to his request a person or document would reach them in a short time bringing incontestable evidence of his innocence. It shall (adds he) comfort you by demonstrating the correctness of your statements and the justness of your adherence to my cause, & will completely evince the guilt of my accusers and murderers. There is a difference between a promise and a threat.—The language of Jesus concerning the Holy Spirit is promisory to believers but menacing to the world. "When he is come he will

comfort you that believe, but he will reprove the world because they believe not me."

A. GRAHAM.

The Blood of the New Covenant.

"God is light," says John, "and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the TRUTH: but if we walk in the LIGHT, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin." We may be asked, how are we to walk in the light? or, what is meant by the expression, walking in the light, which is so indispensably necessary, in order that we may be cleansed from all sin by the blood of Christ? We are told in the words of this Messiah himself, of whose blood we are speaking, in his conference with the Jewish Rabbi, Nicodemus, as recorded by this same apostle above. "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through HIM might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that LIGHT is come into the world, and men loved DARKNESS rather than light, because their DEEDS were evil. For every one that DOETH evil, hateth the LIGHT, neither cometh to the light, lest his DEEDS should be reprov'd. But he that DOETH truth cometh to the light, that his DEEDS may be made manifest that they are WROUGHT in God." "God is love," says John. He is love as well as light; and hence says our Saviour, "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love. If ye KEEP my COMMANDMENTS, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." To "do truth" is to do the word of God, for says our Lord to his Father, "thy word is truth." Hence Christians are spoken of as walking in the truth. John, in his second epistle, says, "I rejoiced greatly that I found thy children walking in TRUTH, as we have received COMMANDMENT from the Father." And again, in his third epistle, "I rejoiced

greatly when the brethren came and testified of the truth that is in thee, even as thou walkest in the TRUTH. I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in TRUTH." And as the "word is truth," it is necessary to continue in the word of the Lord. "If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the TRUTH, and the truth shall make you free." Hence, "To them who by patient continuance in WELL DOING seek for glory and honor and immortality, God will render, "eternal life." Doing the truth, the word of God, obeying him and keeping his commandments, are the only way in which we can "walk in the light," and the only conditions upon which we can have fellowship with Him, "fellowship one with another," and "the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanses us from all sin."

All that light which is God and in which he dwells, that we have and in which we can walk, is that which the Sun of Righteousness sheds in the beams of revelation, through the medium of the word of God. Hence Isaiah prophesying of the Messiah says, "I have set thee to be a LIGHT of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation to the ends of the earth;" and of his advent; "The people which sat in darkness saw great LIGHT: and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up." Hence said Simeon when he took the infant Jesus in his arms, "A LIGHT to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." Hence says John, "That was the true LIGHT, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," Hence says our Saviour himself, "I am the LIGHT of the world: he that followeth ME shall not walk in DARKNESS, but shall have the light of LIFE." Hence says our Lord to his apostles through whom the light of revelation had to be revealed to the world, "Ye are the LIGHT of the world." Hence says Paul of the apostles, "God, who commanded the LIGHT to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our [apostles'] hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." "For we [apostles] preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Hence the Lord told Paul that he had sent him to

the Gentiles, "To open their eyes, to turn them from *darkness* to *LIGHT*, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive *FORGIVENESS* of *SINS*, and inheritance among them that are sanctified, by faith that is in me." Hence, "the Father, * hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in *LIGHT*;" and, "ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous *LIGHT*." And hence it is said, "the God of this world hath *blinded* the minds of them which believe not, lest the *LIGHT* of the *glorious* GOSPEL of Christ, who is the image of God, should *SHINE* unto them." In short, "whatsoever doth make *MANIFEST*, is *LIGHT*."

As it is only by "walking in the *light*," "the *light* of the glorious *gospel*," that we can be cleansed from the guilt and pollution of sin by the blood of Christ, it must be through the medium of that light that it must affect the conscience. This will be sufficiently evident when we consider, that for all that we can know or believe concerning the sacrifice and blood of Christ, we are indebted to the writings of the Apostles or New Testament. We must then contemplate the sacrifice and blood of Christ with the eye of faith; and as faith comes by * * * the word of God," it must then be through the medium of God's word that we can form any conceptions or apprehensions of his blood and that it can have that effect upon us which the Lord designed it to have. Hence we are said to be justified by faith and to be justified by the blood of Christ: "being justified by FAITH, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and, "being now justified by his BLOOD, we shall be saved from wrath through him." That is, we are justified by faith in the blood of Christ, "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through FAITH in his BLOOD, to declare his righteousness for the REMISSION of SINS that are past, through the forbearance of God." To justify, "is either to absolve from guilt, or from the charge of it, or to declare one to be just," consequently there must be remission of sins where any one is justified in this sense, & hence the connexion, as above, between

justification, faith, the blood of Christ, and remission of sins. Hence our Saviour says, "this is my BLOOD of the new testament which is shed for many for the *remission of sins*;" and, "we have *redemption* through his BLOOD, the *forgiveness of sins*;" and he "has washed us from our sins in his own BLOOD;" and, "the BLOOD of Jesus Christ * * cleanseth us from all sin."

We have headed this essay, "the blood of the new covenant." Our Saviour uses the expressions, "my blood," "new testament," and "remission of sins," in a connexion and in a manner which deserve particular attention. When he instituted the supper on the night in which he was betrayed, in exhibiting the symbols of his broken body and shed blood in the loaf and wine, he says in respect to the latter; "this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the *remission of sins*." The Greek term, *diatheekē*, which is here translated "testament," is elsewhere in many places rendered "covenant." See Rom. ix. 4. Eph. ii. 12. Gal. iv. 24. Heb. viii. 6, 8, 9, 10. ix. 4. x. 16, 29. xii. 24. xiii. 20. &c. In this last place similar language is used, to that just quoted from the words of the Lord. Paul in his benediction for the Hebrews at the close of that epistle, says, "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ." Let it be noticed here, (what we have been treating upon in the preceding part of this essay,) that it is through this blood of the covenant we are made perfect in all good works to do the will of God, and that thus he works in us that which is well pleasing in his sight through our Lord.

The "new covenant," under which, or on complying with the terms of which, is granted or bestowed "remission of sins" with its concomitants, "justification" and "sanctification," and under which are embraced or comprehended the "works of faith," by performing which we do the will of God and he works in us, and which are enjoined upon Christians or those who enter into that covenant, (as were the "works of law" embraced under the old, or as it

is sometimes termed, the sinaitic or Mosaic, covenant,) was sealed or dedicated with the blood of Christ; and hence the manner and connexion of the terms and phrases as used above. The terms "new" and "everlasting covenant," imply that there was an *old* one of *limited* duration; and the expression, "blood of the new covenant," implies that there was blood of the old. Hence Paul in contrasting the two in Hebrews, says; "neither the *first* testament was *dedicated* without *blood*. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, 'This is the *blood of the testament* [or covenant] which God hath enjoined unto you.' The expression, "blood of the testament," in the manner here used, is similar to the expressions, "blood of the new testament," and "blood of the everlasting covenant." And of the new, or second, he says; "neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his [Christ's] *own blood*, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

As the first covenant was limited in its subjects and temporary in its duration and only embraced earthly rewards and punishments and as it contained no general provision for remission of sins which could relieve the sinner from present guilt and exempt him from future punishment; it was sealed or dedicated with the blood of animals, which "cannot take away sins," and could sanctify only to the purifying of the flesh," and "could never make the comers thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience." But the second covenant being unlimited in its subjects and eternal in its duration and embracing eternal rewards and punishments, and containing a general and standing provision for the remission of sins, by which the sinner can be relieved from the guilt of sin here and its punishment hereafter; it was sealed or dedicated with better blood than that of the old; which can take away sins and sanctify as to the purifying of the conscience, and forever perfect those who come unto or under it. We have not time to pursue this contrast farther here, nor will the lim-

its of this essay permit it. Besides, we design treating it fully and *in extenso* in our essays on the "Three covenants." We earnestly request our readers and those who are desirous of understanding the nature and design of those two covenants, to read attentively the 9th, and 10th. chap. of Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, and the 3rd. and 4th. of that to the Galatians.

As the first covenant was sealed with the blood of animals and thus rendered valid and effective, so was the second with the blood of the Redeemer. We all know the nature of seals. A Charter, or a Grant to a tract of land, or any other instrument of writing which requires a seal is not worth any thing or of any force until the seal is put to it; and hence neither the first or second covenant was valid or of force until sealed. And as the seal to a Charter or Grant may be properly termed the procuring cause of whatever immunities or benefits conferred in or by them let us come into the possession or enjoyment of these as we may, as it gives effect to them, so the blood of Christ, sealing the new covenant and giving effect to it, may be properly termed the only procuring cause of remission of sins and the blessings and privileges of the gospel, let us come into possession of them as we may. Hence the great importance attached to his blood and the manner in which it is spoken of in the scriptures; and hence what the new covenant confers upon us is spoken of as being conferred by it. And as an instrument of writing derives all its force or efficacy from the seal applied to it, we may with propriety ascribe to the seal what it confers or bestows; and thus we ascribe to the blood of Christ the blessings and privileges of the new covenant which is sealed by it. We frequently hear it said that our Saviour suffered, bled and died; and that he sealed his testimony or the truth of his religion with his blood. Our Lord did not suffer, bleed and die; but suffered, died and bled. The only account we have of the shedding of his blood is that given by John, who states distinctly that he was dead, before his side was pierced by the spear and the blood flowed from it, by which the new covenant was sealed and which was thus shed for the remission of sins. And how well this accords with Paul in Hebrews.

"For where a testament [covenant or institution] is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator, [the instituted sacrifice.] For a testament is of force after men are dead, [for the instituted sacrifice]: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. *Whereupon* neither the first testament was dedicated *without blood.*" If our Saviour only sealed his testimony or the truth of the Christian religion with his blood; then perhaps that of Paul, Peter, James or any of the apostolical martyrs would have done equally as well and have effected equally as much! They poured out their life-blood, or their lives with their blood, and thus sealed their testimony and the truth of that religion for which they died. But this was not the case with Jesus; nor did he die a martyr as they did. His life was taken, as we have shown, *before* that blood flowed from his side, which was shed for the remission of sins and with which the New Covenant was sealed or dedicated; and he did not therefore pour out his life *with* his blood. While here, it may be worthy to remark, that as Moses "took the *blood* of calves and of goats, with *water*, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people," which blood was *typical* of the blood of Christ, so when the side of our Lord was pierced by the spear, "forthwith came there out *blood* and *water.*" Mark how well the antitype fits the type! Notice also the expression used by Moses when he done this; "*This is the blood* of the [old] *testament* which God hath enjoined unto you;" and the expression of our Lord; "*This is my blood* of the *new testament.*" As the old covenant "was ordained by angels in the hand of a *mediator,*" Moses, in its introduction, was mediator between God and the Israelites; and hence *he* dedicated or sealed it with the blood of animals. As this was typical of the *new*, "there is one *mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," and "he is the *mediator* of a better *covenant*, established upon better promises," "he is the *mediator* of the *new testament*, that by means of *death*, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the *first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance," and we Christians are come "to Jesus the

mediator of the *new covenant*, and to the *blood* of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel," which cried to God for vengeance while this pleads for mercy. And as Moses who as mediator, was typical of Christ, sealed or dedicated the first covenant himself with blood of animals, so did Christ the *new*, not with the "blood of others," but "with his *own blood,*" "having obtained eternal redemption for us." Hence the expressions; "*thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood,*" "washed us from our sins in *his own blood,*" "having made peace through the *blood* of the *cross,*" "we have redemption through *his blood,*" "feed the church of God, [or the Lord] which he has purchased with *his own blood,*" &c.

As Christ sealed or dedicated the new covenant with his own blood and thus rendered it valid and efficient, as we have shown, so the privileges, blessings, &c. which are enjoyed by Christians or those under that covenant, are ascribed to his blood, that being thus their procuring cause. Hence we are said to have the remission of our sins, both when we become Christians or enter into covenant with God and afterwards while in covenant, through the blood of Christ; and through it, justification, sanctification, &c. Hence the expressions; "this is my *blood* of the new testament, shed for many, for the *remission of sins,*" "we have redemption through his *blood,* even the *forgiveness of sins,*" "the *blood* of Jesus Christ his [God's] Son *cleanseth* us from all sin" and thus "he is faithful and just to *forgive* us our *sins* and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," "if we *confess* our sins;" "being now *justified* by his *blood* we shall be saved from wrath through him;" "Jesus that he might *sanctify* the people with his *own blood* suffered without the gate;" and the apostate is said to have "counted the *blood* of the covenant where-with he was *sanctified* an unholly thing." As the consciousness of pardon and of being in a state of acceptance with God, is necessary for perfection in all good works in doing his will, which can be enjoyed only under the new covenant, Paul prays for the Hebrew Christians, that God "through the *blood* of the *everlasting covenant* make you perfect in every *good work*, to do his *will;*" and the apostate from Christianity or

that state in which he is placed under the new covenant, is said, as we have just quoted, to have "counted the *blood of the covenant*, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing;" both which expressions Paul uses in Hebrews, the epistle in which he speaks so much about the two covenants. As it is by entering into (this new) covenant with God that we receive forgiveness of sins, and are thus reconciled to God, Paul speaks of both in connexion with the blood of Christ. "How much more shall the *blood of Christ* * * * *purge your conscience from dead works** to serve the living God?" "Much more then, being now justified by his *blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were *reconciled* to God by the *death* of his Son, much more, *being reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life." Those under this covenant, walking in the light, have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all **sin**.

As every *covenant* must have terms or conditions upon which it is to be entered into and on which we are to remain in or under it, so the new covenant is not without its *conditions*. The ordinance of baptism is made the condition of entering it, to every proper subject. And as the washing of the body in water is an apt emblem of the purification of the conscience from the guilt and pollution of sin, the effects of this washing from sin are ascribed to both water and the blood of Christ, the latter as the procuring, and the former as the instrumental, cause. "Unto him that loved us and *washed* us from our sins in his own *blood*;" &c; "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and *washed their robes*, and *made them white in the blood of the Lamb*." "Having our hearts *sprinkled* from an *evil conscience*, and our bodies *washed with pure water*;" "ye are *washed*, * ye are *sanctified*, * ye are *justified*;" "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might *sanctify* and *cleanse* it with the *washing of water by the word*." Paul in his epis-

* Dead works are works done in sin and a state of alienation from God. See Gal. v. 19. Eph. v. 11. Col. i. 21. Titus i. 16. Heb. v. 1. ix. 14.

tle to the Galatians, after expatiating in the third chap. on the design of the two covenants, concludes with the two grand conditions of entering into the new covenant. "Ye are all the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on* Christ." And in his epistle to the Hebrews, after drawing a long contrast between the two, exhibiting the superiority and perpetuity of the new over the old, he uses a kind of double metonymy in allusion to our entering into the new, in which cause and effect are made alternately to stand for each other, cause being put for effect and effect for cause. The old covenant being typical of the new, he seizes upon the sprinkling of blood and washing for purification under the law, and applies it by way of figure to the new. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to *enter* into the holiest *by the blood* of Jesus, by a *new and living way* which he has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a *true heart*, in *full assurance of faith*, having our *hearts sprinkled* from an *evil conscience* and our *bodies washed with pure water*." Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience by "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel," the blood of Christ, as the procuring cause of remission, which gives a *good* conscience, the opposite of one which is *evil*; and having our bodies washed with pure water, in baptism, in which the conscience is cleansed or *purified* from sin, its guilt and pollution. The above quotation from Paul is well illustrated in the following extract. "In the holy place of the Jewish Tabernacle there stood two important articles of furniture of most significant import. The *brazen altar* next the door, and the *laver* between the brazen altar and the veil, separating the holy from the most holy. In this *laver*, filled with water, the priests, *AFTER* they had paid their devotion at the altar, as they came in, and *BEFORE* they approached the most holy place, always washed themselves. This vessel was called in Greek, *louter*, and the water in it *loutron*, though sometimes the vessel that holds the water is called *loutron*.—In English the vesse!

was called *laver*, and the water in it *loutron* or *bath*. The *bath of purification* was the literal import of this vessel and its use. Paul, more than once, alludes to this usage in the tabernacle in his epistles, and once substitutes christian immersion in its place—that is christian immersion stands in the same place in the christian temple, or worship, that the *laver*, or *bath of purification* stood in the Jewish; viz. BETWEEN THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST AND ACCEPTABLE WORSHIP. In the Jewish symbols the figures stood thus: 1st. The *brazen altar*; 2nd. The *laver* or *bath*; and 3rd. The *vail*. In the *antitupo* or antitypes it stands thus: 1st. Faith in the sacrifice of Christ, the antitype of the altar; 2nd. Immersion, or the *bath of regeneration*, the antitype of the *loutron*, or *bath of purification*; and 3rd. Prayer, praise and vocal worship, the antitype of the priests approaching the holiest of all. Now all christians being made *priests* to God, and made to worship in the place where the Jewish priests stood, Jesus Christ having now, as our great High Priest, entered into the most holy place, he hath “*consecrated a way*” for us Christians:—he has authorised us Christians to draw nigh to that place where stood the priests under the law.”

If remission of sins, justification, &c. are not to be received through the blood of Christ under the new covenant, in the way for which we have been contending, but in some mystical and endescribable manner by its “application to the conscience,” then is the Gospel as partial and exclusive a system, as if it made faith the immediate gift of God, conferred by some mystical, physical or metaphysical operation of the Holy Spirit. As “faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God,” all who have eyes and ears, or who can read or hear the testimony exhibited by that word, can believe or have faith. And as all mankind have these organs, God in making faith the *principle* upon which we are pardoned, justified and accepted by him, has made a state of favour with him alike acceptable to all and put it in the power of all, without difference, to believe upon him. So Christ by sealing or dedicating the new covenant with his blood, has placed it in the power of all who submit to the terms or conditions

of this covenant, to receive remission, justification, and every other blessing and privilege promised and bestowed under it. It is put as much in their power to comply with these conditions as to believe upon testimony. “Whom [Christ] God hath set forth to be a propitiation through FAITH in his BLOOD, to declare his righteousness for the REMISSION OF SINS that are *past*, through the forbearance of God.” “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through *sanctification* of the Spirit, unto *obedience* and *sprinkling* of the BLOOD of Jesus Christ.” As it is only by complying with the conditions of this new covenant, (the antitype of the *old*, which had its conditions,) that the favours and privileges annexed to it and flowing through faith in the blood of Christ, can be obtained or enjoyed; how can those who are without or not under it either claim or receive them?
EDITOR.

Seven Rules for Editors of Religious Periodicals.

The following “Rules” deserve the particular attention, not only of the Editors of our Periodicals, but also of the writers who contribute to them. Were they strictly attended to and constantly observed, our papers would obtain a much wider circulation than they now have, and exert a better, a greater and far more extensive influence, than they now generally do. They are extracted from a letter addressed to us by a brother and Editor, of great learning, intelligence and experience; and were designed, so far as we know, only for our own private use and not for the public eye. Thinking that they may be *useful*, we take the liberty of publishing them, convinced that their author will have no objection. We would add to them; open your columns freely to both friends and opponents, and let each side have an equal chance and a fair hearing. As we publish them for our own benefit as well as that of others, should our readers ever find us departing from them, we hope that they will admonish and correct us.
EDITOR.

“1. Introduce nothing into your pages that is not of obvious practical utility.”

"2. Consider well how you are to *end*, or complete, every thing you *commence*.

"3. Remember many readers have many minds. Therefore give a reasonable variety.

"4. When a series of essays is commenced on any subject, let it embrace the whole subject either on a large or small scale—but let it embrace the whole *methodically* on some scale.

"5. Avoid the appearance of dogmatism. Be independent but not disdainful of the views and opinions of others.

"6. Be not too fond of analogies, new ideas, fine sayings and smart repartees.

"7. Be assured that moral influence depends on moral goodness; and therefore our reputation for moral goodness is essential to moral usefulness.—We must shew a good spirit as well as good arguments." A. C.

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. IV.

BRO. HOWARD;—In my last I was speaking of the general application of special cases. An error of no small magnitude may be very nearly classed under this head, I mean the application of a number of passages which belonged to the Apostles as such, to all such as now profess to be called and sent ministers of the Gospel. I named a passage or two in my last, to which I will now add a few others, such as "And lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—*Matthew*; "And they went forth and preached every where the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs."—*Mark*; "And ye are witnesses of these things, and behold I send the power of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."—*Luke*. "He breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost.—Whosoever sins you remit are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, are retained."—*John*. "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him. God also bearing witness, both with signs and wonders, and with di-

vers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?"—*Paul*.

Perhaps I have quoted passages enough to shew the folly of our modern "would be successors" of the Apostles. The Apostles were constituted the *witnesses* of what Jesus said and did, in conjunction with the Holy Spirit. "But when the comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *He shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness*, because ye have been with me from the beginning."—*John*.

Who ever heard tell of a successor to a *witness*? Or who can be so blind as to suppose that a witness can give testimony of things that happened eighteen hundred years before he was born? Paul was "born out of due time," and could not have been a witness, had he not been caught away to the third Heavens, and received revelations from Jesus himself. He had to see Jesus, before he could give testimony. Is it not a wonder that some of our modern witnesses have not claimed to have been caught away to the third Heavens, as well as Paul? Perhaps they have been somewhat fearful that some would not take their word for it, but would try them, as they did Paul, and that they would not be quite as able to prove the fact as Paul was. I fear they would be found of another school, perhaps of the same with them who professed to be Apostles in Asia, and who, when tried, were found to be liars.

How often do we hear men in this, our day, applying all, or nearly all, of the Scriptures, above quoted, to themselves, as though they were the very persons alluded to?

Jesus gave the "glory" to his Apostles, which the Father had given to him, as well as the "words." They were empowered to work even greater miracles, than he, himself had wrought.

What arrogance! What arrogance! are some men guilty of! They would even rob the Apostles of all their honors if they could. Yea, they would fill the Apostles' *thrones*, and give new laws to the disciples if they were permitted.

But they have a difficulty among themselves which it will be hard to settle.—*There can be but thirteen successors of the*

Apostles, and the clergy cannot determine who, of the many pretenders, are the true successors.

Here I shall leave them awhile.

M. WINANS.

Letters to Christians.

LETTER III.

ON LOVE AND GOOD WORKS,

Beloved Brethren and Sisters;—Favour, mercy and peace be unto every *one* that worketh good. I again resume my pen, for the purpose of addressing you on the all important subject of *love* and good *works*.

The apostle Peter in addressing the scattered Christians, says, "see that you love another with a *pure heart* fervently." The apostle John says, that "God is love; & he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." We are told in the Living Oracles, that it is the goodness of God that leads men to repentance. And when do we see the goodness of God more fully developed, than by the manifestation of his love in the gift of his dear Son to die for poor *sinful man*! The Apostle says, "hereby we perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." The ancient Christians knew that they had passed from death unto life, by the love they had for their brethren. When they loved one another, they knew it was from God, for God is love, and he that loveth God will love the children of God. Should the question be asked, how do we know that we love the children of God? we will let the apostle John answer it. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. "For," says he, "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." When contemplating the *love* that God has manifested to a dying world, my heart expands, and I feel the heaven-born principle of love, unbounded love, vibrates through every fibre of my system! Yes! it is calculated to eradicate from our hearts every unholy principle and desire! Then let us daily cultivate this heavenly principle, that we may live happy, die triumphant, and be received into the man-

sions at God's right hand, where there will be nothing but love manifested and felt throughout the vast annals of a never ending eternity!

Beloved brothers and sisters; let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth. If God has blessed us with this world's goods, and we see a brother have need and we shut up our compassion from him, how can the love of God abide in us? I presume none will say it can. Then let us do good to all men, especially to the household of *faith*. It is our business to look around us for objects of charity, and never neglect to do a good deed whenever we have it in our power. We should relieve the afflicted; yea, let us diligently follow every good work.

Beloved brothers and sisters; we should often ask ourselves the question, What good have we done? How many tears have we wiped from the orphan's eye with the soft hand of charity? How many hungry poor have we supplied with bread? Do we clothe the naked? Do we visit the sick and the afflicted? If we have neglected these things heretofore, let us neglect them no longer; and let us henceforward be found in the full discharge of every duty that is enjoined on us in the Gospel of God's dear Son. The apostle James says, "Pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father, is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Oh, Christians! let us keep our garments unspotted by the world. We have separated ourselves from the world; therefore, to be consistent with our profession, we should keep ourselves separate, ever following that which is good, both among ourselves and toward all men. We are not to love the world, neither the things that are in the world, for if we do, we are assured that the love of the Father is not in us. Then let us learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that we be not unfaithful; for the Lord Jesus gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. Paul says to his son Titus; "These things [of which he had just been speaking] I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to

maintain good works;" for they were good and profitable unto men. So we see from the above quotation, that faith is the starting point in the Christian religion, (they that *believed* in God, &c.) But should we neglect to add to our faith all the Christian graces or accomplishments, what will our faith avail us in the day when Jesus shall come in the glory of his majesty, to adjudicate upon the actions of men and to reward every man according as his works shall be? Seeing it is by works that faith is to be perfected, and that we are to be rewarded according to what we have done, whether it be good or evil; let us be careful to do good; let us be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store a good foundation against the time to come, that we may lay hold on eternal life.

Paul told the Philippian brethren, to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, for it was God that worked in them to will and to do of his good pleasure.—Now it is evident that he alluded to their future and eternal salvation, for they had obtained a present one, (through grace by faith.) And let it be remembered that a *present* salvation is not to be obtained by works; for Paul says, it is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to the mercy of God, he saves us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour. The epistles are all addressed to saints, to believers, to those who were saved, consequently all the exhortations to good works belong to us, who in like manner have obtained a present salvation from all past sins. Then let us follow after righteousness, (for he that doeth righteousness is righteous), godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Let us fight the good fight of faith; for if we war a good warfare, we will lay hold on eternal life; for godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and that which is to come. The Apostle tells the Ephesian brethren, (including himself with them,) that they were the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God had before ordained that they should walk in them.

Christians are commanded to use hospitality, one to another, without grudging; to let love be without dissimulation; to be kindly affectioned, one to another, with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another; not to be slothful in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; to distribute to the necessities of the saints; to rejoice with them that rejoice, and weep with them that weep; and not to mind high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Paul told Timothy, to charge them that were rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy. Therefore, if God has blessed us with the good things of this world, let us use them in that way which will be acceptable in his sight. And should we possess but little of this world's goods, and our heavenly Father has blessed us with health and strength, it is our duty to labour, working with our own hands, that we may have to give to them that needeth. Let it be remembered, that when we do a charitable deed to one of the least of the brethren, we do it unto the Lord. Let us ever walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; for it is our privilege to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God.

My dear sisters; let us imitate the example of Dorcas. Now this woman was full of good works and alms deeds that she did. Also Phebe, who was a servant of the congregation and a succourer of many; and Priscilla, one of Paul's helpers in Christ; and Mary who Paul said, bestowed much labour on them. If the apostle Paul could labour with his hands, that he might have it in his power to minister to the necessity of them that were with him, shall we think it too hard a task for us to follow his example? Paul told the Christians to remember the words of our Lord, "how he said it was more blessed to give than to receive." Therefore, my beloved brothers and sisters; let us be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labour is not in vain in the Lord. "Let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not." The saints, by working out their own salvation; by continuing faith;

ful to the end of their lives; by overcoming as Jesus himself overcome; were to enter into the joys into which Jesus had entered, receiving a rest on his glorious throne. Paul says, eternal life shall be given to those who seek for glory, honor, (that comes from God,) immortality. And he tells us when this eternal life will be given to such as seek for it. "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." And now, if we would enter the everlasting kingdom of our blessed Lord and receive eternal life, we must be careful to maintain good works. For if we give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, when we are done with the turmoils of this life we shall find an abundant entrance ministered unto us into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

And may the favour of our blessed Lord be with you all, and comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work, is the prayer of your sister in hope of eternal life.

L. V. C.

larmed as though we were giants, and ten thousand strong!

Yours in the Lord,

SILAS B. READ.

We would recommend to the brethren in bro. Read's vicinity our pious, beloved and able bro. Allen Kendrick of the vicinity of Denmark, Madison county. Also bro. James E. Matthews Barton's, Lauderdale co. Alabama, and old bro. (Dr.) Brown of the Chickasaw Nation, Miss. Come brethren, can you not visit them sometimes?

Ed. C. R.

We have not room in this no. to present our readers with any more notices of the progress of Christianity. We will merely add some remarks on the congregation in this place, the one with which it has been our happiness to be united in the pleasant bonds and sweet ties of Christian covenant and love, for more than two years and ever since we became a citizen of Messiah's Kingdom; Christian union to us indeed and a reality!

We still continue to have occasional additions. We have met constantly every Lord's day almost ever since our organization, to "Break the Loaf;" and our meetings have never been more regularly, punctually and better attended than they are now. With the exception of a discourse once a month from bro. Poits and the occasional visits of proclaiming brethren, we have most of the labouring to do ourself. We much need some talented and well qualified preaching brother as an Evangelist, who can and will devote all his time to the proclamation of the gospel. A wide field is open for him here and in the adjacent country; and he might depend on being well supported and remunerated. I would accompany and labor with him all I could. He would have the advantage too of having constant access to my Library, and many of the best works of criticism and reference. Some of our eminent brethren of character, experience and standing, could not perhaps more pleasantly and agreeably situate themselves.

EDITOR.

Progress of Christianity.

Nashville, Tenn. March 26th. 1836.

We have been for some very considerable time in a very torpid state in our Church, but I trust we shall enjoy seasons of refreshing ere long. Last Lord's day *one* was added and *one* immersed—this, *three* added and *one* for immersion. Our bro. (Dr) Davis, who is, I believe, "an Israelite indeed," is coming next month to live with us; and will, I trust, be a blessing to the church and city.

Wm. A. EICHBAUM.

Fayette Co. Tenn. April 23rd. 1836.

I am pleased with the sentiments of the "Reformer," because it urges the necessity of all parties resorting to the Gospel for their guide in faith and manners. It is true, the Bible is sufficiently intelligible for all "common sense men" to comprehend it; but there are so many misrepresentations afloat in the land, that it is highly expedient to detect them if possible by some means. The press is the most powerful of any.

* * * * *

There are a few disciples in this vicinity, mostly young people; but we have no preacher, and are compelled to resist opposition in the best way we can. But though we are young and weak, our Priest and some of our priestridden friends, appear to be as much a-

The following article appeared on the cover of our last number; but as it was not inserted where we wished and being hastily written and wanting some emendations

and additions, we give it place now after correcting it on the inside of our paper. This will account to our Editorial brethren for the manner in which they received our last No., not wishing them then to copy it into their paper as it was. Ed C. R.

It seems to be the idea of many of our brethren, Editors and others, that the circulation of our periodicals is to be confined principally among ourselves; and hence they express their fears "for the fortunes of so many periodicals." "The reading time and the reading means of all the brethren," says one, "together with all the duties relative, I am doubtful are not sufficient for the demands on them in the labors of the press." Now whatever may be the design of the papers of our other Editorial brethren, it never was ours, that the "Christian Reformer" should be confined principally or exclusively in its circulation to our brethren. It is among others that we hope, wish and expect to do most good; for it is there that it is most needed. To this we have ever had an eye, and shall continually look; while our own church affairs will not be neglected. We would say then to our brethren and friends who are disposed to exert themselves for us, to extend the circulation of our paper as far and widely as they can among the sectarian and non-professing world, as well as among themselves. By this we shall not interfere with our other papers, nor they with us. The subscribers whom we want, are those who will read and who will pay and are punctual in their remittances. This is the class who are mostly benefitted and beneficial. Not those who read without paying, and pay without reading. The first are of no benefit to the publisher, and the publisher of no benefit to the second. We know from what others have done for us, and from what we have done ourselves, what the brethren generally can do for us, if they will but exert themselves. Our paper being so far but an experiment, if not well and adequately sustained will not be continued beyond the present year. It is with the hopes of a good circulation that we continue our labors. It remains principally with our brethren whether it shall exist longer than a twelve month. Let our friends be up and doing what they can for us, in time. To see what can be done for us, let our brethren only see what is done and doing for sectarian periodicals. Let this stimulate them to action, and afford them examples to pattern after in exertion. We cannot say that any one number is a specimen of what our paper shall be. We shall labor continually to improve ourselves and to improve it, by all the means in

our power. We are desirous that it should obtain a general circulation among our preachers and teachers in every part of the country; and we propose therefore, should it be much or generally taken by them, to devote much space and attention to the subjects of preaching and teaching.

The back numbers of the Reformer can be supplied to new subscribers as long as the edition lasts, stitched and covered. Don't let a contrary expectation prevent them from sending their names to us throughout the year. Bishops or Elders of congregations and Evangelists and Preachers of good character and standing among the brethren, are authorised and requested to act as agents for us, in procuring subscribers and making remittances. It will be saving trouble and expense in postage, to both parties, to make remittances for subscribers when their names are sent. Our paper is \$2 within 6 months from subscribing, or \$2 50 after. Our Editorial brethren will please give this an insertion in their respective periodicals.

EDITOR.

EDITORIAL ITEMS.

We regret that we still have to be so late in the time of issuing our paper. Circumstances of difficult control are in the way of our printer, but which we hope he will be able soon to manage. In the mean time, we hope our subscribers will bear with us, as we intend to get up to the time announced in our prospectus as rapidly and as soon as we can, and as so many numbers will be due them any how.

We cannot afford to give one copy gratis for every five. Our paper being of a fine quality and well printed, the materials and printing are expensive. We will do it, however, whenever an extensive circulation and punctual remittances will authorise and justify us.

The Primitive Christian

Is a well conducted periodical, devoted, as its name imports, to the establishment and restoration of primitive Christianity. It is published monthly at Auburn, New York, by bro. Silas E. Shepard "at \$1 per year, if paid within six months after the commencement of a volume, and \$1 25, if not paid till the end of the year. The brethren in the West and South who, in addition to good religious matter, wish to be acquainted with the progress of primitive christianity in the eastern States and the Canadas, would do well and obtain much of what they desire by taking this work. EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME 1.]

PARIS, TENN. MAY, 1836.

[NUMBER 5.

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.—Luce xxiv. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark xi. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS. Jude, 3.

Essay on Universalism and the Three Salvations.

[The following essay is from the pen of bro. Aylett Raines of Paris, Ky.; and was first published in a little work called "Christian Evidences," now extinct. We republish and give it a place in our paper for two very important reasons. The first is, because we are accused with teaching that the present salvation from the guilt, pollution and dominion of sin, is obtained by works, an accusation well met and refuted here. The second is, because Universalism, in every shape it assumes, exerts more or less, the detestable influence of Deism; and is at the present day, infusing its poison into many minds, keeping men back from obeying the gospel, and by taking away future punishment, or rendering it partial and limited, destroying the influence of moral accountability and sapping the foundation of religion. The excellent remarks appended to it, are from bro. David S. Burnett of Cincinnati, Editor of the Christian Preacher.] EDITOR C. R.

It is my intention, to endeavor to prove, iconically and positively, that Universalism, is not only, not a doctrine of the New Testament; but that it is most palpably contradicted, by many testimonies, found in the Christian Scriptures. And in order to do this, I will in the first place, prove, that there are three distinct classes of salvation taught in the New Testament, and that the fundamental assumptions of Universalists, on

which Universalism is predicated, are in direct contradiction to the Apostolic doctrine, relative to these salvations.

Two of these salvations are taught, i Tim. 4: 10. 'For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who IS the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe.' As the Universalists are much in the habit of talking about the *present tense* of verbs, I here beseech them to observe, that the verb IS, is in the *present tense*; and that this text teaches one universal *present* salvation, without regard to faith or moral character, and one *present* special salvation, belonging only to the faithful. And further, that as both these salvations are expressly *present*; and the latter *special one*, is enjoyed only by those who believe, the *former salvation*, being *universal* and *present*, must necessarily signify that preservation, which by the common providence of God, all mankind in some degree enjoy. There is not another possible alternative! And therefore, those Universalists who talk and write of this Universal *present* salvation, as if the text carried it into futurity, and even into eternity, are guilty of just such an abuse of the *present tense* of this verb, as they so often charge upon their opponents, with respect to this *tense*, in many other places. The text does not say, that God *will* be the Saviour of all men to-morrow,—next week; next year,—nor in eter-

nity! but simply, that he is *now*,—at the present moment, the Saviour of all men; and that there is another salvation, still more high than this,—special,—the special property of the believer! And it will consequently appear, that as many unbelievers were under sentence of condemnation at the very juncture of time at which this text was written, because they had not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God, that at the very time in which God was the Savior of all men, by his providential preservation of them, many of those who were the saved, in this sense, were the condemned, as it respects that salvation which is received 'by grace through faith.'

Let it next be observed, that the Universalists teach, that present salvation is obtained by works,* but that future eternal salvation is a free gift, bestowed, in the resurrection, upon all mankind, irrespective of works, or moral character. And this being a fact, I will prove that they have got the cart precisely before the horse, and consequently, that their whole system, is, as a system, wrong-end foremost!

We must therefore look into the New Testament, in order to learn, what the Apostles teach, with respect to works and present salvation. Eph. ii. 8, 9. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works lest any man should boast." Now is this a present, or a future salvation? Present most certainly! By grace are ye saved. Do the saved 'work out this salvation with fear and trembling?' 'Not of works, says Paul, 'lest any man should boast.' This then is a present special salvation, the exclusive property of those who believe, the whole affair being of grace by the efficacy of which grace the believer is saved through faith and consequently not by works.

Again: 2 Tim. i. 9. 'Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own

purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.' Also, Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6, 7. "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit: which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

Now you will observe, that we have, by the above testimonies, proved, as definitely, as any proposition can be proved, that present salvation, is not in any manner, the result of our own works of righteousness: and we have by the last of these testimonies proved even more than this! We have proved, that those, and those only, who were 'saved by grace through faith,' were heirs according to the hope of eternal life.—They were made heirs by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, and consequently were not heirs before.—Believest thou this? Does not Universalism teach that all mankind irrespective of all moral discriminations are heirs, according to the hope of eternal life? Nay more, that they are not only heirs, but do their worst, that they cannot help inheriting everlasting life. And if so, how were those men of whom the Apostle here speaks, made heirs by the washing and regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit?

Having now seen by the testimony of the infallible oracles, in what way men obtain present salvation, let us in the next place endeavor to learn from the same oracles, how future salvation is to be obtained. In Tit. iii. 8. The Apostle declares, that "this is a faithful saying, and these things," say he, 'I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.' Now whom does the Apostle require to do good works? Those who have believed;—those who have been saved not by works, but

* If they deny this, I will prove it by the writings of their best authors.

by the grace of God through faith. Again: Eph. ii. 10. The Apostle immediately after having declared a present salvation by grace through faith, not of works, says, 'for we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.' Thus you will perceive from the light of these testimonies, that although present salvation was not wrought out by the works of the saved, yet as soon as God became the special Savior of any believer, such believer for a certain purpose, was to be careful to maintain good works; and we will now endeavor to prove, that, that certain purpose,—that profitable end which the believer was to have in view, in working good works, was future or final salvation!

Please then to observe gentle reader, that every one of the Epistles were addressed to churches the members of which were of course believers, and consequently had been saved with a present salvation. It is important that you should keep this in view, for inattention to this point, has been the cause of multiplied errors. Having this fact then fastened in your mind, let us listen in the first place to Paul's admonitions to the Saints of Philippi. That this Epistle was written to Saints, and consequently to those who had obtained present salvation, you may learn, from Paul's address in the first chapter. Hear then what he says to the Saints, chap. ii. 12. 'Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God that worketh in you, to will and to do of his good pleasure.' Now I ask, what salvation was this which these Saints were commanded to work out? Not present salvation surely! for this is not of works; and besides, they had obtained present salvation sometime before this Epistle was written! The salvation then, which they were to work out, must necessarily have been future! By reading the context of this text, we learn, that this salvation was not only future, but that it was

to be received, and enjoyed, in a future world. We prove this, from the fact that Jesus himself in consequence of making himself of no reputation—taking up on himself the form of a servant &c. was 'highly exalted.' 'Wherefore,' says Paul, 'God has highly exalted him.' That is because of the work which he had before mentioned, which had been wrought by Jesus! These works, are therefore given as a reason why Jesus was highly exalted after his death, and as the saints were admonished in the same connection to 'let the same mind be in them; which was in Jesus Christ,' we are constrained by the whole context to conclude, that these saints; in imitation of their Divine Exemplar were by their good works, to obtain an exaltation to that glorious throne to which Jesus in consequence of his good works, had been exalted! And the Apostle also teaches the same doctrine in Heb. xii. He there tells the saints to 'run with patience the race that was set before them; Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of their faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross; despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

Now in order to arrive at right conclusions with respect to these testimonies, I ask first where was this joy, after which Jesus ran? *Ans:* Not in this vale of tears, but 'at the right hand of the throne of God.' 2. Where was the object at which the saints were to look, when running the Christian race? *Ans:* At 'the right hand of the throne of God.' 3. What benefit were the saints to expect to receive, when they should arrive at the end of the race? *Ans:* The joy that was set before Jesus, and for which he endured the cross despising the shame: 'To him that overcometh,' says Jesus, 'will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne.' The saints by working out their own salvation,—by remaining faithful to the end of their lives,—by overcoming as Jesus himself had overcome, were to enter into the joys, into which Ja.

us had entered, receiving a rest on his glorious throne!

In confirmation of this fact, let us now turn to ii. Pet. 1. Here we find this Apostle addressing those who had obtained 'previous faith,' and consequently present special salvation; having been, as he says, 'purged from their old sins.' In this chapter, he instructs these saints, in what way an entrance was to be obtained into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. And here we must not forget, that these saints were already subjects of the present kingdom of Jesus;—that kingdom which in the days of John the Baptist, and for sometime afterwards was at hand; and which was established on the earth, on the day of Pentecost. These saints had already 'been translated from darkness to light, and from the kingdom of Satan into the present kingdom of God.' They had also entered it in accordance with its own laws, having been 'born of water and of spirit,' without which, Jesus declares, none can enter it. But now here is another kingdom to which Peter directs the attention of these subjects of the present kingdom of Jesus. And how are they to become subjects of this everlasting kingdom which they have now in prospective view? By being 'born of water and spirit?' Peter does not say so! 'And beside this,' says he, 'giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that you shall neither be barren nor unfruitful, in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things ye shall never fall: For so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

Thus you perceive that the laws agreeably with which these two kingdoms may be entered, are essentially different. The first

was entered by being born of water and Spirit, or by being saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. But the second by 'giving all diligence,'—by good works! The first was entered not on account of works of righteousness: but the second 'by working out our own salvation with fear and trembling,'—for so an entrance,—not by water, nor exclusively by Spirit,* but by giving all diligence to make our calling and election sure, will be ministered to us abundantly, &c.

We have now proceeded so far as to show, 1st. That there is a universal present salvation, by the providence of God, 2. That there is a present special salvation, 'by grace through faith,' enjoyed by such as have been saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit; or who have entered the present kingdom of Jesus, through a birth, by water and Spirit: and 3d. That there is a future salvation for those who work it out; or who give all diligence to obtain an entrance into the everlasting kingdom. But as many would no doubt prefer getting to heaven in their indolence, we will produce other testimonies by which to prove incontrovertibly the position which we have taken, with respect to future salvation.

In accordance with the testimonies which we have already produced in support of this position, let it be remembered, that Paul told Timothy, that godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.—'Follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art called, &c. Timothy in being saved by the washing of regeneration, &c. had become an heir of eternal life, and now in order to obtain, or lay hold of it, he must fight the good fight of faith,—he must give all diligence &c. And hence Paul says again, 'Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded,

* I do not mean to say that the spirit will not help the infirmities of the saints, for I rejoice to believe that it will be their perpetual comforter, and that God will work in them to will and to do of his good pleasure. I only mean that such a birth as that of which we read in the iii. John is not the indispensable prerequisite, to an entrance into the everlasting kingdom.

not trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth them all things richly to enjoy: that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.'— Paul also tells us: 'Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.' But if the elect could obtain future salvation and eternal glory, as easily without Paul's labors and sufferings as with them, why did he think it so necessary, that he should labor and suffer, in order that they might obtain eternal glory? Surely Paul was not a Universalist!

In the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans, he says: 'To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor, immortality; eternal life.' That is, eternal life shall be given, to those, who seek for glory, honor, and immortality! and he tells us when this eternal life will be given to such as seek for it. 'In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.' In 1 Cor. ix, he tells us that 'he was running for an incorruptible crown;' and for the prize of the high calling of God; and in 2 Timothy, iv. chap. we find that this old soldier of the cross was just about to receive his glorious reward. 'I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto (all men? no) all them that love his appearing.' Here then we learn that the apostle expected to receive the crown for which he was running, and the prize after which he was pressing along the mark, after his departure from this world; and it seems also to have been his opinion, that this crown would not be given to any who do not run for it; and it must consequently, I think, be obvious to every discerning mind, that those who would enter the everlasting kingdom of Jesus, must be careful to maintain good works.

The present kingdom of Jesus, is like 'a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind.' Matt. xiii. 47. Good and

bad were received into this kingdom! But not so with the everlasting kingdom. Into that kingdom, flesh and blood could not enter. 1. Cor. xv. 50. The Apostle addressing the subjects of the present kingdom, 1 Cor. vii. 9, 10; whom he says had been washed, sanctified, and justified; but who had now done wrong by going to law with one another, says, 'know ye not that the unrighteousness shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' See the whole connexion. And again, Eph. v. 5. 'For this ye know that no unclean person, nor covetous man who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.' And again, 2 Thes. i. 5, 'Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgement of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God for which ye also suffer.' Matt. vii. 21. 'Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'

Now all the above passages which speak of the kingdom, except the first, must relate to the future everlasting kingdom, and for the following obvious reasons: 1st. Because it has been proved that the present kingdom, 'gathered of every kind, good and bad.' 2d. Because its subjects were admitted, not on account of works of righteousness, or moral worth of any kind. 3d. Because the law agreeably with which men were to enter the second kingdom, or state of future glory, makes moral fitness a necessary prerequisite. as you may learn was the case, by every one of the above testimonies, and in fact, by all the testimonies which we have yet quoted, relative to the everlasting kingdom: And 4thly, and finally, because every one of the above admonitions were addressed to the subjects of the present kingdom, in order to stimulate them to diligence in all manner of good works, in order that they might obtain, as Peter says, 'an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom.'

And it was with respect to this everlasting kingdom, that Jesus spake, when he said, 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt,

and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." And in Phil. iii. 1, 2, in strict accordance with the above admonition of Jesus, Paul says, 'If ye then be risen with Christ,' (that is, from the baptism in which he tells them, in the preceding chapter, they had been buried,) 'seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on earth.' And in Phil. iii. 20. 'For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.'

We cannot mistake when we say that these testimonies relate to the future everlasting kingdom of Jesus, for we have express testimony from the apostle himself, that he was speaking of that eternal world, beyond the grave, into which Jesus had entered, and if so, then it irresistibly follows, that in order that we become rich toward God, we must lay up our treasures in that place, where our hearts and our affections are to be;—we must lay up our treasures where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God, that our conversation and our hearts may be where Jesus is, and that when we shall be removed hence, we may have treasure in the heavens! 'Blessed,' says the Spirit, 'are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'

Having now proved that the eternal life is to be obtained by keeping the Divine commandments, permit me in the next place to prove, that even the heirs of this life, or the subjects of the present kingdom of Jesus, may lose, or forfeit it, by transgressing them!

'If any man shall take from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.' From this testimony it appears that a man by transgression might lose all interest,—all part, or lot, in all the gracious promises of this book, and consequently fall short of life eternal!

'He that overcometh, the same shall be

clothed in 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.' This passage proves that those who do not overcome, will have their names blotted out of the book of life. And this is in strict accordance with the testimony of Paul, when he says, 'to them that seek for glory, honor, immortality; eternal life.'

In the general epistle of Jude, we read of men who were like 'clouds without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever.' Did any person ever know a tree which was twice dead, and besides, was plucked up by the roots, that ever grew again?

The apostle Peter, 2 Epis. ii. speaking of the same persons, says: 'but these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption. He tells us that they are wells without water; clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever. And that these were apostates from the Christian religion, is also evident from the succeeding verses of this chapter, only the last of which we will quote: 'It has happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog has turned to his vomit again; and, the sow that washed to her wallowing in the mire.' Now from these testimonies it appears that these apostates were no more considered heirs of glory, or subjects of salvation, than were the beasts of the field. Their destiny was the mist of darkness;—an utter perishing in their own corruption!

In the sixth chapter of Hebrews we are taught, that if a person is once enlightened; and tastes the heavenly gift; and is made partaker of the Holy Spirit, and tastes the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if he shall fall away, it is impossible! yes! impossible to renew him again to repentance. And in the tenth chapter we are told, that if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judge-

ment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries; and that so dreadful would the punishment, consequent on apostasy be, that temporal death without mercy as it was inflicted by the law of Moses, would not be near so sore, as this punishment. In the xii. chap. he warns them lest any among them should fail of the grace, or favor of God, and lets them know that if they did fail, they would forfeit their birthright (which we have proved to be eternal life;—the life to which every soul born from above is heir,) and that this birthright would be as irrevocably lost, as was that of Esau. Read the whole connexion. He also tells them in the tenth chapter, that God had said, 'the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.'

Now I ask how it can be possible that a person in whom God has no pleasure;—who has as certainly lost eternal life, the birthright of Christians, as Esau had his;—who could not possibly be renewed to repentance;—for whose sins there was no sacrifice;—for whom nothing remained but fiery indignation;—to whom the blackness of darkness was reserved forever;—who were trees twice dead, plucked up by the roots;—and who as natural brute beasts were to be taken and destroyed; and were utterly to perish in their own corruption;—I ask where can salvation be found for such undone rebels as these? The God who created them, has ceased to have pleasure in them;—the Redeemer who died for them, will be a sacrifice for them no more;—they have failed of the favor of heaven, and are consequently destined to the frightful jaws of destruction, prepared to swallow them down!

'I am no longer astonished when I hear the Apostle say, 'knowing the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men;—it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' I am not surprised that Felix* trembled, when Paul reasoned with him concerning righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come; nor that Paul should say to his Christian brethren, 'work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.'

* Felix was a Roman governor, and consequently could not have trembled through a dread of the calamities which were coming on Jerusalem, for he was not exposed to those calamities.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—*Objection 1.* If present salvation be obtained without works, all will obtain it on whom God bestows it, and if he bestow it upon all, then will not all be saved?

Answer. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared," and the reason why all do not obtain a present salvation, is, not that they are required to work for it, in order to obtain it, but because they work against it;—they put it far from them;—they will not have it. Remission of sins and the hope of eternal life is presented to every creature, wherever the pure gospel is proclaimed, irrespective of works or moral character, and as the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, it imparts salvation, to all to whom it is preached, who remain passive under its influences, and fails to serve such, and such only, as resist those influences! The word preached, or taught, in the first place creates faith in the mind of the hearer: for "faith comes by hearing the word of the Lord:—it, next convinces the sinner, of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement:—it fastens it self upon his heart through every avenue, through which it can possibly pass: and it draws the sinner towards God, in exact proportion as it can find media through which to influence his soul, and saves him, not by works, but by "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

The case may be familiarly illustrated as follows: A certain father has a disobedient son, who has rendered himself infamous by his numerous misdeeds; and being moreover in a state of poverty and wickedness from which he can never extricate himself, the tender compassions of the father, move him, to use means, by which to make his son happy and respectable. "Son," says he, "you have acted very wickedly:—you have long abused my goodness, and have indeed sunk yourself very low in vice and misery. But I have determined to do something for your benefit; for I still love you, notwithstanding all your ingratitude to me! I will freely forgive and forget your past transgressions, if you will permit me to do so; and besides, I will give you ten thousand dollars, as capital with which for you to begin business, and by the prudent occupancy of which, you may become affluent and happy!" These words of the father, pierce the son to the heart! "Oh! what goodness is this," in the overwhelming emotions of his soul, he cries! The father forgives! But can the son say that it was in consequence of any of his own good works? No! He had none. The father also bestows on him the capital proposed, Can the son say it was by his good work!

that he obtained this capital? By no means! The son afterwards works by night and by day, in pursuance to the directions of his father, in order to increase his fortune!—Can he at any subsequent period of his life, say, that he would ever have been worth a cent, had it not been for the benefactions of his father? No! He was saved from poverty and contempt by the favor,—the grace of his father: Just so it is with the sinner; “he is saved by grace, through faith, and that not of himself, it is the gift of God. Not of works lest any man should boast;” and this grace, is the capital which the Father of mercies invests him; and thus is he “created unto good works; and enabled to walk in them, and to work out his future salvation by them, just as the son mentioned above, by industry, increased his fortune!

But had this son when the father made his kind advances to him, have drawn back and wrought hard against the invitations of his father, he would have acted precisely as those sinners do, who resist the influences of the gospel, and reject the counsel of God against themselves! We say, therefore, that it is not in consequence of a want of works, that sinners are not saved with a present salvation, but that it is by works,—evil works, that they perpetuate their captivity, and draw down condemnation upon their own heads: and that the grace that brings salvation to all men, saves all men (for this passage is in the present tense,) who do not, in some way, put it from them. And that those who do so are without excuse: for if my physician gives me medicine which possesses efficacy to save my life, and I throw it into the fire, that medicine, no matter how efficacious, cannot save me!

Objection 2. If men are to get to heaven by works, what will become of infants, idiots, and even those who die in so short a time after their conversion, that they have not an opportunity to perform good works! Are all these to be shut out of heaven for the want of works?

Answer. By no means. “If there be first a willing mind, it is required according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not.” Though God be an exact, yet “he is not a hard Master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strewn.” Of every man, he requires, according to his ability,—not beyond it; and therefore when he gives nothing, he requires nothing!

Objection 3. Is not eternal life the gift of God, and if so, does it not preclude the necessity of our working, in order to obtain it?

Answer. Eternal life is the gift of God;

and so are many other things. “Every good and every perfect gift cometh from above.” But the fact that a thing is a gift, does not prove that we will not neglect and abuse it, so as to receive no benefit from it. In order that we should be benefited by any gift we must cultivate it. Jesus was given: and consequently was an inestimable gift, but still those who trample under their feet his precious blood, will by the abuse of this gift; ruin their own souls. The gospel of life is a gift, but it is the savor of death unto death to those who reject it. The one talent was a gift; but wailing and gnashing of teeth was the consequence of possessing such a gift and failing to cultivate it. Righteousness is called the “gift of righteousness;” but in order that it should benefit us, we must “exercise ourselves unto righteousness.” Our eyes and ears are gifts; but we may shut our eyes against light, and our ears against truth, and so abuse all our senses, and all our faculties, as to make them curses instead of blessings. Our daily bread is gift: “give us this day our daily bread;” but still we must cultivate our fields in order to obtain this gift; and so it is with the gift of eternal life. I have already proved, that we, according to our abilities, must become rich in good works, must keep the commandments in order to obtain it. And those who say that eternal life cannot be a gift, agreeably with the above principle of works, had just as well deny that any of the bounties of nature are gifts! God has given to christians eternal life, and this life is in his Son; and consequently he who has the Son has life; and he who has not the Son has not life; and hence Jesus says: John 8, 12. “He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.”

Objection 4. Does not Paul, 1 Cor. 15. teach that in the resurrection all mankind will be clothed with immortality, and that they will consequently inherit eternal life?

Answer. No. Paul never so palpably contradicted himself nor his Savior, as to teach any such doctrine. We have seen by the preceding testimonies relative to this point, what was the doctrine of the Apostle, as well as that of Jesus, with respect to life eternal. If Jesus believed in the doctrine of universal salvation, not through faith, nor by works; I wonder that he had not said something about it, to the young man whom he loved; when he said to him, “good Master what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Had Jesus believed in the doctrine exhibited in the above objection, he might have said to this young man: Do nothing!—Eternal life is a free gift, and all mankind

will obtain it, without any exertions of their own!" But no, Jesus imposed on him a task, which seems to have been thought by the young man to be a very hard one. "Sell all that thou hast," said Jesus, "and distribute to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me!"

"Verily verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. It has generally been taken for granted, without proof, that Jesus here speaks of the morally dead. I think however, that he had an allusion to the literally dead, several of whom heard his voice and lived. "Marvel not at this," that is, at this miracle of raising the dead, "for the hour is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and come forth: they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation, John 5. This agrees precisely to the testimony of Paul, Acts xxiv. 15, when he says "there will be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust." But according to Universalism there will be no resurrection of the unjust, because there will be none who can be called unjust after they are dead. The Apostle however, it seems, believed that there would be some unjust men in the resurrection, and consequently that they would come forth to the resurrection of condemnation: and as to the resurrection of life, he hoped by fighting the good fight of faith to be himself a happy subject, Phil. 3. 11. "If by any means," says he, "I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." In 2 Cor. v. 4, 5, Paul says 'for we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God.'" In the preceding chapter the Apostle had said, that "our light afflictions which are but for a moment, work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." By reading the whole context, you will find that the glory awaited them "in a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" and that this glory was one of the unseen things at which they looked, and which was wrought out for them by those afflictions which they suffered in following Jesus through many tribulations, and that God himself had wrought them for the enjoyment of that glory, and as an earnest thereof, had given them his Spirit; and that they in consequence hoped that their mortality would be swallowed up of

life. From the whole of which it is as obvious to my mind as any thing can be, that a preparation in this life was necessary in order to an admission into the heavenly mansions, and to the putting on of immortality. And hence he says also, Rom. vii. 11. But if the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall quicken you mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' Thus you see that the whole matter, as it relates to whether our mortality will, or will not be swallowed up of life, depends on this one circumstance; whether the Spirit of God dwell in us here. If it do, then that very Spirit which quickened the body of Jesus, will also quicken our mortal bodies, in which case, 'we shall not be found naked.'

Additional Remarks of the Editor of the Christian Preacher.

In the scale of importance, with us, salvation occupies the highest place. Yet it must be obvious, from the foregoing essay, that few topics are less understood, men generally transferring all their thoughts upon this matter, to the bliss reserved for the faithful in heaven. That this is an erroneous impression, will more clearly appear by a consultation of Exod. xiv. 13; the song of Moses, xv. chap.; 1 Sam. xi. 13; and xiv. 45; 2 Chron. xx. 17, and many scores of other passages easily referred to, with the aid of a concordance. In order to a further illustration of the *universal, special, and final* salvation, which comprehend all varieties, we must take a general view of their relations.

THERE ARE THREE KINGDOMS, into which it may be the destiny, and into which we shall prove, it is the privilege, of all who hear the gospel, to be naturalized. Of the first, we all now compose a part; and the three may be styled *Nature, Grace, and Glory*: or, in more familiar terms, *the world, the church, and heaven*. Now, there can be no impriety in calling these several departments of Jehovah's great empire, kingdoms, since he has established in each such an organization of influences, resembling the social arrangements of monarchy, as entitle them to the epithet. In nature, there is the mo-

axianical dominion of the sun, moon, and stars, over our earth, and its inhabitants, and these solar, lunar and siderial influences, with the chemical forces exerted in and about us, form a *material* government, under which we are now placed, the laws of which, are attended with their rewards, pains, and penalties, as in other governments. Now, we reasoning bipeds of the natural kingdom, are called the *world*, as we merely belong to this natural world, until we are adopted into a special society, which is the second kingdom of this arrangement. The church is called the kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven, and the kingdom of God's dear Son, and Christ is repeatedly spoken of as King; and it requires no particular attention to detect all the features of such a government. The same may be said of the society of heaven. The word of God and experimental philosophy have made us measurably acquainted with the constitutions, laws, laws of initiation, birthrights, salvations, and inheritances of each. But of each of these we cannot speak particularly now; our observations must be short and desultory.

The constitutional method of admission into the world, the church, and heaven, is birth. But each birth is of its own kind, the first is generation, the second regeneration, and the third *ex mortuis*-generation,*—born of a woman, of water, and from the dead, or out of the grave. In admission into these kingdoms of nature, grace and glory, then, the agents, or parents, are mother and father, water and spirit, the grave (our mother earth) and God's "spirit that dwelleth in Christians."† The births are natural, spiritual, and immortal, and are all divine institutions, without which admission is not be gained.‡ Learn it, reader, birth is not the qualification for admission, but is admission itself—the only admission, naturalization, or initiation into either of these kingdoms of God, excepting the instances of Enoch, Elijah and the saints living at the second coming of Christ. Yet it is a common re-

mark now-a-days, 'I will join the church—I'll get baptized, after I am born again.' Now such persons do not call things by their right names; they mean faith and repentance, or a change of heart, when they speak of being born again, not knowing that neither birth, nor new birth, are analogous to a change of heart. A change of heart is the commencement of spiritual life; we begin to live by faith, John xx. 31, Heb. x. 38, and every person knows that birth is not the commencement of life, but is a change of state. We are born into the world, to enjoy natural life; we are born out of the water, into the church, to enjoy spiritual life. and lastly we are born out of the grave into heaven, to enjoy immortal or eternal life: but the attributes of life, spirituality and eternal life, do not first attach themselves to us severally at these births. This places baptism in its true position,—the constitutional for admitting penitent believers, the changed in heart, to the enjoyment of spiritual life in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is the consummation of Christian adoption. Gal. iii. 27

The privileges of nature, grace, and glory, are birth-rights. By this right the infant enjoys the first inspiration of vital air; life, light, and joy, communion with all nature by all his senses, and the use of his intellectual powers are his natal rights. It is upon this view of the subject, that the inalienable rights of all mankind are founded, and all tyranny is condemned. As the kingdom of heaven, or Christian church is remarkable for its gracious provisions, each baptized believer, by virtue of his birth of water and spirit, is the most blessed of mortals—is pardoned, is filled with the divine spirit and the hope of glory, and enjoys whatever else of happiness and glory belongs to that blessed state; but he continues to hold them by the

* Christ is said, Col. i. 18, to be, *primogenitus ex mortuis*, in the Latin—the first-born from the the dead.

† Rom. viii. 11.

‡ John iii. 5. Titus iii. 5.

superadded tenure of never ceasing diligence. This is the basis of religious liberty. How philosophical and unscriptural the notion which assigns the bliss of pardon and the joys of the Holy Spirit to the aliens, friendly or unfriendly! It is the privilege of the believer to be born again, i. 12, and it is the privilege of the sons of God to enjoy the familiarities of the relation, and to be his heirs. Rom. viii. 17. Gal. iv. 6. Similar is the constitution of the kingdom of glory; its privileges lie beyond the grave into which man must go, and from which he must be gloriously born, an infant of eternity, invigorated with youthful immortality, in order to reach them. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

In is unnecessary here to inquire into the nature and value of the earthly, gracious and heavenly inheritances. But a glance will show the poverty of those who possess only the first, and the countless wealth of those mortals blest with grace, and those immortals filled with glory.

Admission into either of these kingdoms, and continuance therein, are in the Scriptures, called salvations. The universal providence, which sustains human life and reason, or which continues us in this world, entitles God to the epithet, "Savior of all men." 1 Tim. iv. 10 The books in which we may study this subject, are nature; and general and particular providence, natural philosophy and Scripture history, with the current history of the world, which may be read in anticipation, in the prophecies. How great a salvation each individual enjoys every hour, and what is the value of the aggregate of the temporal salvations of all the generations of men, who can tell! Absorbed in the contemplation of this universal salvation, Paul intimates the great purposes of it, in this exclamation to the man of this world: "Despise thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance!" This salvation of the kingdom of nature, has no other relation to the church, or to heaven: and he, who is satisfied with it, and is not

saved in a Christian sense, will never know the joy of him, "whose iniquity is covered," nor will he ever sing the hallelujahs of glory: Here is the beginning and end, of all that universalism can boast: its votaries must be content with this world—the salvation of nature, which is truly universal. Here "the sun shines upon the evil and the good," but the only hope in it, is, that men may repent and obtain admission into a better kingdom in order to preparation for "the judgment to come" God saves only by the powers which he has constituted, and the constitution of nature terminates in "corruption." To admit that God is the "special" Savior of believers, is to demolish all idea of universal, final salvation.

As the natural or universal salvation, is from death temporal, the special or gracious salvation is from a "death in trespasses and sin," which some, for distinction sake, have called spiritual. As peace of conscience, and the assurance of a happy conscious existence after death, are greater blessings than mere animal life, so is the special salvation of the church dearer to man than the indiscriminate salvation of the world. This latter consists not merely in relief from the condemnation and guilt of sin, but is such an improvement of our condition, as is styled being made alive to God, and consists in the impartation to us, of the Holy Spirit, as well as pardon. In the kingdom of grace, there are ordinances of life as well as in the kingdom of nature. But it would require a volume to disclose the connexions, coincidences, and dissimilarities of these three institutions: and this our space will not permit, had we the ability and zeal of Dr. Butler. Now, ever, it may here be observed, that the question of qualification cannot apply to those born into this world of trial, or into the kingdom of pardoning favor. The salvation of each, are enjoyed, by birth and new-birth respectively. God pardons willing sinners, not because they are good, better or best; but, because they are sinners, they need favor, and because they are penitent, they receive it, in the waters of baptism, through the precious blood of Christ.

Birth from the grave by the spirit of God to the resurrection of life, is the consummation of salvation; while the matters of the other kingdoms are respectively objects of sense and faith: this constitutes the Christian hope. Glorious hope! As heaven is a permanent state and a final abode where the blessed "go no more out," unlike the world and the church, it presupposes moral qualifications for admission into it. This truth arranges the world, the church, and heaven, in the order of consecutive preparation observable in their respective types, the court of the tabernacle, the holy place, and the *sanctum sanctorum*, or most holy place. All priests could enter the court and first sanctuary, but none save the high priest could approach the oracle. All men of the world, who are willing, may gain admission into the church, but not every one "who shall say Lord, Lord!" shall enter the gates closed by single pearls. The saved in nature and the saved in grace, must "work out their salvation" in glory, in working out a good character for faithfulness here.

Strange that so much should have been said by Calvinists and Arminians, about grace and works to no purpose! I have not come across an ounce of reason in the whole controversy, though waged by some of the most reasonable men. We are forcibly reminded of the white man and hostile Indian, who met, being both armed, and each took shelter behind a tree; neither dared stir for fear of the other's bullet, but each watched his enemy all day until night enabled him to escape to his residence. From the preceding essay, the reader must see that the considerations of grace and works both enter into salvation. Where is the quarrel then? In assigning the office of works and grace. As the law of admission into heaven respects character or works, the resurrection is immediately succeeded by a judgment, at which the destiny of all is to be settled by their conduct. It is unnecessary to cite the reader to the numerous Scriptures which sustain this truth. But, on the contrary, both reason and religion teach us, that works

should not be the contingency of pardon or the present salvation. Now Calvinists and Arminians have not noticed that there is more than one salvation, and that grace and works are not predicable of one and the same salvation. At the door of the church there is an all merciful and indiscriminate gospel: at portals of bliss a discriminating judgment.

But let it not be thought, because Paul exhorts Christians to work out their final salvation with fear and trembling, lest they fall short of it, that merit can enter into it, as a consideration. Do our lungs merit the vital air, our mouths the food, or our hands the fruits of the earth, because we sow and reap and prune? He who prays "give us this day our daily bread," need neither deny his duty to labor for it, nor God's unmerited goodness in giving it. It is madness to think of meriting heaven, because God has graciously put us upon a plan of moral preparation for it.

But it has been asserted in the beginning of our remarks, that it is the privilege of all those who compose the world and hear the gospel, to enter these other religious states of pardon and eternal life. This is, and long since was, a favorite proposition with me, and a word must be devoted to its elucidation before I close these addenda. To be short, Adam's obedience was tested by a law, the sanction of which was death before the first sunset thereafter; and the only assignable reasonable reason for the delay in the execution of the threat, is, McKnight observes, he and all his posterity were respited, for the gracious accomplishment of the promise concerning the seed of the woman, who is the Messiah. The provisions of this promise required the respite of Adam and Eve's life, and a fair practical exposition of sin, and its cure required the continuance of respite to many centuries and generations.—By this process we now live in a state of respite. But for the promise of the seed, there would have been neither birth, new-birth, nor *ex mortuis* birth, as it regards our race—it would have been extinguished in the persons of the first transgressors. I never could see any argument or fact which justified the figurative or spiritual interpretation of this law, "the day thou eatest." &c.

Admitting these premises, all other con-

siderations aside, the judgment of reason and charity would be, that all human life being based upon the promise of the Messiah, all who have lived or shall live are in some way interested in him; and that, all who hear the glad tidings, may believe, obey and be saved here and hereafter. Upon this basis, the Scriptures affirm a general resurrection and a general judgment of men according to their knowledge and their works. We owe the sweet consciousness of rational existence, the cooling zephyr and refreshing beverage of nature's founts, all joy and all hope to that blessed Savior who, for our sins, fell a prey to cruel Jews and temporizing Romans.

But if it were necessary to oppose other evidences to the barbarous philosophy which renders God partial and the gospel a mockery of human wo, the Scriptures abound with them. However it is not now our province to quote them.

HOPE.

There is an hour when Hope's not felt;

A heart that cannot feel its pow'r;
'Tis when whole years of blackest guilt,
Crowd life's departing hour.

'Tis when the soul, with all its crime
Bends trembling o'er the verge of time;
Bound to existence by a thread,
With Heaven's last curse upon its head!

That soul must feel the dread hour, when
Hope in its Temple cannot dwell;—

'Tis when the dying gaze is on
The opening gates of Hell:—
When the last link of being's chain,
Is yielding, severing in twain,—
When the parched lip, with quiv'ring gasp,
Is cooling in death's icy grasp.

Oh! ere that heart has ceased to feel,—
Ere life's last parting link does sever;
Hope points to Heav'n—guilt becks to
Hell—

Hope wings, her flight forever!
And leaves the soul enshrouded in
Its winding sheet—unpardoned sin;
Cold, dreary, as the mountain brow
Enshrouded in eternal snow!

Hope lights up many a heart that's been
To woes and sorrows long a prey;

And here and there a cheering scene
Spreads in its gloomy way.
Like an Oasis spreading o'er
A wild and burning desert shore;
From which cool waters gushing free,
Meet the parched lip in Araby.

Hope warms and cheers the guiltless heart
Through being's darkest, gloomiest
scene;

'Twill peace in trouble's hour impart,
Till all is calm, serene.

The evening hour of life illumine,
And guide its pilgrim to a home;
Where no dark billow e'er can roll
Between its sunshine and the soul.

Hope ne'er will lose its Heav'nly pow'r
Till time forever more is past;
Lamp of the Christian's parting hour,
Burns brightly to the last.
Its time-lit beams undimm'd will be,
Mid thy first dawn, Eternity;
And only will be lost, erewhile,
In its own light,—Messiah's smile.

The sun shall lose its light and heat,
And from its burning throne be hurled;
And darkness weave its winding sheet,
Around a time-wrecked world;—
Creation's chain ere long will sever,
And link from link be torn forever,
And sceptred desolation, shriek
Its wild lament o'er the great wreck.—

Oh! soon will fall each starry gem,
And leave those azure fields a waste;
Where sparkles in its diadem,
Creation's glory past.
All from their trackless orbits driven
And to eternal ruin given;
And world on burning world, erewhile,
Rear high creation's funeral pile!

When shrieks the last, the wild farwell,
Of guilty souls from bliss that sever;
And sounds the loud funereal knell,
Of all that's lost forever:—
As heaves the deep, the parting sigh,
Of age worn time in agony;
And its last fleeting hour shall be
Dissolving in Eternity:—

Then, from the universal grave,

Amid the wide spread wreck serene;
 Her starry pinions Hope shall wave,
 In triumph o'er the scene;
 And spotless spirits bear away,
 To perfect bliss and endless day;
 And, all their earth born troubles over,
 Bask in Messiah's smiles forever!

RUSTIC BARD.

Paris, Tenn. May, 1836.

The Setting up of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Numerous are the figures and analogies used by the inspired writers when speaking of the Church of Christ, to illustrate it and to suit the situation in which those spoken to or addressed were placed, and the circumstances by which they were surrounded. Are vine-dressers addressed or are the people surrounded by, or accustomed to vineyards?—then the Church is a vineyard, Jesus is the vine, and his disciples the branches. Are shepherds spoken to or persons accustomed to sheepfolds and sheep?—then the Church is a sheepfold, Christ is the Shepherd, and Christians the sheep. Are rulers addressed or people accustomed to rulers and a kingdom?—then the Church is a kingdom, the Messiah a King, and Christians citizens. As the Jews were surrounded by kingdoms, and had always been accustomed to a king, kingdom and rulers, and as the Church of Christ has a chief Ruler, rulers, laws, and a system of government, it is more generally spoken of, alluded to, and represented, as a kingdom, than under any other similitude.

We merely intend in this essay to speak of the setting up or commencement of the Reign or Kingdom of Heaven; which we shall attend to in the following order: *first*, where it was set up; *second*, when it commenced; and *third*, by whom and how it was opened.

1. *Where it was set up.* The kingdom of God among the Jews and of which they were the subjects, commenced or was set up at mount Sinai in the desert wilderness of Arabia; for it was there that they received the law by the hands of Moses their lawgiver, and that system of government under which they lived during the old or Mosaic dispensation. But as all these things were only the types of the good things to

come under the new or Christian dispensation, the approaching Reign or new Kingdom of Heaven was not to commence there. Accordingly we hear Isaiah in the commencement of his book of prophecy, predicting the place where it should begin. "It shall come to pass in the last days, [of the Jewish Kingdom,] that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, [in the midst of the Roman Empire,] and shall be exalted above the hills; [all other kingdoms around it,] and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: *for out of Zion shall go forth the LAW, and the WORD OF THE LORD from JERUSALEM.* And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares: and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Nearly in the same language is the prediction of Micah. And David in Psalms, "I have set my KING upon my holy hill of ZION." It was there from mount Zion that the law or word of the Lord was to go forth, and in Jerusalem that the Reign of Heaven was to commence. And in accordance with these predictions our Lord told his apostles after his resurrection; "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the *prophets*, and in the *psalms*, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, [Old Testament,] and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance [reformation] and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations *beginning at JERUSALEM.* And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but *tarry ye in JERUSALEM*, until ye be endued with power from on high." And again; "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 part of the earth."

The Reign of Heaven was not to commence in the wilderness of Judea nor in Gallilee, but in Jerusalem. Thus much for the place of its commencement.

2. *When it was to commence.* Some imagine that it commenced with the ministry of John the baptizer; others, perhaps, with the personal ministry of Christ; and others, on the day of Pentecost. From what has been quoted we have shown that it was to commence in the last days, or about the close, of the kingdom of the Jews and after the resurrection of Jesus; consequently it could not have commenced under the personal ministry of either John or the Messiah. It was to commence in *Jerusalem*; while John "came preaching in the wilderness of *Judea*;" and "Jesus went about all *Gallilee*, teaching in their synagogues, and *preaching the gospel of the kingdom.*" Besides, neither John nor Christ preached that the kingdom had already come, but that it was about to commence. John preached, "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is *at hand*," not come; and Jesus, "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is *at hand*." It did not commence with the first mission of the twelve, for our Saviour told them when he gave it, "As ye go, preach, saying, *The kingdom of heaven is at hand.*" The seventy disciples sent forth were also commanded to preach, "The kingdom of God is *come nigh* unto you." And every where else in the narratives of the personal ministry of Christ, the kingdom of Heaven is represented as future and to come. Jesus taught his apostles to pray, "Thy kingdom *come*;" which implies that it had not come. He told the Jews on one occasion that, "The kingdom of God shall be *taken from you*, and *given to a nation* bringing forth the fruits thereof;" which implies that it had not been taken from them before, and could not have commenced anew. We read also of Joseph of Arimathea after the Lord's death, that he "*waited* for the kingdom of God," which he would not have done, had it been already set up. Jesus told his disciples, "It is the Father's good pleasure to *give you* [the twelve] the kingdom;" and "I *appoint* unto you a kingdom;" both which expressions import that it was then future. And he told them on another occasion, "Ye which have followed

me,"—"in the regeneration, *when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also *shall sit* upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Does not this plainly imply that his kingdom was then future? His apostles themselves after his resurrection and before his ascension, inquire of him, "Lord, *wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom again* to Israel?" Had the kingdom been already set up would they have asked such a question as this? Jesus told his disciples once before his death, "There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, *till they see the kingdom of God.*" If it had already come they would have seen it.—And how much this accords with his reply to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again he *cannot see* the kingdom of God." The conference with the Jewish ruler shows that the kingdom had then to come. We could cite many other passages similar to the above, but will only refer the reader to them. See Matt. viii. 11, 12. xxvi. 29. Luke xxii. 18. xvii. 20. xix. 11. xxi. 31. Matt. v. 19. But is argued from the following, that the kingdom of heaven commenced with the ministry of John; "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached." But how was it preached? "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is *at hand*." The law and the prophets prophesied of the coming of the kingdom until John; and he then preached it, as did Jesus afterwards and his apostles and disciples. The former prophesied, and the latter preached, its *coming*; for it had still to come. How could the prophets, which are here equally connected with the law, have been until John in any other sense? And the law, equally connected here with the prophets, continued to govern the kingdom of the Jews, until the death of Christ; and consequently that kingdom continued with it. Paul says in his epistle to the Colossians, "Blotting out the *handwriting of ordinances* [of the law] that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, *nailing it to the cross*;" and in his epistle to the Ephesians, "He is our peace, who hath made both [Jews and Gentiles] one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; *having abolished in his flesh the enmity*, even the *law of*

commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Jesus nailed the legal institution to the cross, and abolished it forever; but it was then, and not before or until then. Besides all this, as it was under the new covenant that the kingdom of heaven had to commence, how could it have been set up before this covenant was sealed or dedicated by the blood of Christ? If it could, and before Jesus had taken his seat on his throne as Lawgiver and his disciples theirs on their twelve thrones as judges or lawgivers under him, it would have presented the singular anomaly of a kingdom without either constitution or laws!—It could not have commenced with John for he was never in it, though the greatest of prophets, as is plainly indicated in the following; "Among those that are born of women, there is not a greater prophet than John the baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." Why? Because he was never in this kingdom; and consequently the least in it must have been greater than the greatest who was never in it.—We have used the phrase, "setting up of the kingdom of Heaven," because the prophet Daniel has authorised it. Prophecy of this kingdom he says; "In the days of these kings [the Cesars] the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed," and, "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Our Saviour did not give John the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," neither did he give them to the twelve or the seventy when he first commissioned them. He gave them to Peter; and if we can ascertain when Peter used them, we can find out when the kingdom was set up; for it was not until it was opened that it was set up or commenced. This, as we learn from the 2d. chap. of Acts, was on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection. Pentecost was the day on which the law was to go forth from mount Zion instead of Sinai, and the most appropriate time, as the Jews from all nations assembled at Jerusalem on that day to celebrate the giving of the law.

3. *By whom and how it was opened.*

Jesus gave the keys to Peter, as we have just observed. He did not give him the key, but the *keys*; as it had to be opened to the Jews first and to the Gentiles afterwards. It required *two*, then, instead of *one* key. Our Savior when on the coasts of Cesarea Philippi asked his disciples whom they said he was? Peter replied, "thou art Christ, the son of the living God."—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona," replies Jesus, "for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee. that thou art Peter; [from *Petros*, masculine, a stone] and upon this rock [from *Petra*, feminine, a rock] I will build my church and the gates of hell [hades] shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee [Peter] the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Savior did not tell Peter that he would build his church upon *him*, but upon the truth he had announced. And it is only those who upon the testimony revealed by God in the Scriptures, are enabled to make the confession made by Peter, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that can be built upon this rock and form part of the church of Christ, of which, under the similitude of a kingdom, Jesus gave Peter the keys. We have seen when and where it was set up and by whom to be opened. Let us now see *how* it was opened. On Pentecost the disciples were all with one accord in the same place. A miraculous noise, "like the sound of a rushing mighty wind," draws the multitude together. When assembled, they witness astonishing displays of miraculous power. Peter standing up with the eleven apostles, in accordance with the commission given him by the Lord, proves from prophetic testimony, the facts of the fulfilment of which they were witnesses, that Jesus of Nazareth whom the Jews slew had arisen from the dead, and was made by God "both Lord and Christ." Believing upon this testimony, and pierced to the heart by the "sword of the Spirit which is the word of God," (for the apostles spake "as the Spirit gave them utterance;") consequently what they said while thus under the influence of the Spirit was the word of God's Holy Spirit, and

"the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a *discerner* of the *thoughts* and *intents* of the *heart*;" "pricked in their heart," they cry out and ask Peter and the other apostles what they shall do? Peter now opens the door into the kingdom.—"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." Let this reply be remembered by every man who attempts to preach the gospel; and let him answer as Peter did. With this precedent before our eyes we cannot, we dare not, reply otherwise. God has not authorised us to tell individuals when they are crying out like these Pentecostians, to "*repent and pray* for the remission of sins," but to "*repent and be baptized* for the remission of sins." Those baptized on Pentecost, having received the remission of sins in baptism were consequently saved from the guilt, pollution and dominion of sin. Hence says Luke, the writer of Acts, speaking of them, "They that gladly received his [Peter's] word [thus confirmed and rendered credible by miracles] *were baptized*: & the same day [not before, but after they were baptized,] there were added unto them about three thousand souls." And again, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," or as the right translation is, "added the saved to the church." For having believed from their heart, (for they were cut or pricked to the heart by the word of the Holy Spirit in Peter, which they heard, and believed with the heart, as "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God," and the word of God "discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart,") having believed and been baptized before they were added to the church, they were saved from their past sins; for "he that *believes* and *is baptized* shall be *saved*." Peter acted in accordance with the commission which our Saviour gave his apostles; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."*

Paul tells the Corinthians what the gospel is, and by which they were saved, if they kept in memory what he had preached unto them. "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." The individual who, upon the testimony of prophets and apostles, believes these three facts, believes "the gospel," and being baptized, is saved.

We can ascertain from the opening of the kingdom by Peter, what Jesus meant when he told Nicodemus that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We can here find out what he meant by the birth of water and of the Spirit. Jesus first told the Jewish Rabbi that "Except a man be born again he cannot see [or discern] the kingdom of God;" that is, he cannot enjoy the life, feelings, privileges, &c. in this kingdom. The second or spiritual birth by which a man becomes a Christian, does not take place in order to procure, but to enjoy, spiritual life. That life commences as soon as a man believes; but birth is necessary in order to its enjoyment. There is an analogy here between the natural and spiritual births. The infant is alive before it is born; but does not and cannot enjoy life, until birth takes place. It then sees or discerns the world, breathes the atmosphere, and is operated upon by the various influences of the Universe.—The kingdom, the birth into which Jesus announced to Nicodemus, was the very same with that of which he gave the keys to Peter, as all must acknowledge. The opening of this kingdom then, and the birth into it must be the *same* thing, varying only in expression to suit each similitude. Baptism was the door opened by Peter on Pentecost, to all properly qualified subjects,—to the believing and reforming Jews. To believe and be baptized then, is to be born again, to be born of water and of the Spirit. There is but little difficulty or misunderstanding about the birth of water. It is generally allowed to be synonymous with baptism.—The difficulty is about the other part of the

ting this leave out "and is baptized?" Are they afraid, or do they shun to declare "all the counsel of God?"

* Why is it that some preachers in que-

process of regeneration; how we are born of the Spirit. There are not *two* births; the first of the Spirit, and the last of water; but *one*, and that by two agents, the Spirit and water; consequently this *one* birth cannot take place until we are born of water. What has the Spirit to do then about it, and how are we 'born of the Spirit?' In believing we are begotten by the Spirit, we are impregnated by the good seed of the word of God; and this begetting takes place in order to birth, and this birth cannot take place without it. In believing we are under the influence and operation of the Holy Spirit, for the word of God by which our belief or faith comes, was spoken and written under the inspiration of the Spirit. In being begotten by the word then, we are begotten by the Spirit. Now for the connexion between believing and begetting. To believe is to have faith. "*Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*" "*Thy word is truth.*" "Of his [God's] own will *begat* he us *with the word of truth.*" "In Christ Jesus I have *begotten* you *through the gospel.*" "This is the word which *by the gospel* is preached unto you." "*Born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God.*" "Whosoever *believeth* that *Jesus is the Christ*, is *born of God*; [*begotten by God*:] and every one that loveth him that *begat*, loveth him also: that is *begotten of him.*" "Except a man be *born again*"—"born of water and of *the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "We are all the *children of God* [and it takes birth to bring children into the world] *by faith* in Jesus Christ; [and faith comes by the word of God:] for as many as *have been baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ;" and become the children of God, by the institution of baptism upon the principle of faith, and are thus "born of water and of the Spirit."

After Pentecost we trace the progress of the gospel from Jerusalem among the Jews until we come to the opening of the kingdom to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. We say, among the Jews; for we are told that "they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only."

This we are told in the 11th chap. of Acts, the one after that containing the account of the opening of the kingdom to the Gentiles, and immediately after it is said, "When they heard these things, [what Peter had been relating about the conversion of Cornelius' family] they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." As Jesus had committed the keys unto Peter we according see, in Acts 10th chap., that he used the other key, and opened the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles. As the Gentiles had not crucified the Messiah, they did not ask as did the Jews, "what shall we do?" Peter only commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; but doubtless "for the remission of sins," as he would not be inconsistent with himself; and on a confession of their faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

But Peter made baptism one of the conditions of receiving "the gift of the Holy Spirit" on Pentecost, while at the house of Cornelius it was poured out on the Gentiles before he commanded them to be baptized. Mark, that it was the *gift* of the Holy Spirit; "for they heard them *speak with tongues.*" It was given to them before, in order to convince the Jews that God would accept the Gentiles as he did them. And hence Peter asked in the presence of the believing Jews that were with him, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" The Jews could now say nothing in objection. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Bishop Sherlock, speaking of miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, says, "That the gifts of this sort conveyed no sanctifying grace to the receiver, is evident from what Paul hath taught us, 1 Cor. xiii. 'Though I *speak with the tongues* of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass, or a tinkling symbol. Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.' The supposition here made, that the exercise of these gifts may consist with a want of charity, that is, with a want of

the moral qualifications of a Christian, warrants the conclusion that these gifts do not convey the sanctifying grace of the gospel; and that they are given, not for the sake of the receivers, but for the sake of others, who through their ministry, are to be converted to the knowledge of the truth. For this reason they were given, and for some time continued in the primitive church, to make way for the acknowledgement of Christ, and for the conviction of unbelievers."

EDITOR.

THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM.

When did the kingdom of heaven commence? 'With the ministry of John,' says one;—'With the ministry of Jesus,' says another;—'With the first sending out of the Twelve Apostles,' says a third;—'At the resurrection of Jesus,' says a fourth;—'At none of them: but by degrees from the baptism of John to the fall of Jerusalem,' says a fifth.

The reader will please remember that there at least *five elements* essential to a perfectly organized kingdom, and that it may be contemplated in reference to one or more of these component parts. Hence the numerous and various parables of the Savior. Sometimes he speaks of the administration of its affairs—of its principles in the heart—of its subjects—of its King—of its territory—of its progress—of various incidents in its history. Hence the parable of the sower—of the wheat and darnel—of the leaven—of the merchant seeking goodly pearls—of the sweep net—of the marriage of a king's son—of a nobleman going into a far country—of the ten virgins—of the talents—of the sheep and goats, present to our view the kingdom of heaven in different attitudes, either in its elements or in its history—its commencement or its close.

The approaching, or the coming of the reign of heaven, can properly have respect only to one or two of the elements of a kingdom; or to a formal exhibition of that whole organization of society which we call a *kingdom*. It can have no proper allusions to its territory; for that was created and located before man was created. It cannot allude either to the persons who were constituted subjects, for they too were in existence before the kingdom commenced. It cannot allude to the birth or baptism of the King, for it was not till after these that Jesus *began* to proclaim its coming or approach. It cannot have reference to the ministry of John or of Jesus, any more than to the patriarchal or Jewish dispensations; because Jesus did not begin to proclaim the coming

of this reign till after John was cast into prison. This is a fact of so much importance, that Matthew, Mark, and Luke distinctly and circumstantially declare, that, in conformity to ancient predictions, Jesus was to begin to proclaim in Galilee and that he did not commence to proclaim the doctrine or the gospel of the coming of the Reign, till after John's ministry ceased and he was cast into prison. In this assertion the Evangelists agree:—"Now Jesus [after his baptism and temptation in the wilderness] hearing that John was imprisoned, retired into Galilee; and having left Nazareth, resided at Capernaum. For thus saith the Prophet," &c. From that time Jesus began to proclaim, saying, "Reform, for the Reign of Heaven approaches;" or, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," as says the common version. (1.)

Some Baptists, for the sake of *immersion*, and some of our brethren in the Reformation, for the sake of *immersion* for the remission of sins, seem desirous to have John in the kingdom of heaven, and to date the commencement of the Christian dispensation with the first appearance of John the Immerser. They allege in support of this hypothesis that Jesus said, "The Law and the Prophets continued till John," (the only instructors of men;) "since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presses into it." "Publicans and harlots show you the way into the kingdom of heaven," said Jesus to the Pharisees. Again, "Alas! for you Scribes and Pharisees! for you shut the kingdom of heaven against men, and will neither enter yourselves, nor permit others that would, to enter." "The kingdom of God is within you." "The kingdom of heaven has overtaken you." From these premises they infer that the kingdom of heaven was actually set up by John the Baptist: 'For,' say they, 'how could men and women enter into a kingdom which was not set up! And did not John immerse for the remission of sins, and call upon men to repent and reform in order to baptism?'

The Paidobaptist, too, will have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, and all the circumcised Jews in the kingdom of heaven, because Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I am;" "Abraham saw my day and was glad;" and Paul says Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, and forsook Egypt in faith of the Christian recompense of re-

(1.) Matth. iv. 12. Mark i. 14. Luko 3. 20. iv. 14.

ward. Yes, and Paul affirms that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their families, who dwelt in tents in the promised land, looked not only to the rest in Canaan, but they sought a heavenly country, and expected the city of foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Thus the Jews had Christ in the manna and in the Rock, and baptism in the cloud and in the sea.

The mistake is specifically the same.—Christ was promised and prefigured before he came, and the kingdom of heaven was promised and preached by John, by Jesus, the Twelve, and the Seventy. (who went about proclaiming the glad tidings of the Reign) before the reign of Christ, or kingdom of heaven, commenced. Because Christ was promised and prefigured in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, the Paidobaptists will have the kingdom of heaven on earth since the days of Abel; and because the glad tidings of the reign and kingdom of heaven and the principles of the new and heavenly order of society were promulgated by John; the Baptists will have John the Baptist in the kingdom of heaven, and the very person who set it up.

Let us, then, examine this matter with all candor: and first we shall place the passages above quoted out of the testimonies of the Evangelists on one side, and the following passages on the other side; and then see if we can reconcile them. John says, "Reform, for the reign of God approaches." Jesus began to proclaim, saying, "Reform, for the reign or kingdom of heaven is at hand." He also commanded the Twelve and the Seventy to peripatize all Judea, making the same proclamation. (1.) Of John the Baptist he said, though greater than all the Prophets, "The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

Thus after John was beheaded we have some eighty-four preachers daily proclaiming the nigh approach of the reign of God; and Jesus often assuring his disciples that the kingdom of God was soon to appear, and that some of his companions would see him enter upon his reign before they died—and the kingdom was set up by John! Scribes and Pharisees were shutting the kingdom against men, when Jesus had only given the keys to Peter! John the Baptist was in the kingdom, and the least in the kingdom is greater than he! More than eighty preachers say, "Reform, for the reign of heaven

(1.) Math. x. 8. Luke x. 1—11. When eating the last supper he distinctly said that the reign of God was then future. Luke xxii. 18.

is at hand;" and John the Baptist before he died introduced all Judea and Jerusalem into it! How, then, shall we reconcile these apparent contradictions? Make both sides figurative, and it may not be done. Regard both sides literally, and it cannot be done! To say that the kingdom came in one point of view at one time, and in another point of view at another time, is only to say that it came in different senses, literally and figuratively. For our part we must believe that the kingdom of heaven began, or the reign of heaven literally and truly commenced in one day.

Many of its principles were developed by the ancient Prophets: David, Isaiah, & others wrote much concerning it; John the Baptist proclaimed its immediate approach, and more fully developed its spiritual design; therefore, he was superior to them. Jesus often unfolded its character and design in various similitudes; and every one who understood and received these principles were said to "press into the kingdom," or to have "the kingdom within them;" and wherever these principles were promulgated "the kingdom of heaven" was said to "come nigh" to the people, or to "have overtaken them;" and those who opposed those principles and interposed their authority to prevent others from receiving them, were said to "shut the kingdom of heaven against men;" and thus all those scriptures must of necessity be understood from the contexts in which they stand: for it was impossible that the reign of heaven could literally commence "till Jesus was glorified." "received the promise of the Holy Spirit," was "made Lord and Christ," and "sat down with his Father upon his throne"—for he left this earth to receive a kingdom.

To make this, if possible, still more evident, we ask, *When did the kingdom of God, established by Moses amongst the seed of Abraham, cease?* This question penetrates the whole nature and necessity of the case: for will any one suppose that there were two kingdoms of God on earth at one and the same time? Certainly the one ceased before the other began.

Now that the kingdom of God, ministered by Moses, had not ceased during the personal ministry of the Messiah on earth, is, we think, abundantly evident from the following facts and documents:—

1. Jesus was to have appeared, and did appear, "in the end of the world," or last day of the kingdom of God. "In the conclusion of the age has he appeared to put a

*Luke xix. 11—15.

way sin by the sacrifice of himself." The "world to come" was one of the names of the gospel age. He has not subjected "the world to come" to the angels, as he did the world past, say Paul to the Hebrews, He appeared, then, not in the beginning of the gospel age, but in the end of the Jewish age.

2. The Temple was the house of God to the very close of the life of Jesus. For it was not till the Jewish ministry conspired to kill him that he deserted it. At the last festival of his life, and immediately before he fell into their hands, on walking out of the Temple, he said, "Behold your house is deserted," for you shall not see me henceforth till you shall say, Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord!" It was his Father's house, the house of God till that moment. Then, indeed, the glory departed.

3. The Jewish offerings and services, as a divine institution, continued till the condemnation of Jesus. He sent the cleansed leper to the priest to make the offering commanded in the law. He commanded the people to hear the doctors of the law who sat in Moses' chair. He paid the didrachma. He was a minister of the circumcision. He lived *under*, not *after* the law. He kept all its ordinances, and caused all his disciples to regard it in its primitive import and authority to the last passover. *Indeed, it could not be disannulled, for it was not consummated till on the cross he said, "It is FINISHED."*

4. When he visited Jerusalem the last time, and in the last parable pronounced to them he told them plainly 'the kingdom of God should be taken from them' and given to a nation who should make a better use of the honors of the kingdom; consequently at that time the Jews had the kingdom of God.

5. It was not until his death that the veil of the Temple was rent; that the things 'which could be shaken were shaken.' It was then, and not till then, that he nailed the legal institution to his cross. Then, and not till then, was the middle wall of partition broken down. The last Sabbath he slept in the grave. *From the moment of his death there was no life in the old kingdom of God.* The Temple was deserted, its veil rent, its foundation shaken, the city devoted, the ritual abolished, and as after death the judgment, the Temple, city, and nation waited for the day of his vengeance.

The kingdom of God was evidently in the Jewish institution till Jesus died. Hence the kingdom of heaven came not while Jesus lived. In anticipation they who believed the gospel of the kingdom received the kingdom of God, just as in anti-

icipation he said, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" before he began to suffer; and as he said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many," before it was shed. So while the doctrine of this reign—faith, repentance, baptism, and a new principle of sonship to Abraham were promulgating by John, the Twelve, the Seventy, and by himself, the kingdom of heaven was approaching; and those who received these principles by anticipation were said to enter into the kingdom, or to have the kingdom within them.

The principles of any reign or revolution are always promulgated, debated, and canvassed before a new order of things is set up. A party is formed upon these principles before strength is acquired or a leader obtained competent to the commencement of a new order of things. In society, as in nature, we have first the blade, next the stem, and then the ripe corn in the ear.—We call it wheat, or we call it corn, when we have only the promise in the blade. By such a figure of speech the kingdom of God was spoken of while as yet only its principles were promulgating.

When these American states were colonial subjects of the King of England, and long before the setting up of a Republic, republican doctrines were promulgated and debated. The believers and advocates of these doctrines were called Republicans, while as yet there was not a republic on this continent. He who dates the commencement of the kingdom of heaven from the ministry of John the Baptist, sympathises with him who dates the American Republics from the first promulgation of the republican principles, or from the formation of a republican party in the British colonies. But as a faithful and intelligent historian, in writing the history of the American Republics, commences with the history of the first promulgation of these principles, and records the sayings and deeds of the first promulgators of the new doctrines; so the sacred historians began their history of the kingdom of heaven with the appearance of John in the wilderness of Judea, preaching the Messiah, repentance, a holy life, and *raising up a new race of Israelites on the principle of faith rather than of flesh:* for this in truth was "the blade" of the kingdom of heaven.

Having from all these considerations seen that until the death of the Messiah his kingdom *could not* commence: and having seen from the record itself that it *did not* commence before his resurrection, we proceed to the development of things after his resur-

rection, to ascertain the day on which this kingdom of heaven was set, or the reign of heaven began.

The writer to whom we are most indebted for an orderly and continued narrative of the affairs of the kingdom of heaven, is the Evangelist Luke. His history begins with the angelic annunciations of the nativity of John and Jesus, and ends with the appearance of the great standard-bearer of the Cross in Imperial Rome A. D. 64. That part of his history to which we now look as a guide to the affairs of the commencement of the Reign, is the notices which he makes of the *forty days* which the Lord spent in his crucified body, previous to his ascension.—The reader ought not to be told (for he ought to know) that Jesus rose in the same body in which he was crucified, and in that reanimated fleshy body did eat, drink, and converse with his Apostles and friends for forty days. That body was not changed till, like the living saints who shall be on earth at his second personal coming it was made spiritual incorruptible, and glorious at the instant of his ascension. So that the man Christ Jesus was made like to all his brethren in his death, burial, resurrection, transfiguration, ascension, and glorification; or rather, they shall be made to resemble him in all these respects.

The Apostles testify that they saw him ascend—that a cloud received him out of their sight—that angels descended to inform them that he was taken up into heaven, not to return for a long time—that he ascended far above all the visible heavens, and now fills all things: Stephen, when dying, saw him standing on the right hand of God.

Much attention is due to all the incidents of these forty days—as much, at least, as to the forty days spent by Moses in the Mount with God in the affairs of the preceding kingdom of God. For the risen Messiah makes the affairs of his approaching kingdom the principal topic of these forty days. (1.) Towards the close of these days, and immediately before his ascension, he gave the commission to his Apostles concerning the setting up of this kingdom. “All authority in heaven and in earth is given to me: go *therefore*,” said he, “convert the nations,” [announce the gospel to every creature,] “immersing them into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe *all the things* which I have commanded you; and behold! I am with you always, even to

(1.) Acts i. 3.

the conclusion of this state.” (2.) “But continue in the city of Jerusalem until you be invested with power from on high.”—Thus according to his promise and the ancient prophecy, it was to “*begin at Jerusalem.*” (3.)

The risen Savior thus directs our attention to Jerusalem as the *place*, and to a period distant “not many days,” as the *time* of the beginning of his reign. The great facts of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, not being yet fully developed to his Apostles, they were not qualified to take any steps to the setting up of a kingdom which was to be *founded upon Christ crucified*—They needed an interpreter of these facts, and a supernatural advocate of the pretensions of the King, before they could lay the foundation of his kingdom.

Again, the King himself must be glorified before his authority could be established on earth; for till he received the promise of the Spirit from his Father, and was placed on his throne, the Apostles could not receive it; so that Christ’s ascension to heaven and coronation were indispensable to the commencement of this reign of heaven.

Here let us pause for a moment—leave the earth, and on the wings of faith in the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, the two witnesses for Jesus, let us follow him to heaven and ascertain his reception into the heaven of heavens, and exaltation to the right hand of God.

Millennial Harbinger.

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. V.

Jamestown, O. 17, Mar. 1836.

BRO. HOWARD;

In my last I left the Clergy trying to ascertain, who among the thousands of pretenders were the true successors of the *thirteen Apostles* of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; but if I were to wait until they agree upon this matter, I should never write another essay; therefore I shall leave it as it is—with this remark, that this difficulty originated in the misapplication of the scriptures had special reference to the Apostles, to every pretender.

But before I leave this respectable deceived class of men I can’t help noticing

(2.) Matth xxiii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 16. Luke xii. 47, 48. (3.) Isaiah ii. 3. Micah ix. 2.

the wretched misapplication they make of the passages of Scripture which speak of spiritual gifts; such as, Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, & Teachers. They are in practice of applying these Scriptures to themselves, as though the end had not been attained, for which those gifts were given to men; as though that which is perfect had not come. These gifts had for their object the bringing of the Saints into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God; into a perfect man; unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; or to a full knowledge of the revelations made by Jesus Christ. The thing which was not perfect when the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians, was "KNOWLEDGE." "We know in part, and prophecy in part, but when that which is perfect has come, [when the whole revelation of God is finished, and Canon of Scripture completed,] then that which is in part shall be done away." The truth is, that there is no use for revelators, when there is nothing to reveal; therefore these revelators, such as Apostles, Prophets &c., ceased when the revelations were finished. The Apostle John was the omega of them.

But to put this matter beyond dispute, suppose we admit for a moment that, that which is perfect has not come, and that the Saints have not been perfected for the work of the ministry. Then it follows of course, that the *work of the ministry* has never been performed upon the Earth, there being none qualified to perform it. If it has never been performed, when will it be? Not while men remain in the flesh, I judge; for I doubt whether any better qualified than the Apostles, and their cotemporaries, have arisen since. If not, then the *work of the ministering* will have to be referred to a future State; and pray what will it be? Surely not, *preaching the gospel; baptizing, ministry the Lord's supper &c;* for all these things belong to this State, and not to the future. There is no command relative to these things or this work, that extends beyond this present life. Therefore we conclude that these gifts attained the object for which they were given, and ceased.—And that the application of these Scriptures to any, in this our day is a *misapplication of them.*

Every Saint may now acquire the knowl-

edge necessary for the work of the ministry, if he will. Having the whole revelation of God before him, he may become as wise as all the Prophets, and Apostles together were; for he has what was revealed to them all; and surely with all this knowledge he may venture to perform the work of the ministry.

Being somewhat pressed for time; I shall now take my leave of that class of men, many of whom I believe to be *honest*, yea as honest as "Saul" was, when he persecuted the Christians; and shall I add, as much deceived? For we acted under a commission from the 'HIGH PRIESTS,' and so do they.

As ever, yours,
M. WINANS.

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. VI.

BRO. HOWARD;—In my last I thought I would take my leave of the Clergy for a while, but being somewhat fond of their company, and having read that in the reformation in Judea, a great company of the *Priests* became obedient to the faith, I concluded to travel a little further with them.

One of their company, the "Rev. T. N. Ralston, of Ky.," has recently got into a difficulty, and I wish to help the poor man out; and with him any others that may have learned to read the Scriptures by a *sentence* at a time, not knowing that one *sentence* stands related to another. The difficulty of this Priest is this: The apostles were commanded to preach and to baptize the nations, and this is all the authority found in the New Testament, for baptizing. But the "Campbellites" say that the Apostles have no successors, and that the Scriptures which applied to them, will not apply to the ministry now. This being so, none have authority now to baptize. Yet the "Campbellites" are great sticklers for baptism. This Priest supposed that he had got the poor "Campbellites" in the fog, by this "cunningly devised fable." But if he will open his Testament and read the next *sentence* to the one authorising the apostles to preach and to baptize the nations, I will by the help of that sentence (which reads thus; "*Teaching them to observe all things*

whatsoever I have commanded you,) try to get him over this difficulty. Well then, the apostles were commanded to *preach* and to *baptize*. And that's not all. They were commanded to teach their converts to do so too; and this they made haste to do, as you will see by turning to Luke's history of the matter. Acts viii. 4. "*Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the Word.*" These preachers were not one of them apostles, as you will see by reading the 14th. verse of the same chap. And they were not successors to the apostles; for they were all alive yet, and had none of them lost their office, as "Judas" once did. And Luke says that, one of these unauthorised men, (as our Priest would say) whose name was "Philip," went down to Samaria, and there he both preached and baptized men, and women too; but he forgot to mention the *babes*, if Philip baptized any.

From the foregoing *sentence*, which our Priest left out, or rather stopped short of, you see that "Campbellites" are not as big fools as the Clergy have supposed them to be. If they are really taught by the apostles, (as they profess to be) they have ample authority both to preach and to baptize.

As ever, yours,
M. WINANS.

Letters to Christians.

LETTER IV.

ON PATIENCE AND PERSEVERANCE.

Beloved Brethren and Sisters;

Favour, mercy and peace be unto all the faithful in Christ Jesus.

In deep humility and with a sincere love for the cause of *truth*, I have again resumed my pen for the purpose of appearing before you, in order that I may call your attention to the great necessity of our patiently persevering to the end of our *lives*. I have addressed you on several duties which are incumbent on us as Christians: *first*, the conversion (or behaviour) of Christians; *second*, the great importance of Prayer, Praise and Thanksgiving; *third*, the necessity and importance of Love and Good Works. And my design at present is to close my series of Letters, on the importance of faithfully discharging all those duties, while we tabernacle here below.

Knowing that it will avail us nothing in the great day of accounts, when the Master of the Universe, the great God of heaven and earth, shall call us to a reckoning; if we grow weary and faint by the way, no difference how good we have been, or how much good we have done, provided we slacken our diligence, turn from the holy commandments, are again entangled by the yoke of bondage, and finally overcome by the corruptions that are in the world. For says the the apostle Peter to those who had obtained a like precious faith with him, through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; "For if, after they *have escaped* the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour 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 unto them."

Oh, my beloved brethren and sisters; let us give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, for if we do, we shall never fall. If we neglect to do those things (or lack these things) that the apostle has been speaking of, it is an evidence that we are blind and that we have forgotten that we have been purged from our old sins. But if we continue to add to our faith, *virtue* (or *courage*), *knowledge*, *temperance*, *patience*, *godliness*, *brotherly kindness*, and *love*, we shall not be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us ever remember that these things are to be in us and abounding in our lives; that we are to go on in the strength of the Lord from conquest to conquest, until we shall have conquered the world with all its alluring snares, the devil with all his fiery darts, and the flesh with all its weaknesses. Then, when we are about to bid adieu to the shores of time, we can say with the apostle Paul, "we have fought the good fight, we have finished our course, (and that with joy,) we have kept the faith, henceforth we may expect there is a crown of righteousness reserved for us in heaven;" and at that great day of God Almighty

—"for which all other days were made," while the unthinking world is slumbering

in ignorance and dreaming of worldly glory, the Lord shall look from the clouds of Heaven, and—the world is at an end! One blast of the trumpet of the great archangel (for the trumpet shall sound) rends open all the tombs, the saints come forth, those who patiently persevered in well doing, they, and they only, will find an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.— They will receive the welcome plaudit, “well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord,” and be crowned with glory, honor, immortality, eternal life! It is one thing to start well, and another to end well. The Gospel of Prince Messiah abounds with promises; but in all these precious and soul-cheering promises, there is not one to be found that is made to any but to those who continue faithful unto the end of their lives. “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.” “Behold I come quickly, hold that fast which thou hath that no man take thy crown.” “He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life.” “Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation.” “And to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father on his throne.”

Beloved brothers and sisters; we know we have need of patience, that after we have done the will of God we may inherit the promise. But we must let patience have her perfect work, that we may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. When Babylon the great, falls to rise no more; when the angel flies through the midst of heaven proclaiming the everlasting gospel to them that dwell upon the earth; and when that innumerable company is gathered together; then we will hear it said; here is the patience of the saints; here are they that kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Yes! then it will be said, “Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.” Let us remember that it is only they who hear the word of God and keep it, who are to bring

forth fruit with patience. In our patience we are to possess our souls. We are to glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope will never make us ashamed, because we have the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us. For if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. Let us ever rejoice in this glorious hope, that we may be patient in tribulation.— When afflictions come upon us, when sorrows and distresses surround us, let this hope buoy us up, and ever keep us in mind that our light afflictions which are for but a moment, work for us a far more and exceeding weight of glory. Let us not look at the things which are seen, but the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. Let us endeavor, as the Apostles exhorted the first Christians, to show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end. Let us not be slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. Let us take the Prophets and Apostles who have spoken to us in the name of the Lord, for examples of suffering, of afflictions, and of patience.

“Lord may we ever keep in view
The patterns thou hast given;
And ne'er forsake the blessed road
That leads from earth to heaven.”

Ere it be long Jesus will make his appearance without sin unto salvation, unto them who look for him the second time. We are told that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be, in all holy behaviour and godliness! Nevertheless we (if we are faithful) according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that we look for such things, let us be diligent that we may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless. Beloved, seeing we know these things, let us beware lest we be led away by the error of the wicked, and fall from

whatsoever I have commanded you,) try to get him over this difficulty. Well then, the apostles were commanded to *preach* and to *baptize*. And that's not all. They were commanded to teach their converts to do so too; and this they made haste to do, as you will see by turning to Luke's history of the matter. Acts viii. 4. "*Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the Word.*" These preachers were not one of them apostles, as you will see by reading the 14th. verse of the same chap. And they were not successors to the apostles; for they were all alive yet, and had none of them lost their office, as "Judas" once did. And Luke says that, one of these unauthorised men, (as our Priest would say,) whose name was "Philip," went down to Samaria, and there he both preached and baptized men, and women too; but he forgot to mention the *babes*, if Philip baptized any.

From the foregoing *sentence*, which our Priest left out, or rather stopped short of, you see that "Campbellites" are not as big fools as the Clergy have supposed them to be. If they are really taught by the apostles, (as they profess to be) they have ample authority both to preach and to baptize.

As ever, yours,
M. WINANS.

Letters to Christians.

LETTER IV.

ON PATIENCE AND PERSEVERANCE.

Beloved Brethren and Sisters;

Favour, mercy and peace be unto all the faithful in Christ Jesus.

In deep humility and with a sincere love for the cause of *truth*, I have again resumed my pen for the purpose of appearing before you, in order that I may call your attention to the great necessity of our patiently persevering to the end of our *lives*. I have addressed you on several duties which are incumbent on us as Christians: *first*, the conversion (or behaviour) of Christians; *second*, the great importance of Prayer, Praise and Thanksgiving; *third*, the necessity and importance of Love and Good Works. And my design at present is to close my series of Letters, on the importance of faithfully discharging all those duties, while we tabernacle here below.

Knowing that it will avail us nothing in the great day of accounts, when the Master of the Universe, the great God of heaven and earth, shall call us to a reckoning; if we grow weary and faint by the way, no difference how good we have been, or how much good we have done, provided we slacken our diligence, turn from the holy commandments, are again entangled by the yoke of bondage, and finally overcome by the corruptions that are in the world. For says the the apostle Peter to those who had obtained a like precious faith with him, through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; "For if, after they *have escaped* the pollutions of the world; through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour 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 unto them."

Oh, my beloved brethren and sisters; let us give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, for if we do, we shall never fall. If we neglect to do those things (or lack these things) that the apostle has been speaking of, it is an evidence that we are blind and that we have forgotten that we have been purged from our old sins. But if we continue to add to our faith, *virtue* (or *courage*), *knowledge*, *temperance*, *patience*, *godliness*, *brotherly kindness*, and *love*, we shall not be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us ever remember that these things are to be in us and abounding in our lives; that we are to go on in the strength of the Lord from conquest to conquest, until we shall have conquered the world with all its alluring snares, the devil with all his fiery darts, and the flesh with all its weaknesses. Then, when we are about to bid adieu to the shores of time, we can say with the apostle Paul, "we have fought the good fight, we have finished our course, (and that with joy,) we have kept the faith, henceforth we may expect there is a crown of righteousness reserved for us in heaven;" and at that great day of God Almighty

—"for which all other days were made," while the unthinking world is slumbering

in ignorance and dreaming of worldly glory, the Lord shall look from the clouds of Heaven, and—the world is at an end! One blast of the trumpet of the great archangel (for the trumpet shall sound) rends open all the tombs, the saints come forth, those who patiently persevered in well doing, they, and they only, will find an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.— They will receive the welcome plaudit, “well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord,” and be crowned with glory, honor, immortality, eternal life! It is one thing to start well, and another to end well. The Gospel of Prince Messiah abounds with promises; but in all these precious and soul-cheering promises, there is not one to be found that is made to any but to those who continue faithful unto the end of their lives. “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.” “Behold I come quickly, hold that fast which thou hath that no man take thy crown.” “He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life.” “Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation.” “And to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father on his throne.”

Beloved brothers and sisters; we know we have need of patience, that after we have done the will of God we may inherit the promise. But we must let patience have her perfect work, that we may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. When Babylon the great, falls to rise no more; when the angel flies through the midst of heaven proclaiming the everlasting gospel to them that dwell upon the earth; and when that innumerable company is gathered together; then we will hear it said; here is the patience of the saints; here are they that kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Yes! then it will be said, “Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.” Let us remember that it is only they who hear the word of God and keep it, who are to bring

forth fruit with patience. In our patience we are to possess our souls. We are to glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope will never make us ashamed, because we have the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us. For if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. Let us ever rejoice in this glorious hope, that we may be patient in tribulation.— When afflictions come upon us, when sorrows and distresses surround us, let this hope buoy us up, and ever keep us in mind that our light afflictions which are for but a moment, work for us a far more and exceeding weight of glory. Let us not look at the things which are seen, but the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. Let us endeavor, as the Apostles exhorted the first Christians, to show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end. Let us not be slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. Let us take the Prophets and Apostles who have spoken to us in the name of the Lord, for examples of suffering, of afflictions, and of patience.

“Lord may we ever keep in view
The patterns thou hast given;
And ne'er forsake the blessed road
That leads from earth to heaven.”

Ere it be long Jesus will make his appearance without sin unto salvation, unto them who look for him the second time. We are told that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be, in all holy behaviour and godliness! Nevertheless we (if we are faithful) according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that we look for such things, let us be diligent that we may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless. Beloved, seeing we know these things, let us beware lest we be led away by the error of the wicked, and fall from

our steadfastness. May we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is the prayer of your sister in the kingdom and patience of Jesus.

L. V. C.

Paris, Tenn.

Abner Kneeland and the Boston Investigator.

'CHRISTIAN REFORMER.'—We have received the first number of a periodical, under the above title, pp. 32, published monthly, at Paris, (Tenn.) J. R. Howard, Editor. Price, \$2, *in advance*. It appears to be a very weak, flat concern; so much so, that we have no wish to exchange with it. We quote the following as a fair specimen of the work:—

'Christianity is a divine and perfect system, having God for its author, and cannot, therefore, be reformed.'

We ask, 'a divine and perfect system' of what? What is it that constitutes Christianity in the opinion of J. R. Howard? and what evidence can he give that it has 'God for its author.' If he will inform us and give us the proof, we will be much obliged to him, and that might induce us to exchange with him.

The above is a notice taken of us by the Editor of the paper, whose name and the name of which, stands at the head of this article. The paper and its editor are both infidel, as the reader will discover from the tone and expressions of the article. He says that our paper is such "a very weak and flat concern," that he has "no wish to exchange with it." Very well. Be it so. Let him freely exchange with us, if he exchange at all. Wishing to hear and know what was going on in the city of "Mental Independence," we very freely and politely tendored our paper in exchange for this organ of Deism, and the above contains the polite notice and treatment with which we have met! But the quotation made from our paper and the remarks appended to it, will give us the reason why Mr. Kneeland looks upon it as "a very weak, flat concern." No doubt but that Christianity is in his estimation "a very weak, flat concern;"—that the Bible is with him, "a very weak, flat concern!" And a work

which would advocate the claims of the Bible or the cause of Christianity, though it might do it with all the argumentative powers of Logic and all the eloquence of Rhetoric, would be with Mr. K. "a very weak, flat concern!" Particularly would our paper be considered by him as a "very weak, flat concern," when the number before him, the first one and generally viewed as the precursor of what is to follow, was filled principally with articles advocating the divine origin and authenticity of the Christian religion, the supreme authority of revelation, and the claims of the Bible upon the faith and obedience of the human family. For such articles, however well written he, doubtless, has no relish!—He has asked us, what is Christianity 'a divine and perfect system' of?—and what in our opinion, constitutes Christianity? We would, consistently with the merits of such an inquiry, inform Mr. Kneeland, that Christianity is a divine and perfect system of *religion*, and that the *Christian religion* in our opinion, constitutes Christianity. Will this satisfy him? If not, we will endeavor to do it again. He asks, what evidence have we that it has 'God for its author?' If he will be satisfied with evidence already given, we will refer him to our essays on the "Divine Origin of Christianity" and the "Confirmation and Reception of the Word," contained in our first number, the one from which he has extracted. We expect that he did not get that far in reading that no.; but balked at the sentence quoted by him. That no. was intended to be prefatory to those which should succeed it, and could not therefore, be a fair specimen of our paper. But as he professes to have given a fair specimen of that number in the *single* sentence quoted by him, let him republish whole or entire either or both of the essays above alluded to (he has room enough in his paper,)* that his readers may judge whether he has given a fair specimen or not, and may have a specimen of our evidence that Christianity has "God for its author." Mr. K. says that if we will give him the proof that it

* We expect he has that no., as it has never been returned according to request. If not, and he will republish those essays, we will send it to him.

has God for its author, it might induce him to exchange with us. The paper of his, containing this, was not received by us until about two months after it was published; and then it seems in consequence of our having requested in our second number, a return of that and the first by all editors who did not intend exchanging with us. Had it not been for this request, we might not have seen that no. of the Investigator at all! Thus Mr. K. would not have sent us even one paper to let us know his reasons for not exchanging; and would not exchange unless those reasons were replied to! Thus by refusing to exchange with us, he gives us no chance to prove to him that Christianity has God for its Author; and refuses to exchange with us until we do prove it to him! How very consistent Mr. Kneeland is!—He is determined we shall not prove it to him!

But we suspect that Mr. Kneeland never knew much about the Christian religion; and that he is contending against, and endeavoring to overthrow, that about which he knows but little or nothing. From what we have learned he was once a Universalist, perhaps a preacher of that sect. If Universalism comprehends all that he knew or knows about Christianity, he knows but little,—he is very ignorant of it!—Let him understand well what he is opposing; and contend no longer against he knows not what.—When men embrace some of the gross corruptions of religion, which are unjustly palmed upon the world as Christianity, we do not wonder when we hear of their embracing Deism.

The Boston Investigator, like the poisonous and deadly Upas, is blasting the religious affections and spreading moral desolation throughout the sphere of its baneful influence!—wrecking the moral powers and perverting the intellectual faculties of man! Its Editor is living in avowed hostility and open rebellion to the authority of the God of heaven, insulting and bidding defiance to his government, and drawing down eternal condemnation and destruction upon himself and others!

Let Abner Kneeland, or any of his fraternity, answer, if they can, the following

SEVEN QUESTIONS TO DEISTS.

1. How did the idea of a God, or the

existence of a God, ever originate, if not imparted to man by revelation from God?

2. Without revelation how can man know any thing about the character and designs of God?

3. If the character of Jesus Christ was fictitious, where has the model ever existed upon which it was formed, or from which it was invented?

4. How did the idea of miracles ever enter into the world, if no such thing as a *real* miracle was ever performed, seeing that miracles are opposed to the constitution and course of nature;—as there can be nothing *false* without the previous existence of that which is *real*?

5. Without revelation how can man know any thing about his origin?

6. Where did the doctrine that man was created in the image or likeness of God, come from, if never revealed to him by his Creator?

7. Where did the idea of a future state of existence derive its origin, if not communicated to man by revelation, seeing that it is opposed to the course and constitution of nature?—and without revelation how can he know any thing of his destiny?

EDITOR.

Infidelity.

If Deism or Natural Religion be sufficient, as its advocates contend, to furnish us with all necessary information in regard to the existence, attributes, character and designs of God, and the relation in which we stand to him and the duties which we owe to him and one to another, why should such continued and repeated efforts be made to make way for it by putting the Bible down and banishing revelation from the world? Is not the system of Deism sufficient to stand of itself and to accomplish all that it is boasted it can perform, without letting the Bible alone? The labors of infidelity are principally and unceasingly directed against the Bible. Its advocates are incessantly attempting to disprove the divine origin of this book. Their works and their periodicals are proof of this and are filled with such attempts. They form the peth and marrow of Tom Paine's "Age of Reason," and of all the numbers of the "Boston Investigator"

which we have examined. This course which they have generally been compelled to pursue, is well calculated to excite suspicion and distrust of their boasted system.

The Bible must be put down, or Infidelity cannot reign! This Book with its mighty train of evidences, with its hope-inspiring promises, with its divine and admirable wisdom and its pure morality, and with all its benign and salutary influences, must be excluded to make way for—what?—for a system which would deprive man of the soul-cheering, the animating, the consoling, the glorious, hope of immortal existence and felicity; rob him of all incentives to virtuous and moral affection and action; and reduce him to a level with the brutal creation!

But say the advocates of Infidelity, "our principles must be fully tested and have a fair trial in order that their superiority over those of the Bible may be exhibited. Let them have this, and their superiority will become manifest." But they have had all this; and what was the consequence? Read the history of the French Revolution, and you will see. The annals of that period make a fine comment upon the System of Infidelity, and constitute the most important book in its History!

After all, where is the superiority in any respect which the Infidel has over the Christian? Let his system have a fair trial, let him be placed under its full influence and operation; and let the Christian be fully influenced and actuated in all his conduct and life by the Bible; and which is the better or happier man of the two? Where or in what consists the superiority of the former? And should Christianity indeed be true, and Infidelity false, how vastly superior must be the state of the Christian after death! The Christian has all to gain and nothing to lose; while the Infidel has all to lose and nothing to gain!

EDITOR.

Concessions of Deists.

[From the (N. Y.) Religious Magazine.]

NECESSITY OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION.

BLOUNT says, "It is not safe to trust Deism alone without Christianity joined to it." Shaftesbury says, "Christianity ought to be more highly prized." Rousseau says, "Philosophy can do nothing good which re-

ligion does not do still better; and religion does many good things which philosophy cannot do at all. Modern philosophers are indebted to Christianity for their best ideas. The solid authority of modern governments, and the less frequent revolutions, are incontestably due to Christianity. It has rendered governments themselves less sanguinary; this is proved by facts, on comparing them with ancient governments. Religion better understood, excluding fanaticism, has given more mildness to Christian manners. This change is not the work of letters; for wherever they have flourished, humanity has not been more respected on their account; of which the cruelties of the Athenians, of the Egyptians, of the Roman Emperors, and of the Chinese, are so many proofs." Byron says, "Indisputably, the firm believers in the gospel have a great advantage over all others—for this simple reason, that if true, they will have their reward hereafter; and if there be no hereafter, they can be but with the infidel in his eternal sleep, having had the assistance of an exalted hope through life, without subsequent disappointment, since (at the worst for them) out of nothing, nothing can arise, not even sorrow."

DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

Herbert says, "Christianity is the best religion. It has manifestly the advantage of all other pretenders to revelation, as in respect of the intrinsic excellency of the matter, so likewise in respect of the reasons that may be pleaded for its truth." Hobbes says, "The Scriptures are the voice of God." Shaftesbury says, "Christianity ought to be more highly prized." Collins says, "Christianity ought to be respected." Woolston says, "Jesus is worthy of glory forever." Tindal says, "Pure Christianity is a most holy religion, and all the doctrines of Christianity plainly speak themselves to be the will of an infinitely wise and holy God." Chubb says, "Christ's mission was probably divine, and he was sent into the world to communicate to mankind the will of God. The New Testament contains excellent cautions and instructions for our right conduct, and yields much clearer light than any other traditionary revelation." Bolingbroke says, "Such moral perfections are in God as Christians ascribe to him. I will not presume to deny, that there have been particular providences: that Christianity is a re-publication of the religion of nature; and that its morals are pure." Gibbon says, "Christianity contains a pure, benevolent, and universal system of ethics, adapted to every duty and condition of life." Paine says, "Jesus Christ was a virtuous

and an amiable man; that the morality he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind; and that it has not been exceeded by any." Rousseau (again to quote him) says, "If all were perfect Christians, individuals would do their duty; the people would be obedient to the laws; the chiefs just; the magistrates incorrupt; the soldiers would despise death; and there would be neither vanity nor luxury in such a state." And finally, to conclude this species of testimony, we cannot do better than to give the admirable character of Christ, as drawn by the same individual.

"I will confess to you," says he, "that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the gospel has its influence on my heart. Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp of diction: how mean, how contemptible are they, compared with the Scripture! Is it possible that a book at once so simple and sublime, should be merely the work of man? Is it possible that the sacred personage whose history it contains, should be himself a mere man? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast or ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity in his manners! What an affecting gratefulness in his delivery! What sublimity in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind in his replies! How great the command over his passions! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weakness, and without ostentation! When Plato described his imaginary good man with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he describes exactly the character of Jesus Christ: the resemblance was so striking that all the Christian fathers perceived it. What prepossession, what blindness must it be to compare (Socrates) the son of Sophroniscus to (Jesus) the son of Mary! What an infinite disproportion is there between them! Socrates, dying without pain or ignominy easily supported his character to the last; and if his death, however easy, had not crowned his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, was any thing more than a vain sophist. He invented, it is said, the theory of morals. Others, however, had before put them in practice; he had only to say, therefore, what they had done, and to reduce their examples to precept. But where could Jesus learn among his competitors, that pure and sublime morality, of which he only has given us both precept and example? The death of Socrates, peaceably philosophizing with his friends, ap-

pears the most agreeable that could be wished for; that of Jesus, expiring in the midst of agonizing pains, abused, insulted, and accused by a whole nation, is the most horrible that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blessed the weeping executioner who administered it; but Jesus, in the midst of excruciating tortures, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes! if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Shall we suppose the evangelical history a mere fiction? Indeed, my friend, it bears not the mark of fiction; on the contrary, the history of Socrates, which nobody presumes to doubt, is not so well attested as that of Jesus Christ. Such a supposition, in fact, only shifts the difficulty, without obviating it: it is more inconceivable, that a number of persons should write such a history, than that one should furnish the subject of it. The Jewish authors were incapable of the diction and strangers to the morality contained in the gospel, the marks of whose truth are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing character than the hero."

THE TRIUMPHS OF SCEPTICISM.

WHEN scepticism triumphs in any heart, the hope of immortality is banished. It crowns the tyrant Death forever on his throne, and the conquest of the grave over the whole human race. It wraps the tomb in eternal darkness, and suffers not one particle of the remains of the great, the wise, and the good of all ages to see the light of eternity; but consigns by an irreversible doom, all that was admired, loved and revered in man, to perpetual annihilation. It identifies human existence with the vilest reptiles and levels man to the grade of the meanest weed whose utility is yet undiscovered.— Having robbed him of every thing which could make him dear to himself and proud of his existence, it murders all his hopes of future being and future bliss. It cuts the cable and casts away the golden anchor, it sets man adrift on the mighty, unfathomable, and unexplored ocean of uncertainty, to become the sport of the wind and waves of animal passion and appetite, until at last in some tremendous gust he sinks to everlasting ruin. Say then, proud reasoner, of what utility is your philosophy—what your boast!

You boast that you have made man ignorant of his origin and a stranger to himself. You boast that you have deprived him of any real superiority over the bee, the bat, or the beaver; that you have divested him of the highest inducements to virtuous life by taking away the knowledge of God and the hope of heaven. You boast that you have made death forever triumphant not only over the body, but over the intellectual dignity of man: and that you have buried his soul and body in the grave of an eternal sleep never to see the light of life again—O scepticism! is this thy philosophy, is this thy boasted victory over the Bible! And for this extinguishment of light and life eternal what dost thou teach and what bestow? Thou teachest us to live according to our appetites, and dost promise us that in thy Millennium more shall live in a paradise of colonies almost as industrious, as independent, and as social as the bees. Well then dost thou preach with zeal, and exert thy energies, for thy heaven is worthy of thy efforts, and the purity of thy life is just adapted to the high hopes of eternal annihilation.—*Christian Baptist.*

THE TRIUMPHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

A TRUE believer and practitioner of the christian religion, is completely and perfectly divested of a guilty conscience, and of the consequent fear of death.

The very end and intention of God's being manifest in the flesh, in the person of Jesus our Savior, was to deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life time subject to slavery. Jesus has done this.—He has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. He has given strength to his disciples to vanquish death, and make them triumph over the grave.—So that a living or a dying christian can with truth say, O death, where is now thy sting! O grave, where is now thy victory! He conquered both, and by faith in him we conquer both. This is the greatest victory ever was obtained. To see a christian conquer him who had for ages conquered all, is the sublimest

scene ever witnessed by human eyes. And this may be seen as often as we see a true christian die. I know that a perverted system of christianity inspires its votaries with the fear of death, because it makes doubts and fears, christian virtues. But this religion is not of God. His Son died that we might not fear to die, and he went down to the grave to show us the path up to life again, and thus make us victorious over the king of tyrants, and the tyrant over kings.—They understand not his religion who are not triumphant over those terrors of guilty man. The guilty can only fear, and the guilty are not acquainted with the character, mission, and achievements of Jesus our life. No one taught of God can fear these horrors of the wicked. Jesus Christ made no covenant with death, he signed no articles of capitulation with the horrible destroyer. He took his armour away; he bound him in an invincible chain, and taught him only to open the door of immortality to all his friends.

A Christian, then, must triumph and always rejoice. Our gloomy systems say, Rejoice not always, but afflict your souls: whereas the apostles say, Rejoice in the Lord always; and again, we say, Rejoice. The gospel, as defined by the angels of God, is, *Glad tidings of great joy*; and who can believe *glad tidings of great joy*, and not rejoice? Deists, Atheist, and the whole host of sceptics may *doubt*, for this is their whole system; the wicked the guilty and the vile may *fear*, for this is the natural issue of their lives; but how a Christian, knowing the Lord, believing the promises, and confiding in the achievements of the savior, can doubt or fear as respects death or the grave, is inconceivable. Thanks be to God who give us the victory!

Some persons may doubt whether they are Christians; and some may fear the pain of dying, as they would the toothache or a dislocated joint: but that a Christian should fear either death or the grave is out of character altogether. For this is the very drift, scope and end of his religion. They who are under the influence of such fears and

doubts, have much reason to fear and doubt whether they have known or believed the truth, the gospel of salvation. But a Christian in fact, or one who deserves the name, is made to rejoice & triumph in the prospects of death and the grave. And why? because his Lord has gone before him—because his rest, his home, his eternal friends and associates, his heaven, his God, all his joys are beyond the grave. Not to know this is to be ignorant of the favor of God; not to believe this is to doubt the philanthropy of God; not to rejoice in this is to reject the gospel, and to judge ourselves unworthy of eternal life. But the Christian religion is not to be reproached because of the ignorance or unbelief of those who profess it. All rivers do not more naturally run down the declivities and wind their courses to the ocean, than the Christian religion leads its followers to the sure, and certain, & triumphant hopes of immortality.—*Christ. Bap.*

Education.

The continuance of our Church, like that of our Federal Constitution, depends upon the education of its members. I am much gratified to observe, that you have so earnestly taken up the cause of Education; but, my dear brother, I think the time fast approaching when there will be a complete revolution on the subject. I think it high time, that what has heretofore been termed a *classical Education* should be superseded by the far more valuable and every day useful one, which will consist in acquiring a knowledge of every thing which can be acquired in our *native tongues*, and leave the dead languages to the moles and bats. This I know to be considered very presumptuous from one—not of the number of the literati.

W. A. E.

We agree in the main with the views on education expressed above. But though we are opposed to the general course of what is termed a "Classical Education," as given in our Colleges and highest Seminaries of learning and as constituting a necessary prerequisite to the obtaining of a "diploma" and "academic honors," we are

not opposed to it in every respect. We are in favor of some parts of the course usually prescribed and pursued, because really good, and necessary in any good system of education. As to the "dead languages," a knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin, if not indispensably necessary, are of great advantage to the preacher, and write upon religion. One of the most objectionable features in Classical Education, is the place occupied in it by Roman and Grecian mythology and the demoralizing works of atheists, pantheists and deists.

EDITOR.

Reading the Scriptures in Public.

It is extremely to be regretted also, that so few of our brethren read *well*, as with us so much of Scripture is read in public. How much more attention would be paid to it, if well read; and much more likely to be retained by the hearers.

W. A. E.

The fault alluded to here is a very general one and needs correction, and the remarks of our correspondent are very just. We should be careful to avoid reading *mechanically*, monotonously, and without effect, as a school boy repeats his lesson; and should pay particular attention to pauses, tones and *emphasis*. Good reading, like good speaking, to be effective or to affect, should be done as much as possible in the manner and tone in which we generally converse. We have found from experience, that this is one of the best rules to be governed by in both.—Kirkham's Elocution is an excellent work to be studied by those who wish to read and speak well.

EDITOR.

The volumes of Revelation and Nature.

It has been very justly observed, that nature is the interpreter of revelation—the volume of nature, of the volume of revelation.

Revelation is the text and nature is the interpretation. But the Deist throws away the text, and will only have the interpretation! He is about as wise as the man who coming across a volume of antiquity, with a commentary or interpretation of it, should

throw away the volume and take the commentary! And the difficulty of understanding the commentary would be as great in one case as in the other. One would be as useless and devoid of instruction as the other would.—What the sun is to the material world, revelation is to nature. We are indebted to revelation for all the knowledge of God which it is pretended that nature furnishes us with.

It is in the volumes of nature and revelation, of creation and redemption, that we read the power, wisdom and goodness of God.

EDITOR.

The Gospel Advocate.

This periodical had its appearance this year in a new dress, and much improved in typography and neatness, as well as in the quality and variety of its matter. The two brethren who conduct it, John T. Johnson of Georgetown, Scott Co. Ky. and Dr. B. F. Hall of Lexington, Ky. are both of them able and zealous writers and preachers. Bro. Hall is perhaps one of the most promising young writers in the Reformation. His late discourse in the "Christian Preacher" on the "Type and Antitype of Salvation," is a powerful production, and much admired.—

We have no doubt but that these brethren will do all in their power to increase the value of their paper. The *Gospel Advocate* is now published at Lexington, Ky. "monthly, at \$1 per year, if paid on the receipt of the first number—or \$1 25 cents if not paid within six months. They who procure 10 subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, shall be presented with an additional copy." The Advocate has several able contributors, among whom are bros. Rains, Challen, &c. All letters on business, communications, &c. to be directed to J. T. Johnson, P. M. Georgetown.

EDITOR. C. R.

POSTAGE.

We hope and it is our request, that our correspondents when they write to us, will pay the postage on their letters, where no remittances of money are made. The little sum which each would have to pay, is un-

important to them and one which they would scarcely miss; but when we have them to pay they form an aggregate by which we are subjected to a heavy tax in the course of the year. Let them consider this.

EDITOR.

DEBATES ON BAPTISM.

Our readers will see from the advertisement on our cover, that we have a few copies of bro Campbell's Debates on Baptism with Walker and McCalla, for sale. These Debates should be in the hands of every proclaimer of the Gospel, and every disciple who can afford it. They have a value which no other works on baptism perhaps have. They give both sides of the question in the language and sentiments of their respective advocates; and ought therefore to be as interesting to the Paidobaptist as the Baptist.—They are at this time deserving the particular attention of our Baptist friends, in consequence of the state of things occasioned by the late decision of the American Bible Society.—They contain a rich fund of valuable and interesting matter.—They are *cheap* enough; and from the dates of the editions offered for sale, must, if not republished, soon become scarce and difficult to be procured.

EDITOR.

A REQUEST TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

Cannot each reader procure another subscriber, or more, for us? We think that with a little exertion they might. Would each one procure another, it would double the circulation of our paper, and more than one would treble it. Thus one paper might soon obtain a sufficient circulation to sustain and establish it permanently. Unless we obtain about 800 more subscribers who will be *punctual* in making their *remittances*, it will not be sustained beyond the present year.

EDITOR.

OUR AGENTS.

From several of our agents we have not heard any thing since we sent them our paper. What is the reason? Does it meet with their approbation? Then why do they not obtain subscribers for us? There are some of them however who have done a good deal for us, and who seem disposed to do all they can. We hope that they will not relax their exertions, and that others will imitate their example.

EDITOR.

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. JUNE, 1836

[NUMBER 6.

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem Luke XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and IS BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XI. 15, 16.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS. Jude, 3.

Election.

[The following comprises nearly the whole of a discourse on Election, written several years since by a preacher of the "Christian Denomination" or *Schismatic* as generally termed in the West, whose name was KINCAID, and published in a pamphlet. We have selected it for republication, because it maintains the scriptural doctrine of Election against its perversions, and contains some of the strongest and most pointed arguments with which we have met against the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election. We have omitted some few occasional sentences, which omissions are marked by asterisks, and which were so trifling and unimportant, that leaving them out would not affect the discourse any.—It is but justice to the Presbyterians, that we should say, a large majority of them and nearly or quite all with whom we are acquainted here, do not entertain the sentiments imputed to them in this discourse, but those of the opposite cast. They do not understand the "Confession of Faith" as teaching what is here ascribed to it, or draw from it the same inferences which are here made out. They do not subscribe to the *form*, but *substance*, of doctrine, contained in it; though we confess that it is difficult for us to distinguish between form and substance of doctrine, at least here.]

EDITOR C. R.

FROM ROMANS viii. 33.

"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?"

I HAVE always regarded election as one

of the most important doctrines of christianity, and have been no little surprised to hear some christians say "away with election!" As election is plainly taught in the Bible, I shall attempt, not to explode, but to explain the doctrine. In doing this, I shall have occasion frequently to hold up to view that system of election, which is believed by my Calvinistic brethren, and by so doing I do not expect to offend pious and sensible Calvinists, because all my sensible readers must discover that it is my intention, neither to deceive nor ridicule, but in humility and love to instruct them. Although this text would naturally lead me to speak not only of the elect, but also of the charges that might be brought against them, and of the principle on which they are cleared of those charges; yet as I design the sermon shall be entirely on election, I shall neglect the two last propositions, and confine myself to the first, in discussing which, I shall endeavor to shew—

1. Who the elect are;

2. When and how they were elected; and

3. Answer the objections that are most commonly brought against the doctrine, which I shall advance.

Agreeable to the method proposed, the first question that arises, is, "who are God's elect?" I answer, the *elect* of God are, first Jesus Christ, and secondly every christian. That Christ is called God's elect appears from Isa. 42. 1, 2, 3. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine *elect* in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgement unto truth." That the person

here described is Christ, is evident from Mat. 12. 18, 19, 20. "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory." But this is not the only place where Christ is called the elect of God; he is mentioned under that character in 1 Pet. 2. 6. "Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth in him shall not be confounded."

To *elect*, is to choose, and that Christ was chosen of God, is clear from the following texts. "I have made a covenant with my chosen." Psal. 89. 3. No person, who will read this psalm throughout will deny that the person here mentioned is Christ. "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious: To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious." 1 Pet. 2. 3, 4. "Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people." Psal. 98. 19. From these passages it appears that Christ is the great *elect* head, and of course every christian must be an *elect* member, for the church is the body of Christ, and of this body every believer is a member. "Now ye are the *body* of Christ, and *members* in particular." 1 Cor. 12. 27.

"And gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his *body*." Ephes. 1. 22, 23.

"And he is the *head* of the body, the church." Col. 1. 18. "So we being many, are one *body* in Christ, and every one *members* one of another." Rom. 12. 5.

As Christ is the *elect* head, and the church his *elect* body, we may safely conclude that all christians are *elect* members of this body; and consequently there must be a great difference between God's chosen, or *elect* ones, and the world: hence Christ says, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own, but because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you." John 15. 19. Christ who speaks as man never spoke, gives an excellent trait of the *elect* character in his parable of the unjust judge; "Shall not God avenge his own *elect* who cry day and night unto him?" Luke 18. 7. St Paul more fully delineates the character of the *elect* in Col. 3. 12, 13. "Put on therefore, as the *elect* of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of

mind, meekness, long-suffering. Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."

It is not necessary for you to ascend to the third heaven, and there search the secret book of fate in order to discover whether you are of the *elect* or not. Their character is here clearly described, and you need not the knowledge of a prophet, nor an apostle, nor even a liberal education to know whether you are, or are not of that character. Do you cry to God day and night? Are you holy and beloved? Have you put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness and long suffering? Do you possess that forbearing and forgiving spirit, which was in Christ? If you do not, you may rest assured that you are not of the *elect* number.

As the *elect* members have a union with Christ their *elect* head, they must be elected, or chosen in him, hence the apostle says, "He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." Eph. 1. 4. The apostle in this text tells us for what purpose we were chosen, viz. "That we might be holy, and without blame before him in love." It also appears from the same passage, that we are chosen not out of Christ but in him: and the same apostle says, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things become new." 2 Cor. 5. 17. Now I think if we are new creatures, and holy, and without blame before him in love, we must be christians; and therefore this passage will not prove that God has chosen us while we were wicked. The most probable meaning of the text is, that God from before the foundation of the world chose the character, that he knew would on gospel principles, unite with, and be in Christ. And now if we sustain that character, we may with propriety say, "He hath chosen us in him from before the foundation of the world." Yet he has certainly left it to our free will, whether to be, or not to be of that character.

Some people are at a great loss to know whether they are of the *elect*, or *reprobate* number; but I can tell you, if Christ is in you, you are of the *elect* number, but if he is not you are *reprobates*. Because the apostle says, "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves: know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Cor. 13. 5. That the *elect* are Christ's people, I suppose no person will deny; and it is evident from scripture, that no

destitute of Christ's spirit can be one of his people, because the apostle says, "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8. 9.

It is impossible that we could have been of the elect number from all eternity, because we all recollect a time when we had not Christ in us, and were therefore not of the elect, but of the reprobate number. We all know that there was a time when we had not the spirit of Christ, and were on that account none of his.

Having thus shown who the elect are; I now come, according to the second proposition, to shew when, and how they are elected. Among christians I know two parties, who differ on this subject; one says election takes place in this life, the other affirms it was from all eternity. Those who believe the latter sentiment are mostly Presbyterians and Baptists. I will state their sentiments in their own words: "By the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. Those angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot either be increased or diminished." See Confession of Faith, chap. 3. sec. 3. 12. The confession of faith of the Regular Baptists is, in this doctrine, precisely that of the Presbyterians; and it appears to me that if their system be true, we are so bound down by the cords of fatality that no person, by any thing he can do, can make any alteration in his fate.

Some say that the saints were elected from all eternity. This I do not believe, for the following reason:

Election signifies a choosing, and implies action; every action has a time when it takes place, and of course there must have been a time before it took place, and therefore cannot be from all eternity. The same may be said of justification from all eternity; the thing is impossible, because, to *justify*, is either to absolve from guilt, or from a charge of it, or to declare one to be just: and in either of these senses it cannot be from all eternity, because the guilt, or the charge of guilt from which the act of justification acquits, must be anterior to that acquittal. Justification in every sense of the word implies action, and every action has a time when it takes place, and for that reason cannot be from all eternity, therefore seeing these truths are self evident, I hope we will hear no more of election, or justification from all eternity.

But there are some people, who do not

think election was from all eternity, yet they think it took place before the foundation of the world: with these I agree in part. First, I believe, that, from before the foundation of the world, God chose, or elected Jesus Christ to be the great head of the church. And secondly, I believe that God at the same time chose the character, that every one of his members should sustain; yet I do not think that he at that time, elected us personally, but left it to our free will, whether to be, or not to be of that character. Saint Paul says of himself, and the Ephesian church, that they "were by nature the children of wrath even as others." Ephes. 2. 3. Now if they had been elected, and their salvation made sure before the foundation of the world, I do not see how at any time of their lives, they could have been children of wrath *even as others*.

When we were under conviction, we were under the teachings of the Holy Ghost, and certainly he taught us the truth, and well do we remember that the spirit then made us believe, we were in danger of the pains of hell, and the wrath of God forever. It is plain that if we were elected, and made completely safe from before the foundation of the world, our conviction must have been a mistake, because according to that principle we could not at any time of our lives have been in danger either of hell, or the wrath of God. It is easy to see that this system contradicts the experience of every christian in the world; therefore every christian who acts rationally will reject it, or try to get a new experience. If it be true, that God has, as the confession of faith says in chap. 3, sec. 5, according to an eternal purpose of his own, from before the foundation of the world, elected a part of mankind, and that not on account of any good works which he foresaw in them, and at the same time past by the rest of mankind, and ordained them to eternal destruction, it must follow with moral certainty, that he is a respecter of persons. But the following passages of scripture sufficiently prove the reverse. "There is no respect of persons with God." Rom. 2, 11. "And ye masters do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your master also is in heaven: neither is there *respect of persons* with him." Eph. 6. 9. "But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." Col. 3. 25. It is probable that saint Peter once thought God was a respecter of persons, and that his spiritual blessings were confined to the Jews. But the Lord shewed him a vision, which convinced him of error, and made him willing to go and preach in the house of Cor-

nelius an uncircumcised Gentile, and as soon as Peter had entered into his house, and heard how the Lord had been dealing with him, he exclaimed, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10. 34, 35.

It is impossible that God could have been a respecter of persons toward the human family before the fall of man, for then they were all holy, they being all in Adam's loins, and Adam in God's image, and if God had then passed a decree of reprobation against any of them he would have reprobated his own image.

He could have been no respecter of persons toward them after the fall, because then they were all fallen. As we all fell equally in Adam, would it not comport with justice, and mercy, and the principles of equality to give us all an equal chance to rise in Christ? Certainly every benevolent mind must agree, that this is reasonable and right, and I am happy in affirming to my readers that it is no less scriptural, than reasonable, because saint Paul says, "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Rom. 5. 18. * * * The grace displayed in the second Adam embraces all, who fell in the first. Therefore with Paul, "we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for all, that they, who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again." 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15.

The following passages of scripture which prove that Christ died equally for all men, are sufficient to convince us, that he did not elect a part, and reprobate the rest from before the foundation of the world. "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet, and peaceable life in all Godliness, and honesty; for this is good; and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1. Tim. 2. 1-6. The word *all*, occurs three times in this passage, and it is each time of equal extent. First Paul will have us to pray for *all men*, and the reason he gives is because, "It is good and

acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have *all men* to be saved." And the consequence of that willingness is, that the Mediator has given "himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time."

John says, "He is the propitiation for *our* sins: and not for *ours* only, but also for the sins of the *whole* world." 1. John 2. 2. Paul says, "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory, and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for *every* man." Heb. 2. 9. Jesus Christ says, "God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." John 3. 16. God himself says, "look unto me, and be ye saved, *all* the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else." Isa. 45. 22. When the angel announced the birth of Christ to the shepherds, he said, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all people*." Luke 2. 10. As the gospel signifies good news, and shews the willingness of God to save all men, so Christ made it the duty of his ministers to preach the gospel to all. "And he said unto them, go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to *every creature*. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." Mark 16. 15, 16.

If God from eternity, according to an eternal purpose of his own, had passed by a part of mankind, and ordained them to wrath even before either they or their parents sinned, it would prove that he had some pleasure in their destruction: but hear him swear the reverse. "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." Ezek. 33. 11.

Some people suppose that God from all eternity, decreed all things whatsoever comes to pass, and therefore they conclude that God from all eternity fixed the fate of every man. I will here state their sentiments in their own words. "God's decrees, are the wise, free, and holy acts of the counsel of his will, whereby from all eternity, he hath for his own glory, unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass in time, especially concerning angels and men." See Larger Catechism, question 12th.

Now if this doctrine be true, I will acknowledge that election was from all eternity, but the doctrine appears to carry its own refutation in it. The authors tell us, that the decrees of God are the acts of his will, they then say, that by these acts, he has from all eternity fore-ordained whatsoever

comes to pass, but every plain man knows it to be a self-evident truth, that every act must have a time when it takes place, and for that very good reason no act can be from all eternity.

If God has, by the acts of his will, fore-ordained all things whatsoever comes to pass, then it will follow that every thing comes to pass just as he wills it; and of course no being can, ever could, or ever will do any thing contrary to his will. I cannot see any difference between this doctrine, and Deism. The deists say "every thing comes to pass just as God wants it," and the Calvinists say, "God ordains whatsoever comes to pass." Now where is the difference? I can see none. If ideas are to be drawn from words, this doctrine makes God the author of every sin in the universe, because all sins come to pass, and it says, "God ordained whatsoever comes to pass." Certainly if this doctrine be true, the idea of sin is a mere elusion, all angels and men are doing that which God from eternity decreed they should do, and which he by the same decree put out of their power to not do. But the Lord says, "They have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart." Jer. 7. 31. Here is a thing, that came to pass, which it never entered into God's heart to ordain.

The decrees of any sovereign are his laws, so I conclude the decrees of God are God's laws, and as these are the effects of his own will, every one who transgresses them, acts contrary to the will of God.

The advocates of this doctrine, commonly try to prove it by the fore-knowledge of God. They think that as God fore-knew every thing, he consequently fore-ordained every thing; for they say, they can see no difference between God's fore-knowledge and his decree. Now, if God's fore-knowledge and his decree be one & the same thing, must not our first parents have been placed in a most desperate situation, when they were put in the Garden? God fore-knew they would eat the forbidden fruit, and therefore according to this doctrine, he had decreed they should eat it. He then made a law, that in the day they eat thereof they should surely die; so if they refrained, from eating, they would break God's decree, and if they eat, they would break God's law. It is easy to see, that according to this doctrine, it was impossible for our first parents to please their maker.

The same may be said of all the sinful ac-

tions of men, God fore-knew them, and therefore decreed them, and then, after decreeing them, made a law to punish those who commit them with eternal destruction. Surely every benevolent mind must abhor that doctrine, which represents God as punishing his creatures in hell-fire to all eternity for doing those things which he himself had decreed they should do.

God has decreed many things, that never came to pass, and if his fore-knowledge and decree be the same this would prove, that he fore-knew many things which he never fore-knew, or it would prove that he was frequently mistaken in his fore-knowledge.

That God has decreed some things, that never did come to pass, and that some things have happened contrary to his decrees, are evident from the following passages of scripture. The Lord said to Hezekiah, "Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live." 2. Kings 20. 1. Although this was a firm decree, yet on Hezekiah's repenting, God revoked it, and added to his days fifteen years.

God spake by the mouth of Jonah, saying, "Yet forty days Ninevah shall be overthrown." Jonah 3. 4. This was a firm decree, yet on repentance the city was spared, and the decree was never executed.

God decreed that our first parents should not eat the forbidden fruit, but they violated the decree. He also passed decrees to govern men, saying, "Thou shalt not kill.—Thou shalt not steal, &c." But still we see men break through all these decrees. I have mentioned these passages to shew that God's decree, and fore-knowledge cannot be the same thing, because God's foreknowledge is perfect, and cannot thus be frustrated and violated.

The Lord certainly fore-knew all sin, and if his fore-knowledge be the same as his decree, then he must have decreed all sin.—Now sin is the *transgression of the law*, and that law which it transgresses is not only the system of God's Government, but also a transcript of his nature, therefore that decree which occasions sin operates against both the government and nature of God. This doctrine would prove that God is divided against himself, and if he be, according to Christ's own maxim, his kingdom must come to an end. But this doctrine may not appear so erroneous to some people, as it does to others, and for that reason we ought to have a great deal of charity for one another.

Can we not easily conceive how God could fore-know all things without decreeing them? Or is it not possible for him to fore-know that an event will fall out in a cer-

tain way on certain conditions. and at the same time fore-know that we, by the free determination of our own wills in acceding to, or rejecting those conditions, may cause the event to fall out in another way.

I think the following narrative respecting David when he was at Keliash is fully to the point. He was afraid that Saul and his army would come down to Keliash, and that the men of the city would give him and his men up to them; and he enquired of the Lord, and said: "Will Saul come down as thy servant hath heard? O! Lord God of Israel, I beseech thee thy servant. And the Lord said, he will come down. Then said David, will the men of Keliash deliver me and my men to Saul? And the Lord said, they will deliver thee up. Then David and his men, who were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keliash, and went whithersoever they could go. And it was told Saul, that David escaped from Keilah; and he forbore to go forth." 1 Sam. 23. 11, 12, 13.

Having gone thus far in proving that we were not elected from all eternity, nor even from before the foundation of the world, I now come more particularly to show when and how we were elected.

Saint Peter Says, that those to whom he addressed his first epistle, were "elect according to the fore-knowledge of God the father, through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience, and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1. 2.

If we can remember when we were sanctified by the spirit unto obedience, and had our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience by the blood of Christ, that was the time, and the sanctification of the spirit, and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, were the means of our election.

If a man can be of the elect number while he is in unbelief, then a blaspheming infidel may be an heir of glory; yea, if it be so that a man is elected before he is regenerated, then he may be an heir of heaven, and an heir of hell both at the same time, because all will acknowledge that the elect are heirs of heaven, and Christ says of unbelievers, "he that believeth not is condemned already." John 3. 18.

But Saint Paul tells us very plainly how we were elected: "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth." 2 Thes. 2. 13. Surely we were not sanctified by the spirit, nor was it possible for us to believe the truth before the world began, and of course could not have been chosen before the word began, be-

cause these were the means, through which we were chosen.

The fact is, when our souls were converted, then we were elected, before that time we were "children of wrath even as others." And the apostle shews that there is a very great difference between the state we were in before our conversion, and that in which we are present. "At that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus, ye who were sometime far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ" Eph. 2. 12. 13.

I now ask the strongest advocate of election from eternity, that may ever read my book, if it is not pretty hard to believe, that a man can be one of God's elect, and consequently an heir of glory, and at the same time be *without Christ*, an *alien* from the commonwealth of Israel, a *stranger* from the covenants of the promise, having *no hope* and *without God* in the world? Yet hard as all this is to believe, every one, who believes the scripture, and holds that the saints were elected before the world began, must believe it. Certainly the elect are his heirs, but we cannot conceive how that which has no being can be an heir, or in other words we cannot understand how a child can be an heir before it is adopted, born or even conceived. But when we were born again, we received the adoption of sons, were united with the great family in heaven, and were made *elect members* of Christ our great *elect head*.

Having shown who the elect are, and when, and how they were elected I now come to the third proposition, which is to answer the principal objections, that have been most commonly brought against the doctrines, which I have advanced. In doing this I need only comment on a few of those passages, that are most frequently pressed to prove the doctrine of eternal election. Some suppose that Paul was elected before he got religion, and their reason for so thinking is, that while he was blind in Damascus, Ananias said to him, "the God of our fathers hath chosen thee." Acts 22. 14. And because Ananias spoke in the past tense, they conclude that Paul was elected from all eternity. * * * However let us hear what Paul himself says on the subject. "Salute Andronicus, and Junia my kinsmen, and my fellow prisoners; who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me." Rom. 16. 7. Now it is plain that if Paul had been in Christ from all eternity, Andronicus and Junia could not have gotten in before him.

Acts 13. 48 is sometimes brought to prove that election precedes regeneration, "and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Here I will just remark that this passage is rather unhappily translated; the more literal rendering of it would be, "and as many as believed were ordained to eternal life." In this translation I am supported, not only by Wesley, and many other pious and learned divines, but also by the general tenor of scripture. The scriptures nowhere teach that any person is set apart to eternal life before he believes, Jesus Christ says, "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God." John 3. 18. We can hardly conceive how a person can be ordained to eternal life, and at the same time a condemned unbeliever.

The next passage I shall notice is Rom. 8. 29, 30, 31. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also so glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" I have heard many persons quote this text erroneously; instead of putting the *predestination, calling, justification, glorifying* all in the past tense as they really are, I have heard them put the justification in the present, and the glorification in the future and thus they have read it: whom he justifieth, them he also will glorify; as if the glorification were yet to come; whereas in reality the persons of whom Paul was speaking, had all been, not only predestinated and called, but also justified and glorified before he wrote on the subject. Therefore it is certain that this passage did not respect one person, that lived on the earth at the time it was written, or that should live on it afterwards. Certainly the Lord never foreknew the wicked to be his people, because he will say to them, "depart from me ye workers of iniquity, *I never knew you.*" Then the question is, whom did he foreknow? Or in other words, may we not say? Whom did he formerly know? I believe the persons, whom he is here said to have foreknown, were no other than the prophets, patriarchs and all his saints of old, And as they were the people, whom he formerly knew, he predestinated them to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. That is, he predestinated them to a happy resurrection, in which their bodies should be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, so

that Christ should not be the only one, that should be born from the dead, but that he might be the first born among many brethren. And having thus predestinated his old saints, he called them to serve him in their various offices, justified them in their righteous conduct, and glorified them when they died. Now, what shall we say to these things? That is, what inference, or conclusion shall we draw from these things? The conclusion is this, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" That is, if God was so good to his saints, whom he foreknew, he will be good to his saints whom he now knows. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? it is God that justifieth." If God has of old glorified his saints, whom he then justified, we may comfortably hope that he will henceforth glorify his saints whom he now justifieth.

The next passage I shall notice is that in the ninth of Romans, respecting Esau and Jacob, which I have frequently heard quoted in the following erroneous manner: "for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of him that calleth, it was said Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." But this reading is essentially different from the text. By quoting the passage correctly, we can easily discover, there is nothing in it of God's hating Esau before he was born: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her the elder shall serve the younger." This is what was said of them before they were born. But in the next verse the apostle quotes another text, which was spoken of them, or rather of their posterity, long after they were both dead. "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." We will now go to Genesis and see what was said of them before they were born; "And Rebekah his wife conceived, and the children struggled together within her; and she said, if it be so why am I thus? And she went to enquire of the Lord. And the Lord said unto her, two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Gen. 25. 21, 22, 23. Certainly there is nothing in this about God's hating the one and loving the other. Yet Paul says it is so written and so it is, but not in Genesis before the children were born, but in Malachi long after they were both dead. "I have loved you saith the Lord:

yet ye say wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? Saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob and hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness; whereas Edom saith we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places." 1. 2, 3. It is plain that the Lord here speaks of the nation of Esau whom he hated for being wicked, and for the same reason he might have said, "Moab have I hated, or Ammon, or Egypt, have I hated." I have cited these passages to show that the great God of infinite goodness, who holds the winds in his fists, handles the forked lightnings, and rules the Universe does not place his hatred on a poor little unborn infant. To do so would be beneath the character of a man, much more that of the Supreme Being, yea to hate an unborn infant, is only worthy the character of a devil. It is evident the prophecy, that "the elder should serve the younger," did not respect the two men, but the two nations, that descended from them, because it was never fulfilled in the two men. And indeed it was not said, that "the one man should be stronger than the other man," but that "the one people should be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger."

As for Esau himself it is certain that when he sold his birth-right, he was wicked, because the apostle calls him a profane person for so doing. It is also pretty evident that he was wicked about the time his father died, for then he wanted to kill his brother, but that he continued wicked till he died, is by no means certain. True it is, that the apostle says, "He found no place for repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." But I would here remark, that it was repentance itself, and not a place for it, that Esau was seeking. Because the Greek word *autēn*, which is here rendered *it*, being a pronoun feminine cannot agree with the masculine noun *topon*, which is here rendered *place*, but must agree with the feminine noun *metanoias*, which answers to the English word *repentance*. As it was repentance he was seeking, it is not probable he was seeking it in himself, for it was then in him and seemed to influence his conduct. And as repentance signifies a change of mind, I rather think with the great Raphaelus, and the celebrated Parkhurst, that the change of mind which Esau sought, was in his father; and inasmuch as Isaac would not recal the blessing which he had conferred on Jacob, it might be said with propriety, that although Esau sought repentance carefully with tears, he found no place for it.

Although Esau by his sin in selling his

birth-right, might forever forfeit the priesthood, which was probably annexed to it, yet perhaps it was not a sin of such magnitude as would eternally prevent his reconciliation to God. The testimony of saint Paul, who says, "By faith Isaac blessed Esau and Jacob," the spirit of forgiveness, Esau manifested towards his brother when he met him returning from Padanaram, the circumstance of Jacob's having seen Esau's face as though he had seen the face of God, are all arguments to prove that Esau did regain the favour of his maker. * * * * *

I will explain a few more verses of the same chapter: verse 15, "for he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." The character of the persons on whom the Lord will have mercy and compassion, is clearly pointed out in the following texts: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will abundantly pardon." Isa. 55. 7. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Mat. 11. 21. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Prov. 28. 13. "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10. 34, 35. These passages leave us in no doubt respecting the persons on whom the Lord will have mercy and compassion. But the 16th verse next calls our attention:—"So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." This text shews that *willing* and *running* are not the causes of salvation, but only the conditions on which it is received. A little comparison will elucidate the subject. A rich man who has his table spread with plenty of the most wholesome and palatable diet, tells a number of starving persons, who are not able to procure food for themselves, that if they will eat, they may have as much as they need for nothing: now it is certain that neither their willingness to eat, nor their eating, either procures or pays for the victuals, yet both of these are necessary as conditions, but the food is of the rich man, who shews mercy. And it is evident that if these poor people starve it will be their own fault. So all the provisions of the gospel were made for us before we came into the world, and are now offered to us on the conditions of faith, and obedience, and although both of these together cannot merit salvation, yet the want of either of them is sufficient to ruin our souls.

We now come to the 17th verse. "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." From the express words of this text it is plain that God raised up Moses and all the rest of us for the same purposes, that he raised up Pharaoh, that is, that he might shew his power in us, and that his name might be declared throughout all the earth. * * * * *

Yet as Pharaoh would rebel, God overruled that rebellion to his own glory, and so if we obey God, he will shew forth the power of his grace in us, by making us completely happy, but if we continue in rebellion against him until death, he will, by punishing us for that rebellion, shew forth the power of his justice in us. Thus God can carry on his plans in defiance of sin without making it any part of them.

But says one, "is it not said that God hardened Pharaoh's heart?" I acknowledge the scripture says so, but I cannot think the Lord ever intended that we, from this text, should take up the idea that he promoted a spirit of wickedness in the heart of Pharaoh, because God is not the author of sin, and "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." Jam. 1.—13. * * * *

Such judgments and mercies as God sent on Pharaoh when abused, tend to harden the hearts of those on whom they are sent; and in this indirect sense, we should probably understand the Lord, when he said, he would harden Pharaoh's heart. These judgments and mercies would not have hardened Pharaoh's heart, if he had not abused them, therefore it is said that Pharaoh hardened his own heart. "And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go." Exod. 8. 32. "And when Pharaoh saw that the rain and hail, and the thunders were ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants." Exod. 9. 34. So it may be said of Christ, that he by the gospel, indirectly hardens the hearts of those who reject it, for the apostle says, "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish. To the one we are the savour of death unto death: and to the other the savour of life unto life." Thus we frequently say, that sinners are gospel hardened. But when we say, that sinners are hardened by the gospel, we only mean that they have hardened themselves by rebelling against it. And when it was said that Pharaoh's heart was

hardened by the Lord, I think the meaning is, that Pharaoh hardened his own heart by rebelling against him.

The next objection that deserves notice is commonly raised from the eighteenth verse of the same chapter. "Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." As I have already pointed out the character of those, on whom the Lord will have mercy, it only remains for me to shew whom he will harden. According to the definition of the doctrine as given above, he will harden all that will continue to the end rebelling against him. Perhaps the following passages will give full satisfaction on the subject. "Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts; to dishonour their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever and ever, Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections, &c." Rom. 1. 21, 25. It appears from this passage that God gave them up to *uncleanness and vile affections*, not because he had predestinated them to be wicked, but because of their own wilful rebellion against him.

Paul says, the man of sin will come; "with all power and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie; That they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thes. 2. 9, 10, 11. Thus it appears, that not because God had predestinated men to wickedness, or destruction, but because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, he sent them strong delusions. And although these delusions of error and infidelity have ruined many, yet as they brought the delusions on themselves by their own wickedness, their destruction ought to be ascribed to themselves, and not to the Divine Being.

The next difficulty that I shall notice, arises from a misunderstanding of Rom. 11.

8. "According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." To get the right understanding of this text, it is necessary first to read it in the old Testament where it was originally written, and then to compare it with those passages where it is quoted, and explained in the New. The Lord first used these words in his charge to Isaiah when he sent him to preach to the Jews "Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and convert and be healed." Isa. 6. 9, 10. On this text it is necessary to remark, that the Lord does not say, *he* will either make their hearts gross, their ears heavy, or shut their eyes, but tells *Isaiah* to go and do these things. Yet I do not think we ought to take up the notion from this, that God sends his prophets and ministers into the world, either to harden the hearts, stop the ears, or blind the eyes of his creatures. Because frequently when the prophets are in scripture said to make things happen, or cause them to take place, there is nothing more meant, than that they prophesied, that such things should come to pass. For the Lord says to Jeremiah: "Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send thee to drink it. Then took I the cup at the Lord's hand, and made all the nations to drink unto whom the Lord sent me; *to wit*: Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, and the kings thereof, and the princes thereof, to make them a desolation, an astonishment, an hissing and a curse, as it is this day." Jer. 25. 15, 17, 18. Certainly Jeremiah did not pour God's wrath on the nations, nor desolate Jerusalem, nor the cities of Judah; all that is here meant is, that he foretold that these things would be done. Again the Lord says to the same prophet: "See I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, and to build and to plant." Jer. 1. 10. Surely all that is here meant is that Jeremiah was to prophecy of these things. So I think that when Isaiah was told to make their hearts fat, their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, all that was meant, was that the prophet should foretel that they themselves would do these things.

But let us hear what he, who speaks as man never spake, says on this passage:—"Therefore speak I to them in parables, because they seeing, see not; and hearing,

they hear not; neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, by hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive; for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Mat. 13. 13, 14, 15. It is evident that the blessed Jesus does not only relate this as a mere prophecy, but also pointedly says, "their eyes have *they closed*." Saint Paul gave the same exposition of this text, when he repeated it to the Jews at Rome: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the prophet to our fathers, saying, go unto this people, and say, hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have *they closed*; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them."—Acts 28. 25, 26, 27.

The advocates of eternal election, sometimes try to prove their doctrine from Rev. 17. 8. "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world,) when they behold the beast, that was, and is not, and yet is." From this they infer that the names of some people were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world. In this I agree with them, but perhaps we may differ in explaining what these names are. They seem to think they are the names, which their parents gave them, such as John, Thomas, Elizabeth, &c. But if this be so, then the parents of every child must be infallibly inspired to give it the same name, that was recorded for it in the book of life from the foundation of the world; yes, and it may be added, that the grand parents, uncles, and aunts, and sometimes a few of the neighbors must also be inspired, for frequently the name of the child depends on the notions of some of them, as well as those of the parents. But as these relations are frequently very wicked, and notionate, and often change the name several times, I rather think there is nothing of inspiration in the business. It is probable that the names, which were recorded in the book of life from the foundation of the world, were nothing more than the characters, which God had determined to save.—And now we are left to our own choice

whether we will, or will not be that character or name.

That the word *name*: does, in scripture, sometimes signify character, is plain from the following passages: "In Judah is God known; his *name* is great in Israel." Psal. 76. 1. God used the word in this sense, when he spoke to David by Nathan the prophet: "And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and I have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great *name*, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth." 2 Sam. 7. 9. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a *name*, which is above every name." Phil. 2. 9. "Proud and haughty scorner is his *name*, who dealeth in proud wrath." Prov. 21. 24. In Exod. 33. 18, Moses said to the Lord: "I beseech thee shew me thy glory." And in the next verse God said "I will proclaim the *name* of the Lord before thee." And in the 5th, 6th and 7th verses of the 34th chapter we find this name no more, nor less than the Lord's character: "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the *name* of the Lord. and the Lord passed before him, and proclaimed the LORD, The LORD GOD, merciful and gracious, long suffering, &c.

The next difficult text that remains to be explained, is that respecting the potter and the clay: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" As the Bible is the best and safest interpreter of itself, in order to understand this text we must read what the Lord himself has said on this subject: "The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord saying arise and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words.— Then I went down to the potter's house: and behold he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? Saith the Lord. Behold as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to pluck up, and pull down, and to destroy it: If that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it: If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I

will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." Jer. 18. 1—10. I hope my readers will understand this allegory. Every body knows that a potter's vessel, when he is forming it on the wheel, is very tender. This potter had his vessel marred in his hand, and then it would not answer the purpose for which he first designed it, so he changed it to another vessel. Perhaps he first intended it for a jug; or a jar, but after it was marred, it was only fit for a platter: "so he made it into another vessel as seemed good to the potter to make it." Just so God does with his creatures: "Behold as the clay is in the potter's hand so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel." "At what instant the Lord speaks concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it," then he has it on the wheels for a vessel of wrath.

But the Lord says: "If that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." Now we see that by repenting that nation so marred itself in God's hand, that he no longer esteemed it fit for a vessel of wrath, but by repenting of the evil, which he thought to have unto it, he changed it to a vessel of mercy. Again, "at what instant the Lord speaks concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build, and to plant it," then he has it on the wheels for a vessel of mercy; but hear what the Lord says in the next verse respecting that nation: "If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

Thus we see that, by doing evil in God's sight, that nation so marred itself in his hand, that he no longer esteemed it fit for a vessel of mercy, but by repenting the good wherewith he had said he would benefit them, he changed them into a vessel of wrath. Thus we see from this allegory, that although God has as much power over men, as the potter has over the clay, yet he does not exercise that power without respect to their free-agency. I suppose no person will deny that the parable of the potter, and the clay is as applicable to individuals as it is to nations. because Isaiah says: "O Lord thou art our father: we are the clay, and thou our potter, and we all are the work of thy hand." Isa. 64. 8.

Now when God says of an unbeliever, "he that believeth not is condemned already," and when he says of a wicked man, that on him "the Lord shall rain snares, fire, and brimstone and an horrible tempest." Job. 3: 18. Psal. 11. 6. then he has them on the

wheels for vessels of wrath, but if they repent of their sins, and believe the gospel, they will, by so doing, be so marred in the hand of the potter, that according to God's plan, as revealed in the gospel, they will be no longer fit for vessels of wrath, because God says to repenting sinners: "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." I suppose there are very few christians, and indeed I have never seen any, but can recollect the time when they felt themselves to be vessels of wrath: and in this the apostle agrees with them, for he says, "we were by nature the children of wrath even as others: Eph. 2. 3, but now know by experience that God has changed us to vessels of mercy. We know from scripture that every wicked person is a vessel of wrath, because the Psalmist says: "God is angry with the wicked every day." Psal. 7. 11. And the apostle says: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." Rom. 1. 18. But still we are happy in believing that as God has changed many of these vessels of wrath into vessels of mercy, he is yet willing, and able to change all that will come to him by faith and repentance. And here it is worthy of remark that God has graciously enabled all sinners, that hear the gospel to repent; and it is also worthy to be remarked that although, they by repentance may so marr themselves, as, in God's view, to unfit them for vessels of wrath, yet they are not able to change themselves to vessels of mercy: none but the great potter is able to do this. The Lord has all christians on the wheels for vessels of mercy, and therefore he promises mercy to them, saying: "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart. for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." Mat. 5. 7, 8, 9. Again the Lord says of the righteous, that he will never forsake them, and that his grace is sufficient for them. But when the righteous man turns to be wicked, he, by so doing, so mars himself in the hands of the potter that he is no longer fit for a vessel of mercy, and on that account God will, by repenting of the good wherewith he said he would benefit him, change him to a vessel of wrath.

That it is possible for a person to be changed from a vessel of mercy to a vessel of wrath, appears from a great many passages of God's word, but here I shall only mention a few of them, "But when the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and do-

eth according to all the abominations that the wicked man 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. 18. 24. Some people affirm that it is self righteousness, which is here meant, but it is plain that it is a righteousness sufficient to save the man if he do not forsake it; and indeed we can hardly think a man can be lost for turning away from self-righteousness. Others have acknowledged that the righteousness is good, but they say the death we incur by forsaking it is temporal. To these I answer, whether we forsake our righteousness or not, we will die a temporal death. Saint Paul comparing the Jews to tame, and the Gentiles to wild Olive branches, says: "Well because of unbelief they were broken off and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness, and severity of God, on them who fell, severity; but toward thee goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shall be cut off." Rom. 11. 20, 21, 22. When the apostle found the Galatians were turning back to the law, he said "I stand in doubt of you;" and then he plainly told them: "Whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 4. 20. Chap. 5. 4. Paul did not only stand in doubt of the Galatians, for fear they would fall from grace, but also appeared a little apprehensive that he might fall himself, for he says: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others I myself should be a cast away." 1 Cor. 9. 27. When David exhorted his son Solomon to be faithful in God's service he said: "If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." 1 Chron. 28. 8. And thus the prophet speaks to the Jews and their king; "The Lord is with you while ye be with him: and if ye seek him he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him he will forsake you." 2 Chron. 15. 2. In this doctrine Saint Paul agrees with the Psalmist and the Prophet, for he says to Timothy: "If we deny him he also will deny us." 2 Tim. 2. 12.

Those who believe that it is impossible to fall from grace commonly bring Romans 8. 28, 29, to prove their doctrine, "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of

God, which is in Christ" Jesus our Lord." Although this text is a glorious encouragement to christians, and assures them that their enemies cannot separate them from the love of God, yet it does not prove that they cannot lose his favour by straying away from him. A small comparison may serve to illustrate the subject. A woman loves her husband and is loved by him; neither her relations, neighbors, acquaintances, nor any other person is able to separate her from him; but still she may prove unfaithful and leave him. Again we are members of, and enjoy the protection, and favour of the United States government; and although neither the British, Spanish, French nor any other nation is able to separate us from our union with it, yet this very government may condemn us to death for transgressing its laws. Although no creature is able to separate us from God, yet God the Creator is able to punish us for our sins, and will do it if we rebel against him. The following passages of scripture abundantly prove that God will, for certain offences, cut off some who are united with him, disinherit others that are heirs of glory. Jesus says: "I am the true vine, and my father is the husband-man. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit *hetaketh away.*" John 15. 1, 2. A more intimate connection cannot be imagined, than that which the branch has with the vine; and although our union with Christ is equally as intimate, yet, for being barren, God the great husband-man will cut us off. In the third verse he says: "Now ye are clean through the word, which I have spoken unto you." And in the sixth verse he says: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire and they are burned."

Perhaps the following parable will set the subject in a fair point of view: "Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord? when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, my lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the men servants, and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." Luke 12. 42—46. Here notice particularly, that this is a faithful and wise steward, and if he will continue to be till his lord shall

come, he will make him ruler over all that he hath, but if he prove unfaithful, his lord will cut him in sunder, and appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. When the children of Israel made the golden calf, Moses prayed for them, saying: "If thou wilt, forgive their sin, and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book, which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, *whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.*" Exod. 32.—32, 33. With this compare Rev. 3. 5: "He that *overcometh* the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and *I will not blot his name out of the book of life.*" Take both these passages in connection, with Rev. 22. 19.—"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

Surely those who were written in the book which God wrote, and those who have a part in the book of life, and the holy city, are vessels of mercy, yet by sin they may so marr themselves that God will change them to vessels of wrath. Certainly the angels in glory, and our first parents in Paradise, were vessels of mercy, and we know that for sin they were cast out of heaven, and changed to vessels of wrath. Thus, we see the scriptural principle, by which the great potter works, when he, out of the *same lump*, makes one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor.

Here it becomes us to remark particularly, that these vessels are all made out of the *same lump*. If God from eternity has elected some to happiness, and made their number so definite that it cannot be increased, nor diminished, then they must be an *elect lump*, and it would be impossible to make a reprobate vessel out of them. Again, if God has, from eternity, passed by a part of mankind, ordained them to wrath, and fixed their number so definite that it cannot be increased, then they must be a *reprobate lump*, and it is impossible for God to make an elect vessel out of them, because he has already fixed their number so definite that it cannot be diminished.

Having taken this view of the subject I think we may safely conclude, that no person is under a fatal necessity to be a vessel of wrath; but if any poor sinner, who feels himself such, will forsake his sins, and turn to the Lord, he will change him to a vessel of honour. Because the apostle Paul says: "But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour. If a man therefore purge him-

self from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." 2 Tim 2. 20, 21.

I have heard some try to prove that God makes people wicked from the first verse of the sixteenth chapter of Proverbs: "The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea even the wicked for the day of evil." On this text I will just observe that the Hebrew word *poie*, which is here rendered *made*, does not signify to *create*, but to *work*, *operate*, *prepare* or *contrive*, and *lemoneoo*, which is rendered *for himself*, more properly signifies to *answer his purpose*, and the learned Mr. Parkhurst thus translates the sentence: "*Jehovah hath prepared all things to answer his purposes, even the wicked for the day of evil, i. e. to inflict evil or punishment on others.*" See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon under *o-ne*. In this sense the Lord prepared wicked nations to bring temporal evil on the Jews for their sins; and to these evils the Lord no doubt alluded, when he said: "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace and create evil. I the Lord do all these things." Isa. 45. 7. I have heard some people in quoting this text leave out the word *these*, and then read it, "I the Lord do all things;" but this entirely destroys the meaning, because God cannot be the author of moral evil. That the word *evil* does frequently signify temporal calamities, is plain from the following texts. When Job was under great temporal affliction, he said to his wife: "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job 2. 10. When Judah was afraid that his father would die of grief, he said: "Lest peradventure I see the evil that shall come on my father." Gen. 44. 34.—When the Lord threatened the Jews with calamity of war he said: "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it? Amos 3. 5. So the Lord prepares wicked people against the day of temporal evil, and frequently courages one nation with another.

Having shewn, according to the first, and second propositions, who the elect are, and when, and how they were elected, and then in the third place answered the principal objections, that are most commonly brought against the doctrine, which I have advanced; nothing more remains for me, but to apply the subject:

And now I shall begin the application with the tenth verse of the first chapter of Peter's second epistle: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these

things, ye shall never fall." If our election has been unalterably fixed from eternity, it cannot be made sure by any diligence that we can give.

From what has been said it is plain that no person is under any fatal necessity to be a reprobate. And I now, by the authority of God, proclaim that every sinner in the world, is on certain conditions, eligible for this election. And I also announce by the same authority, that no person who knows right from wrong, can be elected unless he will offer as a candidate, and *comply with the conditions of the gospel*. If any person should inquire what the design of this election is, I answer, it is not to make us members of congress, nor of the state assembly, but of the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven. To that happy company we will be joined, not to represent our country, but to be eternal monuments of the power and love of God. Now let every candidate for this election sit listening at the feet of Christ the great judge, while he proclaims the following conditions: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." Luke 9. 23. "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." Mat. 10. 33.—"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened."—Luke 11. 9, 10.

God, in his infinite goodness and wisdom, has given us power to comply with these conditions, but if we wilfully abuse this power, and refuse to comply with these conditions, we will loose our election. And now O! sinner, I set life and death before you.—If you choose life, you will, to all eternity, esteem it as an inestimable gift, freely bestowed on a poor helpless, unworthy sinner. But if you choose the way to death, you will have an eternity in which to lament the wretched choice; and while you will be mingling your cries with the groans of the damned, this bitter reflection will eternally roll through your mind: "I once had the opportunity of being elected to eternal happiness, but, alas! for me, I willingly, and knowingly brought myself to this doleful region of despair.

Additional Remarks by the Editor.

The arguments advanced in the preceding discourse, are, in our judgement, conclusive against the doctrine of eternal

election, irrefutable, and not to be explained away by any rules or principles of scripture interpretation.—It may not be uninteresting or unedifying to the reader, for us to offer some additional ones of our own.

And first, the *principle* upon which Christians are chosen and elected, forbid that their choosing and election could have been eternal or from eternity,—that it could have been before they became Christians. Paul says to the Thessalonians, "God hath from the beginning *chosen* you to salvation *through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.*" And in similar language Peter says of those to whom he wrote, "*Elect* according to the foreknowledge [predetermination] of God the Father, *through sanctification of Spirit*, unto obedience and sprinkling the blood of Jesus Christ." *Faith or belief* which is the same thing, is then the *principle*, the grand principle, upon which Christians are chosen and elected. It is the principle too without which sanctification cannot be. Christ told Paul when he appeared to him on his way to Damascus, that he would send him to the Gentiles, "that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are *sanctified by faith, that is in me.*"

Now agreeably to Paul, the Thessalonians could not have been chosen to salvation until they believed; and according to Peter, they could not have been elected before; consequently not from eternity. Now how do we believe, or how does faith come? "Faith," says Paul, "comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Faith* is the belief of facts and truths upon the report or record of *others*. *Knowledge* is the intelligence of things which we experience or observe *ourselves*. The ear and the eye are the only mediums of communication to our minds, of the information of things which we do not know, or experience or observe: the eye by reading or the ear by hearing. It is the same thing in believing, whether we hear or read. The same ideas are received into the mind in the one case as in the other. Ideas are conveyed into the mind by *words*; and it is the *same* word, whether written or spoken, which represents the idea. Words are words, whether spoken or written; and

clothed in *sounds* enter the mind by the ear, or in *letters*, the representatives of sounds, enter it by the eye. The information in both cases is the same. Now all mankind being alike constituted as to the faculties of body and mind, all having eyes and ears, perception, understanding, memory, judgment, imagination, &c. it follows as a matter of course, that it is in the power of all to believe or have faith whenever they can either hear or read the word of God. This places *all* on the same footing as it regards becoming Christians—There is but "*one faith*," says Paul, and of course but *one* principle on which men are chosen, elected, sanctified, &c. All are constituted alike, as we have shown, as to the faculties of body and mind which we have to exercise in believing or obtaining faith, all therefore have the capacity to believe. Every body knows, or ought to know, that in believing any thing, we have to either hear or read it, and employ the faculties of our minds on the information imparted to us by the testimony by which the fact or truth is reported us or recorded. It is in the power of all mankind therefore to believe and obey the gospel and participate in that salvation which is freely tendered in it to all.—This argument is conclusive against the doctrine that God has chosen, elected, predestinated and foreordained from eternity or before the formation of the world, a certain part of mankind to eternal life and salvation, to the exclusion of all others.—It must be acknowledged that the chosen and elect are the children of God; and that none but those who are children of God can be the elected or chosen. Now how do we become the children of God? "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." It is then, according to Paul, by the ordinance of baptism on the *principle* of faith, that we become the children of God, that we are born again, "born of water," in *immersion*, "and of the Spirit," in *believing*, having been begotten by the Spirit, who, "of his own will begat he us by the word of truth," "through the gospel," and then when born of water, we are "born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God," by which "faith

comes." All then who believe and are baptized are "born of water and of the Spirit," and become the children of God, whether they are or are not chosen and elected from all eternity or before the formation of the world.

Another argument. The scriptures which are usually wrested and brought forward to support the doctrine of eternal election, and the arguments adduced in its favor, confine it entirely to Christians or to persons after the advent of our Saviour into the world. The doctrine completely cuts off all the pious and righteous, Jew and Gentile, who existed before. From righteous Abel to John the baptizer, it excludes, or cuts off Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the whole "cloud of witnesses!"

We could adduce other arguments, but we have not opportunity or space. We intend to take up this subject again, and notice the scriptures usually cited and employed in its vindication.

EDITOR.

The "Two Seeds," or Origin of Good and Evil.

The most effectual method of overturning error is to set up truth. Error will fall before truth, like the Philistian god, Dagon, did before the Ark of the God of Israel. As the two could not remain in the same temple, without the destruction of one, so truth and falsehood cannot remain in the same bosom together. One must fall and the other prevail.—The shades and darkness of error dissipate before the rays of truth, like the mists and darkness of night before the beams of the risen sun.

The following contains one of the best replies, to what is generally termed the "Two Seed" doctrine, that we recollect to have met with; as well as a complete refutation of hereditary total depravity. It is from one of a series of replies, in the Gospel Advocate, by bro. Aylett Raines of Paris, Ky., to Dr. Cleland's "Strictures" on his "Refutation of the Doctrine of Hereditary Total Depravity." EDITOR.

As the earth produces neither nutritious nor poisonous fruits, without a previous deposition of the requisite seeds, so the nature of man, produces neither good nor evil works, until the seeds of these works shall have been

deposited within his soul. All his excitements to good and to evil, are but the effects of causes foreign from his own nature; and without which never could he be a moral being,—never could he be either righteous or sinful.

But to the law and the testimony. 'Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.' James 1; 14, 15. Observe, 1st, The being drawn by lust is called temptation. 'Every man is tempt'ed when he is drawn—enticed.' But 'Christ was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.' Heb. 4; 15. Being tempted, drawn, or enticed, therefore, is not sin! 2d. In order to the production of sin, a conception by lust, of an evil principle, is necessary. 'Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin.' By the word conceived we understand a consenting, a willing of the mind,—Through diabolical agency an evil principle is made to search and excite the soul. This excitement, is the temptation, the drawing, the enticement. If the inner man consents to the performance of the act to which he is tempted, conception takes place; and by the performance of the act sin is born;—an imp black as the neithermost pit! Sin grows up to maturity and becomes the mother of death! Lust is the mother of sin, and sin the mother of death, and the devil is the father of both sin and death!!

Nor is it difficult to ascertain what that evil principle is, which lust conceives in order to the production of sin. It is falsehood. The very first lie that was ever told in the world, was the seminal principle of the first sin. Satan whispered the first falsehood into the ear of our first mother—she listened, believed; consented to reduce it to act, sinned, died! And thus, all the subsequent satanic falsehoods that have ever been disseminated by the great adversary, have been the seminal principles of all the sins which have ever been committed by man.

'Ye are,' says Christ to the Jews, 'of your

after the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do; he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it.' John 8; 44.

From this testimony, we learn, 1st. That the devil is the *father of lies*. 2d. That through lies, he has been, in all ages and climes, the murderer of the human family, 3d. That so depraved is the devil, that lies are emphatically HIS OWN; so that when he speaks them, he speaks of *his own*—there is no truth in him!

But not only is the devil said to be the father of lies, wicked men are declared to be 'the children of the devil?' 'Ye are of your father the devil.' 'In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil? whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.' 1 John, 3, 10. 'He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil.' 8th verse.

Almost all persons will admit that wicked men are not the children of the devil by creation. In what sense, then, are they the children of the devil? By the influence of falsehood, just as righteous men are the children of God by the influence of truth! God is the father of all truth—the devil of all falsehood, God impregnates our souls by truth—the devil by falsehood. An impregnation by truth, constitutes us children of God,—an impregnation by falsehood, children of the devil. 'Of his own will he—God—begat us by the word of truth.' 'Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible—the word of God.' This word, or gospel is hence called, 'The power of God unto salvation.' But persons thus impregnated by the word of truth, and born again, and become the children of God, are said to have been saved 'From the power of darkness,' meaning, the power of satanic lies; from 'The power of satan,' meaning the influence which he has gained through falsehood, treachery, deceit; 'From the

snare of satan,' meaning his sophistries, subtle, penetrating, delusive,—his multiplied and multiform wiles!—God makes us the partakers of his divine nature by an operation of his spirit through the truth; the devil sheds abroad his nature in our hearts by an operation of his spirit through falsehood. Hence our sins are called 'The works of the devil.' And hence, also the devil is said 'To work,' that is by falsehood, 'in the children of disobedience.' Indeed his working is said to be 'With all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.' 2. Thess 2; 9, 10. And those evil principles with which he excites or impregnates us are called 'Fiery darts,'—so numerous, so poisonous, so dexterously aimed, that nothing short of the 'whole armor of God' can protect even the christian from that destruction, which they are calculated to inflict.

When, then, we seek for the cause of the general prevalence of sin in the world; when we are compelled to admit that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, this fact, is no proof to us, of hereditary total depravity. From what has been said, it must be evident, that the seeds of sin constitute no part of man's nature. They are, to all intents and purposes, an exotic, and must be sown in the heart before their legitimate fruits can be produced. They are the poison, conveyed to our hearts, from hell, on the points of satan's poisoned arrows!—Was it not in this way that our first parents were impelled to the commission of their first sin? The seeds of sin, existed not natively in their heart!!—the devil put them there; and immediately they began to germinate; and from that time to the present has this great sower of the seeds of sin, been scattering them abroad in the field of this world; and incalculably plentiful has been the crop produced. But if the injection of a lie, by satan, into the minds of our first parents, was adequate to the production of the first sin, without any native depravity possessed by them, might not the same cause be adequate to the production of a similar effect in relation to every son and daughter of their posterity?—

We conclude, then, that in every instance, lust must 'conceive' a seminal principle of sin from satan, before any sin, of any imaginable magnitude can be produced! Before Judas can betray his master satan must 'Fill him,' must 'Enter into him.' Before Ananias can act the hypocrite satan must 'Put it into his heart.' And before the tongue of the slanderer, detractor, calumniator can do its infernal work, 'It must be set on fire'—of what? Human nature in its present depraved state!! 'of hell!!!' As like, throughout all nature produces like, so it is with sin! As wheat, corn, oats, the poisonous hemlock, and all seeds both nutritious and deleterious will grow in the same soil and produce each after its kind, so the seeds both of truth and falsehood will germinate in the human heart, and produce it after its kind. But who would say, should he behold a field of hemlock, that this was in consequence of the poisonous qualities of the soil! * * *

We perceive, now, it is presumed, what is the real seed, or seminal principle of sin. It is not native to man, any more than the poison of the hemlock, is native to the soil in which it grows. The poison is in the seed, as the Peafowl, with all its gaudy and variegated colors is in the egg. * * * *

Human nature is a fruitful soil;—fruitful in good if placed under propitious circumstances—of evil if the circumstances are unpropitious. Every man, therefore, should be encouraged to cultivate his own mind and heart; to purge out the noxious weeds of sin; to break up the fallow ground of his heart; and to sow with a liberal hand the seeds of heavenly truth within his mind. Especially, should parents cultivate the minds and the hearts of their children. If brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, a harvest of virtues will repay their parents' toil, a harvest of blessings and of glories!

But some man will say, 'How does the devil tempt men?' We have in fact already answered this question. He tempts them through falsehood. It is true that he has not had the whole system of his satanic lies printed in a book; many of them have nevertheless been printed in books—books which

have spread fire-brands, arrows, and death. He was the first preacher of Polytheism!—'And ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil.' Gen. 3; 5. Who can tell what a flood of moral evil has deluged the world from the falsehood contained in this one sentence.—We may also say, that if the bible is at all to be credited, there were in ancient times persons who 'dealt with familiar spirits,' and that even when Jesus was upon earth there were many persons possessed of demons.—Might not these have been fruitful sources of satanic falsehood and delusion? And beside all this, he has had in all ages his ministers! Yes, says Paul, 'For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ, and no marvel; for satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore, it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness.' 2 Cor. 1; 13, 14, 15. Every man, who by evil communications, corrupts others, is a minister of satan! Every dram-shop, every theatre, every place of frolic and vanity, every association, invention, and device under heaven that has corrupting influence on the human heart, is a tempting engine, a bow with which to shoot fiery darts, invented by our murderer, the devil!

A. R.

INTRODUCTION OF EVIL INTO THE WORLD.

We have been frequently asked, "why did not God constitute Adam upon principles such as would have rendered him incapable of sinning?" "Why did God permit the introduction of evil?" As well might we ask, why did he not give water a consistency, such as would have unfitted it for drowning a man? And why did he permit fire to possess those properties, by which it burns the fingers of the cook, and is in all respects so good a servant, but so bad a master? The physical evils which originate in the use of fire and water, take their rise from either the misapplication, or the abuse of them, and could originate in no other way; but were fire and water deprived of those

essential principles, by the misapplication or abuse of which physical evils are sometimes produced, they would cease to be fire and water: and would be therefore, incapable of their present beneficial results! The same answer will hold good in respect to man. To be a *man*, he must neither be a mere animal, nor the arch angel! He must be that link in the long chain of created beings, to which we apply the term *MAN*. To be a man, he must also have all his native passions and appetites; all his native properties of soul and body; and to be a moral accountable being, he must be a moral agent; placed under law; capable of obedience and disobedience; capable of feeling self-approbation for well doing, and self-disapprobation for evil doing. Any possible organization of human nature, or constitution of the divine government, in which these principles should not have been recognized, would have placed man in a moral condition, such as is now occupied by brute animals; as incapable of virtue and vice, of rewards and punishments, of moral elevation and degradation, as the mole, the oyster, or bat! "Contrivance," says Paley, "proves design; and the predominant tendency of the contrivance, indicates the disposition of the contriver. The world abounds with contrivances; and all the contrivances with which we are acquainted are directed to beneficial purposes. Evil no doubt exists; but is never, that we can perceive, the object of contrivance. Teeth were contrived to eat, not to ache. Their aching now and then, is incidental to the contrivance, perhaps inseparable from it—but it is not the object of it. This is a distinction that well deserves to be attended to. In describing instruments of husbandry you would not say of a sickle, that it was made to cut the reapers fingers, though from the construction of the instrument, and the manner of using it, this mischief often follows." Thus, also, it is in the works of God. Evil is incidental to his contrivances, but forms no part of them. His contrivances are a pure stream, flowing from the holy fountain of his perfections, partaking necessarily of

the nature of its fountain; so that the origination of moral evil can no more be the object of any divine contrivance, than cutting the reapers fingers could have been the object of the inventor of the sickle!

In the abuse or misapplication of good, therefore, is to be sought the origin of all evil. Just as by the misapplication or abuse of the properties of fire and water, and every other physical agent in the universe, physical evil is the result, so by the misapplication or abuse of the good properties of man, have originated all moral evils. Had not Adam been constituted a moral agent, liable by an abuse of his agency to the commission of evil, he could not have performed actions morally good. He would have been just as capable, and just as incapable of virtue as of vice: and just as proper a subject of praise or blame, of reward or punishment, as a clock or a watch. He could have felt no consciousness of merit nor demerit any more than a mere animal; and could, therefore, neither have risen nor fallen in the moral scale. There could have been no morality, nor immorality among men, any more than among a flock of geese! Depriving man of the liability to fall, would have deprived him of the ability to rise, and have rendered him forever incapable of those expansive, those exquisite, those ennobling feelings, consequent upon a sense of praiseworthiness, and of fitness for the approbation of his Maker, and for the reception of those rewards, rich with everlasting glory, which await the obedient.

Long before the Almighty put forth his creative fiat, it was in his mind, a matter of perfect knowledge, that by creating the material universe and originating its innumerable forms of matter and of mind, (man, the topmost stone not excepted,) birth would be given to an infinity of good, which could not be produced in any other way. Evil, he knew would incidentally originate; but the good, the object of his creative contrivance, would so far outweigh the evil, that notwithstanding his immutable hatred to the evil, he did for the purpose of producing the good, in the beginning create the heavens and the

earth and all things—and pronounced them **VERY GOOD**. Thus viewing the subject, we wonder and adore! and we doubt not, that when in some future period, the wisdom of the whole plan shall be developed, we shall say intelligently with the apostle. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out!"—*A. Raines.*

Faith and Baptism.

In our additional remarks in the present number, to the extracts which we have made from the discourse on Election, we adverted to the subjects of *faith* and *baptism*. Every individual intelligent in the scriptures of the New Testament, knows the important place these two occupy there. This is sufficiently evident from the commission of Christ to his Apostles; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that *believeth*, and is *baptized*, shall be *saved*; but he that *believeth not*, shall be *damned*." But what salvation is alluded to here?—*eternal* salvation? This construction would do violence to the language of the Saviour. It would be making faith and baptism merely, irrespective of good character and good works, the conditions of eternal salvation, when we are plainly and repeatedly informed, that the two former will avail us nothing in the affair of this salvation, without the two latter. It is a present, then, instead of a future salvation of which Jesus spoke to his disciples; not a salvation from the grave and eternal misery and death, but from the guilt, pollution and dominion of sin here. And in accordance with this, the Apostles represent Christians as already saved and in a saved state. "The preaching of the cross," says Paul to the Corinthians, "is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are *saved* it is the power of God." This implies that they were already saved. And again in the second epistle, "We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are *saved*, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life." To the Ephesians he says, "By grace ye are *saved*;" and to Titus, "According to his [God's] own mercy he *saved* us; by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit;" and to Timothy, "Who [God] *hath saved* us, and *called* us with an holy calling." All these imply a salvation from past sins, for the angel said of Jesus, "he shall save his people from their *sins*."—

Faith and baptism, according to our Saviour, are the two, and the only two, necessary prerequisites to the obtaining and enjoyment of this salvation. We are not saved by the former alone without the latter, nor by the latter alone without the former. Jesus has inseparably connected them together and made them joint conditions; and "what therefore GOD hath joined together, let not MAN put asunder." "By grace ye are saved *through* FAITH," says Paul. But was it by faith alone? Then he would contradict Peter, who says, speaking of the salvation of Noah and his family, "The like figure whereunto, even BAPTISM, doth also now *save* us." Noah believed and obeyed God, and was saved from the deluge with which the antediluvian world was overwhelmed and destroyed; saved in the ark by water. We believe and obey God by crediting his testimony concerning his Son and by being baptized; and thus baptism, the antitype of Noah's salvation, saves us. Then would Paul also contradict himself; for he says that God "*saved* us *by* the *washing* [bath] of *regeneration* AND the *renewing* of the *Holy Spirit*;" that is, "the washing [bath] of water by the word." Then would he also contradict his Lord, who says, "He that *believeth* AND is *baptized*, shall be *saved*." Peter says that "*through* his [Christ's] name whosoever *believeth* in him shall *receive remission of sins*." But are we to infer from this, that remission of sins is granted upon faith alone? Then would Peter contradict himself, for he told the Jews on Pentecost to "Repent and be *baptized* every one of them, in the name of *Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins*." Paul says that we are "*justified by faith*," but not by faith alone, for he elsewhere represents Christians as being "*washed*" (having their "*bodies washed in pure water*,") before they are justified. Besides he would contradict Peter on Pentecost; for to be justified is to be *pardoned*, acquitted or released from sin. He would also contradict James who says, that "a man is justified by *works* and *not by faith only*." Thus by faith and baptism we are pardoned, justified and saved. We believe "the gospel." "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." We are then, after having died to sin in having the love of it destroyed by faith, "*having the old man crucified*," we are then "*planted together with him [Christ] in the likeness of his death*" in being buried by immersion, and then rise "*in the likeness of his resurrection*" in emerging or rising from the water.

Faith is the principle and baptism the institution of adoption, by which we enter into the family of God on earth and become the "sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty;" "for we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." This is the only way in which all can and will be brought under the sceptre of the Messiah. Man in the plenitude of his wisdom, never has and never can devise such a scheme as this one of God. He may originate one to suit a party; but it cannot reach all mankind; it cannot be adopted to the condition and situation of all, from the high and intelligent to the low and illiterate, of all habits, temperaments, dispositions, characters and pursuits. Upon this scheme of the gospel all can be inducted into the temporal kingdom of the Messiah, while all cannot upon any other. All having that constitution of body and mind by which they can hear and read and believe, and the capacity to obey, wherever the word of God goes and water is to be had, all may believe and be baptized and be saved. Praise be the Lord for this plan of salvation! Brethren, proclaim it far and wide, without being intimidated by the fears or temptations of the world. "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 take of the water of life FREELY."

EDITOR.

Weekly Observance of the Lord's Supper.

To treat this subject with all the particularity and latitude that it requires, and to do it all the justice that it deserves, would require a little volume instead of a short essay. We merely intend in this, to speak of the *weekly* observance of this institution, or the observance of it on every Lord's Day or first day of the week, in connexion with its meaning and design, which strengthen the argument for thus frequently attending to it, drawn from New Testament example and precedent.

That there is a regular and stated time for attending to this institution we learn from the first mention made of its being observed, which we have. Luke speaking in Acts, of the first Christian community formed after the Reign of Heaven had commenced on Pentecost at Jerusalem, says, "They continued *steadfastly* in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and *breaking*

of bread, [or the loaf,] and prayers." Had they done this *irregularly* or at certain times appointed at their *own* option, they could not have been said to have "*continued steadfastly* in the *Apostles'* doctrine," &c. for they would have continued in their *own*. We also learn the same from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. Correcting their abuses of this institution he represents their observance of it, [see 11th chap.] as being as common as their meetings. "When ye *come together* therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken." "When ye *come together to eat* [the Lord's Supper] carry one for another. And if any man hunger let him eat at home; that ye come not together to condemnation." From another part of this same epistle we learn upon what day they met together. The Apostle speaking of the collection for the saints, instructs them, "Upon the *first day of the week* let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." But we have testimony positive, direct and conclusive. We are told in Acts 20th. of the Christians at Troas, that, "On the *first day of the week* * the disciples *came together to break bread*," or the loaf, as that is the correct translation of the Greek word, *artos*, here used for "bread." That the first Christians were accustomed to meet together every first day of the week, or Lord's Day, to break the loaf or eat the Lord's Supper, we are compelled from these testimonies to admit. And if they did, it must have been in accordance with divine precept and injunction; and Christians are as much authorised and required to meet together every Lord's day to observe the Lord's Supper *now* as then. The first Christian congregation at Jerusalem, "continued as *steadfastly* in breaking of bread as in the *Apostles'* doctrine, fellowship, or prayers;" "did as *steadfastly*, and as uniformly in their meetings, attend on the breaking of bread, as on any other mean of edification or act of worship." "And on the first day of the week when the disciples assembled to break bread." "Now all must confess who regard the meaning of words, that the meeting of the disciples and the breaking

of bread, as far as these words are concerned, are expressed in the same terms as respects the frequency. If the one was *fifty-two* times in a year, or only *once*; so was the other. If they met every first day, they broke bread every first day; and if they did not break bread every first day, they did not meet every first day." "From the 2d of Acts, then, we learn that the *breaking of bread* was a stated part of the worship of the disciples in their meetings; and from the 20th, we learn that the first day of the week was the stated time for those meetings; and, above all, we ought to notice that the most prominent object of their meeting was to break bread." "The Apostle applauds and censures the church at Corinth with respect to their observance of the order he instituted among them. In the second verse he praises them for *retaining* the ordinances he delivered them, and in the conclusion of this chapter he censures them in strong terms for not keeping the ordinance of breaking bread as he delivered it to them. They retained in their meeting the ordinance, but did abuse it. He specifies their abuses of it, and denounces their practice as worthy of chastisement. But in doing this he incidentally informs us that it was for the purpose of *breaking bread* they assembled in one place. And the manner in which he does this is equivalent to an express *command* to assemble for the purpose. Indeed there is no form of speech more determinate in its meaning or more energetic in its force than that which he uses, verse 20. It is precisely the same as the two following examples: A man assembles laborers in his vineyard to cultivate it. He goes out and finds them either idle or destroying his vines. He reproves or commands them to business by addressing them thus—"Men, ye did *not* assemble here to cultivate my vineyard." By the use of this negative he makes his command more imperative and their guilt more apparent. A teacher assembles his pupils to learn—he comes in and finds them idle or quarreling. He addresses them thus—"Boys, ye did *not* assemble to learn." In this forcible style he declares the object of their meeting was to learn, and thus commands and reproves them in the same words. So Paul addresses the disciples in Corinth—"When ye as-

semble it is *not* to eat the Lord's Supper;" or, (*Macknight*) "But your coming together into one place is *not* to eat the Lord's Supper;" plainly and forcibly intimating that this was the design of their meeting or assembling in one place, commanding them to order, and reproving them for disorder. Now it must be admitted that Paul's style in this passage is exactly similar to the two examples given, and that the examples given mean what we have said of their import; consequently, by the same rule, Paul reminds the Corinthians, and informs all who ever read the epistle, that when the disciples assembled, or came together into one place, it was primarily for the purpose of *breaking bread*, and in effect most positively commands the practice." All Christians are now authorised by the same authority by which they *met* together on every Lord's day, to attend to the *breaking of bread* or observe the Lord's Supper on that day. There is as much and the same scripture for one as for the other.

Moreover, we learn from church history, that for 300 years after Christianity was first established, Christians were in the habit of assembling together every Lord's day to attend to this institution. Justin Martyr who was cotemporary with the last of the Apostles, and who wrote about 40 years after the death of John, speaks of the observance of this institution, in the following language: "On Sunday all Christians in the *city* or *country* meet together, because this is the day of our Lord's resurrection, and then we read the writings of the prophets and apostles. This being done, the president makes an oration to the assembly, to exhort them to imitate, and do the things they have heard. Then we all join in prayer, and after that we *celebrate the Supper*. Then they that are able and willing, give what they think fit; and what is thus collected is laid up in the hands of the president, who distributes it to orphans and widows, and other Christians as their wants require." Pliny, in his Epistles, Justin Martyr and Tertullian, "testify that it was the universal practice in all the weekly assemblies of the brethren, after they had prayed and sang praises—"then bread and wine being brought to the *chief brother*, he taketh it and offereth

praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit. After prayer and thanksgiving the whole assembly saith, *Amen*. When thanksgiving is ended by the *chief guide*, and the consent of the whole people, the *deacons* (as we call them) give to every one present part of the bread and wine, over which thanks are given."

All the most eminent and popular biblical critics and commentators acknowledge that the first Christians, under the immediate instructions and directions of the apostles, attended to the Lord's Supper on every Lord's day. We shall begin with CALVIN. He says in his Institutes; "EVERY week, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for Christian assemblies, and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed." We will hear JOHN WESLEY next. In a letter to America, 1784, quoted some years ago in the Gospel Herald, Lexington, Ky., he says; "I also advise the Elders to administer the Lord's Supper EVERY Lord's day." This shows what his sentiments were; and that he believed in weekly communion. He wrote a discourse on "The Duty of Constant Communion," in which he treats the phrase "*frequent communion*" as "absurd to the last degree." Dr. ADAM CLARKE in his note on Acts xx. 7. where it is said the disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread, says, "To break bread] To break eucharistid, the eucharist, as the Syriac has it; intimating by this, that they were accustomed to receive the holy sacrament on EACH Lord's day." MATTHEW HENRY says in his note on the same place; "In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches, to receive the Lord's Supper EVERY Lord's day." SCOTT in his note on the same place; "It is not said, that the disciples were called together, as on a special occasion; but that they came together, as it seems, according to their general practice. Hence it is evident, that Christians were accustomed to assemble for religious worship, "on the first day of the week." "Breaking of bread," or commemorating the death of Christ in the eucharist, was one chief end of their assembling. This ordinance seems to have been constantly administered EVERY Lord's day." He also

says elsewhere in his works; "It is evident, both from Scripture and the earliest records of the primitive churches, that this ordinance was administered to the professed disciples of Christ in general, on EVERY Lord's day at least." Dr. DODDRIDGE paraphrases Acts xx. 7. thus; "And on the first [day] of the week, when the disciples, as it was usual with them on that day, met together to break bread, that is, to celebrate the eucharist in remembrance of the death of our blessed Redeemer." He has the following in his note; "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." "Mr. FULLER [Andrew]" says an Editor of his "Strictures on Sandemanianism," "Mr. Fuller does not deny that the Lord's Supper was observed by the first christians every Lord's day, (nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject.)" Dr. MASON of New York, an American "divine" of great celebrity, in his "Letters on Frequent Communion," says; "It is notorious, that during the first three centuries of the Christian era, communions were held with the frequency of which, among us, we have neither example nor resemblance. It is also notorious, that the original frequency of communions declined as carnality and corruption gained ground. And it is no less notorious, that it has been urged as a weighty duty by the best of men, and the best churches, in the best times. WEEKLY communions did not die with the Apostles and their cotemporaries. There is a cloud of witnesses to testify that they were kept up by succeeding christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries. It is not necessary to swell these pages with quotations. The fact is indisputable. Communion EVERY Lord's day, was universal, and was preserved in the Greek Church till the seventh century; and such as neglected three weeks together, were excommunicated. In this manner did the spirit of ancient piety cherish the memory of the Saviour's love. There was no need of reproof, remonstrance, or entreaty. No trifling excuses for neglect were ever heard

from the lips of a christian; for *such* a neglect had not yet degraded the christian's name. He carried in his own bosom sufficient inducements to obey, without reluctance, the precepts of his Lord. It was his choice, his consolation, his joy. These were days of life and glory; but days of dishonor and death were shortly to succeed; nor was there a more ominous symptom of their approach, than the decline of frequent communicating." And again:—"Were Paul to rise from his rest, and to visit our churches, one of the first things he would miss is the communion table. What would be our confusion should he address us in inquiries like these, "How often do you remember your Redeemer in the sacramental feast?—Every Sabbath?—every other Sabbath?—every third Sabbath?—every month?" Alas! no, this was never heard nor thought of, among us. "How often, then?" Oh, I feel the rising blush; but the shameful truth must come out:—"Generally not more than twice in the year." What astonishment would seize the Apostle! He would hardly own us for his disciples!" We might add to these many other testimonies, such as Bishop King, John Brown of Haddington, &c. but these are enough. We know of scarcely any congregations now except those in the Reformation, and only a *part* of these, that commune weekly. And yet the different "denominations," who, in the face of apostolic precedent and example, and the united testimony of their principal and most erudite writers, much of which we have adduced, neglect the *weekly* observance of this institution, are continually crying out to us, heresy, heresy, heresy! Nothing is more true, perhaps, than that it is necessary to take the beam out of our own eyes in order to see clearly to pick the mote out of the eyes of others. And what can our own brethren promise themselves, who are living in wilful neglect of this institution, as numbers of them are? Are the promises of the Lord to them while thus wilfully living in disobedience? *Verily*, no. What advantage is there in adding members to such congregations?—or in proclaimers laboring among them? "Behold I come *quickly*; and my reward is with me to give to every man according as his *work* shall be." Let us deny him not in works, by

neglecting any he has commanded.

There are still greater arguments for observing this institution every Lord's day, when its meaning and design are considered. It is designed to represent the great and perfect sacrifice which our Lord made upon the cross by visible emblems, in the way best calculated to impress it forcibly and vividly upon the mind. Its meaning is found in its design. Its power is in its meaning, and its meaning can be only felt as its design is correctly apprehended and understood.—The two great moral points in the case of every alien or sinner are the love and guilt of sin. Destroy the love and take away the guilt of sin, and he is made perfect as pertaining to the conscience. The love of sin must be destroyed before its guilt can be removed; for without the former the latter would be unnecessary and useless. The love leads to the practice, and the practice induces guilt. The first destroyed, both the others must of course cease. Now the sacrifice of Christ is sufficient to accomplish both. By faith in his crucifixion or death, when considered in connexion with its real design and his divine character and offices, the love of sin is destroyed; and by faith in his blood, when contemplated in like manner, the guilt of sin is taken away.* Hence the order of his sacrifice. His body was broken on the cross to destroy the love of sin, *before* his blood was shed to procure its remission. The only account which we have of the shedding of his blood is that given by John in his testimony, who is particular in showing this order. "Then came the soldiers, and broke the legs of the first, [malefactor,] and of the other which which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was *dead already*, they broke not his legs: but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out *blood and water*." The whole sacrifice was accomplished upon the cross; and hence his blood is termed "the blood of the cross." As Jesus was crucified upon the cross, and left mortality in the grave, so we must have "the old man crucified that

*See my essay on the "Blood of the New Covenant," in the April no. of the "Reformer."

the body may be destroyed" We must die to the love of sin; and be cleansed from its guilt and pollution, which last is accomplished by his blood. "Christ also *suffered* for us, leaving an *example*, that we should *follow in his steps*. * * * *

Who his own self bare our sins [bore away our sins] *in his own body* on the tree, that we, *being dead to sins*, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." "Christ was once offered to bear [bear away] the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, [*a sin offering*] unto salvation." Hence Paul exclaims, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is *crucified* unto me, and I unto the world." "I am *crucified* with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And to the Corinthians, "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him *crucified*; and to the Galatians, "They that are Christ's *have crucified* the affections and lusts."—Hence Paul says, Christ "made peace through the *blood* of his *cross*;" and prays for the Hebrew Christians, that God "through the *blood* of the everlasting covenant make you perfect in every good work to do his will." Hence John says, "the *blood* of Jesus Christ. * * * cleanses us from all sin," and "he washed us from our sins in his own *blood*." And Paul says to the Colossians and Ephesians, "We have redemption through his *blood*, even the forgiveness of sins."

As is the order of the sacrifice of Christ, so is that of the institution which represents it. Hence Jesus when he "instituted it," broke the loaf, the representative of his broken body, and gave it to his disciples, before he gave them the cup, the representative of his blood shed after his body was broken, or he was crucified. "As they were eating, Jesus took bread, [or a loaf,] and blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to his 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." Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians, observes the same order; "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, [a loaf,]: and when he had given thanks, he broke 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, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, [loaf,] and drink this cup, ye do shew forth [or openly publish] the Lord's death till he come."—Through the loaf, first whole and then broken, the emblem of his body, first whole and then broken, we contemplate with the eye of faith his body crucified and broken on the cross for us when he died; and through the wine, the emblem of his blood, shed for the remission of sins after his body was broken, we contemplate his blood poured out for us on the cross after he had died, and with which the new covenant or institution was sealed or dedicated.—"Where there is such an institution, the death of the instituted sacrifice must necessarily intervene: for since the institution is ratified over the dead, it has no force while the instituted sacrifice lives"—Hence the order of our Saviour's sacrifice, the order in which he instituted the Supper, the order in which the Apostles observed it, and the order in which it is attended to by us. Hence as there was but one sacrifice, which as we have shown was a perfect one, able to destroy the love and remove the guilt of sin, which is all that is morally needed or required, so there is but one institution to represent that sacrifice. We want, we need, we require no other. For if the love of sin can be continually repressed or destroyed and the conscience cleansed from its guilt, we are as morally perfect as we can be made. Now as far as an ordinance is concerned, this institution, by continually reminding us of the great sacrifice which it represents and by often and continually bringing it before our minds in the most vivid and impressive manner, is sufficient to accomplish this. Hence, as we are continually exposed to temptation

and liable to sin, the necessity of constantly observing it. "This do," says the Lord, "in remembrance of me;" "this do, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me;" in remembrance of his sacrifice. These expressions are so far from furnishing us with a pretext to observe this institution at our option and as seldom as we please, that it enjoins its constant observance upon us.—As all the circumstances attending the life, death, resurrection and ascension of the Lord, are designed to operate upon us in every possible way to banish sin from us and promote our present and eternal felicity, so the Apostles in their writings have seized upon them and used them to accomplish these purposes. For instance, Peter sets before the persecuted and suffering Christians to whom he wrote, the sufferings and death of Christ, to encourage and induce them to patiently suffer and die for him. "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow in his steps. * * Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." "For Christ also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." As the Corinthian church had become divided into parties and factions, Paul seizes upon the communion they had together in the Lord's Supper, to persuade them to union. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread [loaf] which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, [loaf,] and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread, [loaf,]" The proper translation is "the joint participation" of the body and blood of Christ.

EDITOR.

The Breaking of Christ's Body on the Cross.

It is supposed by some that the breaking of our Saviour's body on the cross to which he alludes when he says to his disciples in instituting the Supper, "this is my body broken for you," took place when his side was

pierced by the spear of the soldier; and we have heard others seemingly infer the same, by saying that the expression, "this is my body broke for sin," showed that there was a connection between the breaking of his body for sin and the shedding of his blood for the remission of sins. Now it is no where expressly said that our Saviour's body was broken for sin. The expression quoted above is taken from our Hymn Book, not from the New Testament. It is said of the death of Jesus; "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust," "who his own self bare [bore away] our sins in his own body on the tree that we, being dead unto sins, should live unto righteousness," &c. These expressions show that the breaking or crucifying of our Saviour's body on the cross is designed to affect us some way in regard to sin; but then they also show that his sufferings had as much to do with it as the breaking of his body, and do not necessarily imply that the breaking of his body alluded to was that when his blood was shed.—They moreover plainly imply that this was not the case. It must be admitted that when our Lord's body was pierced with the spear, he was dead, his sufferings were over. We have just quoted; that, "Christ also has once suffered for sins." It was when he suffered, not when his side was pierced, that his body was broken, for us, that "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him: and with his stripes we are all healed," says Isaiah.—How well the following from Peter, in the same epistle in which he says that Christ suffered for sins, accords with this quotation above from the prophet: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." There is a difference too in the Greek terms used in the original for "pierced" and for "broken." The Greek term for pierced, in John, is "nussoo—to stab, pierce, as with a spear," says Parkhurst.—The term for broken is *klazoo*, which Parkhurst defines, as follows; "To break, as bread. To show the exact propriety of this expression it may be proper to observe, that bread among the Jews was made into thin cakes, not in loaves, as with us. Mat. xiv. 19. xv. 37. [xxvi. 26. Mark. viii. 6, 19. (KLASAI ARTON EIS TINA to break bread for any one, i. e. in order to distribute it, comp. Is. lviii. 7. Sam. iv. 4. See Ezech. xviii. 7.) xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19. xxiv. 30. Acts ii. 46. (See Kypke.) xxvii. 35.] It is applied to the body of Christ broken on the cross, 1 Cor. xi 24." Jones, an excellent authority,

defines it, "I break—break *bread*, distribute, partake of, Mat. 14. 19. Acts 2. 46. 10. 16.—break *my body*, cut, wound, 1 Cor. 11. 23 [24.]" We might adduce more, but these authorities are sufficient. From these definitions then it appears, that our Lord in saying, "this is my body broken for you," is not alluding to a mere literal breaking of his body, from which idea the errors noticed in the commencement of this article originated, but refers particularly to the *sacrifice* of his body, thus made when broken or wounded, of which all his disciples are to partake or enjoy the benefits, like bread broken and distributed.

As Christ is the end of the law to every one that believes, the design, the object contemplated by the legal institution, when he died, he "took it out of the way nailing it to the cross," "having abolished in his flesh * * * the law of commandments. contained in ordinances * * * that he might reconcile both [Jew and Gentile] unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." The New Institution then could not have been sealed or dedicated with his blood until the Old Institution sealed by Moses with the blood of animals, was dead or taken out of the way. The Mosaic institution, a *temporal* economy, died with Christ when he died a temporal death. It would be most anomalous then, to have the New covenant sealed with the blood of Christ shed *before* he was dead! How could the New be sealed while the old was remaining, which continued until he drew his last breath upon the cross! It was sealed then after he died, when the spear pierced his side and there came out blood and water, the antitype of the blood and water with which Moses dedicated the Old, and the symbol of the union of the blood of Christ with water in baptism.

As Christ died, suffered, was crucified and had his body broken or wounded for us, before he shed his blood for us, so we are crucified and die to sin, its love and practice, before its guilt is removed by that blood; and so we in the Lords supper break first the bread which represents his body, first whole and then broken, before we partake of the wine, the emblem of his blood shed for the remission of sins.—"Our old man is crucified with him [Christ] that the body of sin might be destroyed." "I am crucified with Christ." "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."—"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin." "The

blood of Christ [shall] purge your conscience from dead works." Christ "loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."

EDITOR.

Faith in the Blood of Christ.

This is a subject of great importance, to which we wish to call the particular attention of the reader; and hence we treat it thus by itself instead of incidentally as we have elsewhere done. We say it is important, and every one must think so who has read the Living Oracles attentively; as it is through the *blood* of Christ that we receive remission of sins, are redeemed, justified, sanctified, &c. We should be particular then how we speak of the blood of Christ, and the way in which we are affected or affect others by it. It is not by an *opinion*, but by FAITH in his blood that we are properly affected by it and receive its benefits. Paul contrasting the Law and the Gospel on the subject of justification, says, in Rom. iii. 21—26, (New Version,) "But now, a justification which is of God, without law, is exhibited, attested by the law and the prophets: even a justification which is of God, through FAITH in Jesus Christ, for all, and upon all who BELIEVE; for there is no difference, [between Jew and Gentile.] For all, having sinned and come short of the glory of God, are justified freely by his favour, through the REDEMPTION which is by Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth a PROPITIATORY through FAITH in his BLOOD, for a demonstration of his own justice in passing by the sins which were before committed, through the forbearance of God: for a demonstration, also, of his justice in the present time, in order that he may be just, when justifying him *whom* of the FAITH of Jesus." How important the information communicated here! In the first place, justification, which is a pardon, acquittal or release from sin, is asserted to be of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Let this be well noted. Then justification is asserted to be through the redemption which is in Christ. Let this also be as well attended to. Then he is said to have set forth Christ, to have exhibited him, as a propitiatory, or offering for sin through FAITH in his BLOOD, to demonstrate his justice in thus remitting or passing by sins. Mark the expression, "through faith in his blood."—We frequently hear it said that our Saviour suffered, *bled* and died; and the flowing of his blood from his hands and his feet on the cross are expatiated upon in order to excite the sympathies

of the heart. Even our Hymn Book has it,

"See from his hands, his side, his feet,
Sorrow and love flow mingled down,"

thus confounding the fact of the shedding of his blood from his side with the opinion of the shedding of it from his hands and feet!

Again,

"When he *complained* in tears and blood,
As one forsaken by his God.
The Jews beheld him thus forlorn,
And shook their heads and laugh'd in scorn."

And again,

"They *wound* his head, his hands, his feet,
Till streams of blood each other meet."

Once more,

"As on the cross the Savior hung,
And groaned, and *bled* AND *died*."

It's not true that Jesus shed his blood for the remission of sins *before* he died. This has only an *opinion* of the mind to support it; and if we are thus affected by his blood, we are affected by an *opinion* not by *faith*. John is the only one of the four apostles and evangelists, who has recorded the shedding of our Saviour's blood, and he distinctly affirms that he was dead first. Here we have the *FACT* recorded by John, in his *testimony*; and as faith is the belief of testimony, and without *fact* we can have no *testimony* and without *testimony* no *faith*, we cannot have faith in the blood of Christ, so important and necessary as we have seen above in order to justification, only as having flowed from his side. This was the "blood of the new covenant shed for many for the remission of sins." Let it be well noticed above, that justification is only "for all and upon all who *believe*," and that this belief is "FAITH in the blood of Christ." It is thus, by *faith* and not by *opinion*, that the blood of Christ purges or cleanses the conscience from sin. "If the blood of bulls and of goats," says Paul to the Hebrews, "and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the *blood of Christ*, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God: *purge your conscience* from dead works [works done in sin] to serve the living God." This faith we have asserted is the belief of the testimony of John, who says, "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his [Christ's] side, and forthwith came there out *blood* and *water*. And he that *saw* it bare *RECORD*, and his record is *true*; and he *knoweth* that he saith true, that ye might *BELIEVE*." Thus by faith in the blood of Christ the Hebrews had their "hearts sprinkled from an *evil conscience*," when they had their "*bodies* washed with *pure*

water." Thus by faith "the *blood* of Christ *cleanses us from all sin*. The faith which we have in that blood comes by the *word* or testimony of John, for "*faith* comes * * * by the *word* of God." This word or record is true or is truth; for says Jesus to his Father, "thy *word* is *truth*;" and Paul calls it "the *word* of the *truth* of the gospel." Hence says Peter of the Gentiles, that God "put no difference between us and them, *PURIFYING their HEARTS by FAITH*;" and in his epistle, "ye have *PURIFIED your SOULS* in *OBEDYING the TRUTH*;" and Jesus to his apostles, "ye are *CLEAN through the WORD* which I have spoken unto you."

EDITOR.

Progress of Christianity.

Prospect Hill, Adams Co. Missi. }
May 20th, 1836. }

Brother Howard,

I have just received the 1st. and 2nd. numbers of the Christian Reformer; and with its contents both original and selected I am well pleased. I do hope that as you have launched your little bark, you may have a safe and prosperous voyage. True, you expect tempests and contrary winds from opposing sects; but these I regard not so much as the flood-gates of vice and infidelity or unbelief. For I have found that in this country the "pride of life and deceitfulness of riches," exerts a more powerful influence against the onward march of the Redeemer's Kingdom than any thing else with which we have to contend. Though, thank the Lord, I have been the humble instrument of doing something for my Master. During last year I immersed about *thirty*, and since last Christmas I have immersed *eleven*; and bro. Hodgen about the same number in Wilkinson county.

B. L. D'SPAIN.

Sommerville, Fayette Co. Tenn.

As I said in my last letter to you, so say I again; send, if you can, some proclaimer to Sommerville. We have friends in this place who would delight in accommodating any preacher of the Book,—soon as he is known. SILAS BUNYAN READ.

ANOTHER SPLENDID TRIUMPH OF THE GOSPEL!

We make the following extracts from some editorial remarks by bro. David S. Burnett in the May No. of the Christian Preacher. It is seldom that the Gospel has in modern times been attended by

such success. And yet in the face of these statements of the progress of the Reformation, our opponents have been reporting and trumpeting to the world almost ever since its commencement, that it was waning, on the decline and would soon come to nothing!

Ed. C. R.

"I know of no greater triumph awarded to our efforts than in the little town of *Warsaw*, Gallatin Co. Ky. between the 20th and 28th April. Brother John T. Johnson about the first of the month visited some of his old friends of that place and vicinity, and preached for several days. Some brethren who were originally of the Baptist Community—and "waited for the consolation of Israel," now were joined by some Methodists & some sinners in their determination to submit to the institutions of the Messiah. These numbered in the town and surrounding country 17 in all. Brother J. proposed to return April 20th and in the mean time I was sent for. I waited to meet my fellow laborer at the time appointed, and the good Providence of God brought us together. Though I was not well and intended to stay but two or three days, I could not force myself away until the eighth. *One hundred and three or four persons obeyed the Lord.* Bro. J. was the baptist during the meeting, and consequently I had to do such an extra amount of speaking as for a time almost prostrated my voice. We baptized seven or eight different times, and as high as twenty six at once, of which last number about fifteen were young men, who descended in succession into the emblematical tomb.

* * * * *

Several preachers of "the denominations," were at times in attendance as spectators and auditors, and had an opportunity to see their flocks receive the truth, but they all treated us with becoming courtesy except in one instance, and then but one was implicated. But in favor of one of these gentlemen we have more than this to say: Mr. Benjamin Tiller, a minister of the Methodist Ep. Church, heard publicly and privately; he examined, and though at the close of our meeting he had not seen so fully into the ancient order of things as to publicly avow his intention to forsake Methodism, he did receive the baptism of ancient Christianity with great joy, and subsequently assisted the baptist in burying and raising several others. I feel persuaded that brother Tiller, will throw himself into the midst of the congregation of the Lord, composed to some extent of his former flock, and consecrate himself to the restoration primitive

Christianity. I cannot but think that his enlightened views of duty and privilege will prove incompatible with a different course."

☞ We have not room or time now for more accounts of the progress of Christianity. We give here the most original and interesting we have.

Ed. C. R.

MISAPPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

NO. VII.

Beloved Bro. Howard;—I have already forestalled your periodical, provided all my essays should be considered worthy of publication.

But allow me to resume the subject, by stating that no Scripture is more frequently misapplied than the commission given to the Apostles of our Lord. Because they were commanded to teach and to baptize the nations, it is supposed that none but Elders, Bishops, or Overseers, or, as called by some, Reverends, Divines, &c. are now authorised to administer the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Some, perhaps, admit that Evangelists and Deacons have the right so to do. But nearly all affirm that it is not proper for any one not ordained by the laying on of hands, to administer the ordinances. This practice has grown out of the notice, that the Elders, &c. are in some sense the successors of the Apostles. But the writers of the New Testament nowhere convey the idea that the administration of these ordinances belonged to the office of a Bishop or a Deacon. Not one of these officers are said to have been set apart for that purpose. And there is not a single case recorded where a Bishop, Elder, or Overseer, ever ministered either baptism or the Lord's Supper. Nor is there a single command directed to them in the Apostolic writings, to do so. Therefore, without either command or precedent, they have claimed the sole right of administering the ordinances.

I will now put a difficulty in the way of the "Paidobaptist" Clergy, which they will find it difficult to get over or around. They say that baptism came in the room of circumcision. And, pray by whom was circumcision administered among the Jews?

Not by the Priests, I trow, but by the parents or friends of the child. How came it then to be the exclusive privilege of the Priests now to administer baptism? There lies the rub.

All those who advocate the notion that baptism & the Lord's Supper should be administered by the Clergy exclusively, leave out a part of the commission which was given to the Apostles, which part reads thus, "*Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" And the Lord had just that moment commanded them to teach and baptize the nations into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Now the question is, did the Apostles do as they were bid, by teaching the disciples made by them, to observe or do that which the Lord commanded them? I think they did; and shall offer as proof what Luke said about these disciples, Acts viii. "As for Saul he made havoc of the Church, &c." "And they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word." I wonder who taught these disciples to preach, if the Apostles did not? It was not "A. Campbell," for he was not born for nearly eighteen hundred years after these men went about preaching.—Therefore they were not "Campbellites." And it is admitted that any who are authorized to preach have the right to baptize also.

Paul however did not permit women to teach or usurp authority; because the gospel did not come *by* them, but *to* them. From this it appears that men had the right to teach, &c. This is the reason why those people called "Campbellites," do not allow women to baptize, although some of the Clergy have published to the world that women as well as men preach and baptize among the "Campbellites." For these lies they will have an account when they come before the judgment seat of Christ; and unless they repent and get forgiveness, will have their portion in another place than Heaven.

As ever, yours,
M. WINANS.

RELIGION.

Jamestown, O. June 2d, 1836.

Bro. Howard;—Yours of the 10th ult.

is to hand, in which you request communications apart from my regular series, under the head of "*Misapplication of Scripture.*" And you wish me to notice in my regular series the misapplication of sundry passages to prove universal "hereditary total depravity." This has been attended to by our talented Bro. A. Raines, of Paris, Ky., in a masterly manner. Therefore if any thing on that subject be necessary for your pages, I must refer you to his "Refutation" of that doctrine.

I am willing, however, so far as in me lies, to contribute to the edification of my fellow beings; and at present shall speak of *Religion*. This term is more used perhaps, than any other, and in as vague a sense. Some speak of getting religion; and in fact we have those who make religions, and those who get them ready made. Mahomet, the Pope, and various other manufacturers, have made religions; and they are now selected and got by men according to their tastes, or rather according to their *traditions*. Each chooses from among the religions thus made, that one which accords best with his views or sentiments; and those views or sentiments are nothing more nor less than the traditions which he has received. Therefore when a public speaker visits a town or village, every one who comes to hear him, brings with him *his rule* to measure the doctrine he may advance. And if per chance the speaker teach the religion of Jesus Christ, as exhibited in the Scriptures, he is condemned of all. For there are few, if any, who use the Scriptures for a rule to measure doctrines by.

But if he teach any of the fashionable religions now in use, his hearers will begin to say, that man preached my sentiments exactly—he is a smart man, &c. While others, who have chosen another religion, now in use, will be heard to say, he spoke very well on some things, but he missed it in others, &c. But how few will be found examining the Scriptures to see whether the things taught be so or not.

Some measure by their feelings. If they have good feelings while the man is speaking, they pronounce the things taught to be of God. While others measure by the speaker's dress, or by the fashion of his hair; and some can tell by his countenance, whether his religion is right or wrong.

Now seeing that these things are so, how shall we manage this people, so as to restore the religion of Jesus Christ? He that attempts a religious reformation undertakes a hard work. It would be easier to make and dispose of a half dozen new religions, than to persuade men to be contented with the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, as taught and practiced by the Apostles and primitive Christians.

Men have become so vain, as to suppose that improvements may be made on the religion of Jesus Christ. Some have ventured to say that it was best suited to the climate of Judea, and that immersion was only intended for the Jews! Others have said, that to mingle water with the wine used in shewing forth the Lord's death, would be an improvement, as by that means a love of temperance would be manifested. And some have added another "love-feast," in which pure water is used with the bread. These modern improvements are more strictly attended to, than those appointed by the Lord. Hence the religion of Jesus Christ is pushed out of the way, to make room for the ordinances of men!

Yours, &c.

M. WINANS.

The Christian Preacher.

This periodical has reached its seventh no.; and as we anticipated, has proportionately increased in the interest, quality and style of its matter, and the variety and originality of its contents. Such has been its patronage and so widely has its circulation been extended and so rapidly has its list of subscribers been increased, that a *new edition* has already been found necessary.

The cover of the last no. contains the following:

"We commenced this edition with 200 subscribers, but printed 1000 copies.— Though it was for sometime doubtful whether it would not be a losing concern, during my recent tours abroad my list has so increased as to leave many subscribers, who will receive this one, without the back numbers. Now what is to be done? Upon reflection I have determined to republish the back numbers, and enlarge the present edition. Do not then be afraid, my patrons, of increasing the number of readers *ad infinitum*. I ask again, will each reader get another? Preparatory to this arrangement I

have procured a lot of very superior high priced eastern paper, which, added to the reprint, and enlarged edition, will as every printer knows, require many hundred advance-paying subscribers to pay for. Will the brethren sustain me in these severe expenses incurred in diffusing our cheapest work? As to our prospects, I am happy to say there are many able brethren who are interested in our success, and are willing to contribute to our pages. Hence we may hope to improve. Our city has been full of *strikes, turn outs, &c.*, for higher wages, fewer hours, etc., and our printer's office has not escaped; it is owing to this cause that this number makes its appearance so late.— As soon as possible, all subscribers shall be supplied from the beginning.

Will the brethren comply with bro. Burnett's request above? Will each reader of the Preacher do it? With a little exertion they can give it as extensive a circulation as he desires.

We were mistaken in the title of the first discourse. It is "The Riches of Christ," and not the "true" riches of Christ as we had it. All the riches of Christ are *true* riches. The second (Febry.) no. contains a very able essay from bro. Aylett Raines of Paris, Ky. a bishop in the congregation there, on "Universalism and the Three Salvations," which, with some excellent additional remarks from bro. Burnett, we republished in the preceding no. of our paper. The third (March) no. contains a very good discourse from bro. Burnett, entitled "The Christian, God's Steward of the things of this life," a most important subject, interesting to every Christian, and well treated here. The fourth (April) no. is occupied by a discourse from bro. (Dr.) F. W. Emmons, bishop in the congregation at Noblesville, Indiana. Its title is "The Ancient Order of Things in the Public Worship of the Christian Congregations." It is very ably written; and is designed to show and illustrate, as its title imports, what was the ancient order of worship in the Christian congregations. The fifth (May) no. contains an able and eloquent discourse from bro. (Dr.) B. F. Hall, of Lexington, Ky. co-editor of the "Gospel Advocate," on the "Type and Antitype of Salvation." These are perspicuously and beautifully illustrated; and the discourse is full of edifying and interesting matter. The brethren whom we have heard speak of it, pro-

fess to be much pleased and delighted with it. The sixth (June) no. contains a discourse on "Faith, Hope and Love," from the pen of our pious, zealous, talented and promising young brother, Alexander Graham, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., co-editor of "The Disciple." It is ably and elegantly written; and the subject of spiritual gifts, is well treated. It exhibits a rapid improvement of the talents of our young brother. The seventh (July) no. contains a discourse from bro. Raines, entitled, "The Divine Government, a Model for the Parental." Of this we cannot speak too highly. It is indeed praiseworthy; and deserves the particular attention of every Christian parent. This great, this important subject, is here treated as it deserves to be. This single discourse is worth a whole year's subscription to the Preacher.

It is seldom that we meet with a periodical of such beautiful and neat typographical execution as the Christian Preacher; and the contents of which are deserving of so elegant a dress. The generality of works issued from the press are undeserving the paper and type containing them; but this well deserves to be so handsomely printed on such fine paper, with its beautiful cover.

EDITOR.

Primitive Christian.

This periodical has been united with the Christian Investigator, under the title of the "Primitive Christian and Investigator." It is still under the editorial auspices of bro. Silas E. Shepard, and published at Auburn, N. Y. The "second vol. contains more than 8 pages more matter than the 1st. It is \$1 if paid within 6 months after the commencement of a vol. and \$1 50 if not paid till the end of the year." The spirit of mildness and forbearance with which it is conducted is commendable.

ED. C. R.

A FEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Quest.—Why is it, that some persons professing to be Christians, are in the habit of frequenting balls, parries, theatres, and similar places of public amusement and resort?

Ans.—Because they have the spirit of the world in them, and are actuated and influenced by it, and not that of *Christ*. The spirit of the world carries people to such

places; the Spirit of Christ commands them to come out and be separate from the world, and carries them to other places.

Quest.—Are they not as culpable and censurable in inducing, influencing and encouraging others to go as in going themselves?

Ans.—Equally as much so. The criminality is as much in one case as in the other. We might as well sin ourselves, as to connive at or encourage it in others.

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN'S COMFORT IN AFFLICTION.

I

As Adam's image we have borne,
The form of Jesus we shall bear;
When from the grave we shall be born,
To meet the Saviour in the air.

II

Lo! in the twinkling of an eye,
At the last trumpet's living sound,
We'll mount above the burning sky,
And in immortal bliss be found!

Fayette Co. Tenn.

S. B. R.

Correction.

In the article in our last headed "Abner Kneeland and the Boston Investigator," we observed, "He has asked us what is Christianity 'a divine and perfect system of?,'—and what in our opinion, constitutes Christianity! We would, consistently with the merits of such an inquiry, inform Mr. Kneeland, that Christianity is a divine and perfect system of religion, and that the *Christian religion* in our opinion, constitutes Christianity." We meant and should have said, "consistently with the merits of such an inquiry, as coming from him." Such an inquiry coming from one ignorant of those things, honest of heart and really desirous to know, merits a *different* answer; but, from an infidel like Mr. Kneeland who doubtless pretends to know all about them, our answer was appropriate enough. If Mr. K. has noticed the article alluded above we hope he will copy this into his paper. EDITOR.

When we enter into covenant with God, into that "everlasting covenant" of which the Lord Jesus Christ is Mediator, we become bound to live according to the terms of that covenant. We are bound by them to assemble ourselves together on every Lord's Day to partake of the Lord's Supper; and when we wilfully neglect or omit it, we have violated that sacred covenant and the Lord will not hold us guiltless.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. JULY, 1836

[NUMBER 7.]

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem Luk^e XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and IS BAPTIZED shall be SAVED; but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XI. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS. Jude, 3.

Testimony of a Presbyterian on the Design of Christian Baptism.

Mr. J. W. Hall of Gallatin, Tenn. a talented, erudite and eloquent Presbyterian preacher, has lately written "Four Lectures on Christian Baptism," the publication of which was lately concluded in the "American Presbyterian" of Nashville. He has, as might be supposed, zealously contended for sprinkling and infant baptism. But we were surprised, as well as gratified, at many of his remarks on the design of Christian Baptism. They evince an independence of mind, a manliness of character, and an acquaintance with the real meaning of the Scriptures, not often met with among the members of the different "denominations." It is the sentiments in these remarks alluded to here, which are so opprobriously nicknamed "Campbellism;" and it is for entertaining and expressing such sentiments, in language perhaps no stronger or more unguarded, that we are denounced as *heretics* and "Campbellites!"—We do not see how Mr. Hall can entertain such consistently with infant baptism and sprinkling or pouring. The moral and symbolical meaning of this ordinance would, in our judgement, exclude both.—To such an one as Mr. H. we would say, with our views of the subjects and action or mode of baptism, "You are not far from the kingdom of heaven."—We here present the reader with the most important extracts from these "Lectures."

EDITOR.

I submit the question to all those who believe in the holy scriptures, whether an individual, no matter what he may think himself about his faith or repentance, goodness of heart or exemplariness of life, or others may flatteringly say to him concerning them, whether if he forbears and continues to forbear from visibly connecting himself with the people of God, thus acting contrary expressly to the command of Christ, who has bidden us observe the ordinances of his house, whether such an individual can expect to bring forth the fruits of righteousness and peace, and whether in a course of such disobedience, he can, on Scriptural grounds, hope to enter into the kingdom of Heaven when he dies? The answer, we think, is obvious. Dr. Dwight shall give it, whose opinions in religious matters, you know, are entitled to much reverence and consideration. After stating, that to be born of the Spirit, is the great qualification for membership in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, he throws out this caution: "It is, however, to be observed here, that he, who understanding the nature and authority of this institution (baptism), refuses to be baptized, will never enter either the visible or invisible kingdom of God. As he refuses to become a member of the visible, he will certainly be shut out of the invisible kingdom. He who persists in this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom." Theology, Ser. 146, page 202.

Baptism is intended to connect us with the family of God. It is the *adopting act*. * * * So it would seem from the form of words appointed to be used in the ceremony: they are to be baptized, (*eis to onoma*) into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy

as Christ in any requisition, and intends to refuse obedience to any precept, and lives on in disobedience to his expressed authority is to expect salvation? If he can disobey one precept, and still be in a state of forgiveness and salvation, may he not disobey two and still be safe? and three? and twice ten, if there be so many? Where will you stop? The truth is, the Bible teaches us that we must repent, and believe, and not only so, but be baptized, and commemorate the death of Jesus Christ; in a word, *obey the Lord Jesus Christ*; and in doing so it teaches us that we are safe: but it teaches no safety either to infidels, or impenitents, or to men who may think they have repented and believed, and yet refuse to obey Jesus Christ; in other words, it teaches no safety for unholy believers, or *disobedient penitents*, if such characters can be supposed to exist.

In reference to the second objection, viz. that some have been baptized whose sins do not seem to have been remitted, it is sometimes replied, that baptism without repentance, and faith, and a new heart, although when *connected with these qualifications*, does certainly ensure the remission of sins; yet, without them, being alone, and only one condition on which it is suspended, can do no good; and for an obvious reason, not being done with right views, right motives, right intentions, the baptism is made no baptism; just as the circumcision of the Jews was made no circumcision by reason of their hypocrisy and unholiness. But the question is not, what will be the influence of baptism administered to an impenitent, unbelieving hypocrite, but what will be its influence administered to a subject, who shall, in that act, solemnly intend to obey Jesus Christ, separate himself from the world, consecrate himself to God, unite himself visibly, among the other branches, to the living vine; and enter by this means into the trials and duties of the Christian family; and humbly by that act signify his intention to obey the Lord Jesus Christ in all things; what consequence does the Bible attribute to a baptism embodying such views and purposes as these? This is the question. Let the true penitent, the unfeigned believer in God's promises, with his eye upon what Peter says in the Acts of the Apostles, (ii. 38,) try and see what will be the effect upon his feelings. Will it not be a sweet sense of forgiveness—the consolations of a good conscience, and of the Holy Ghost?

With regard to the third objection derived from Paul's language to the Corinthians, it may be remarked, that when the apostle says, that Christ sent him not to baptize,

his language is certainly not to be construed as if he was prohibited in his commission from administering the rite of baptism; for we find, on some occasions, he *did* administer it: neither is this, or any other language which he used in this letter, to be construed as if intended to teach that baptism ought not to be administered at all, or that the rite was a useless, meaningless appendage to the gospel, or that he was not gratified that the Corinthian converts had submitted to it: but the true interpretation of his language has been given, in part at least, under the fourth head of his lecture; and when he says that Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the gospel, we are to understand, that although he did baptize occasionally, yet this was not his great business. His great business was, *to open the eyes of men, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God*. But can it be believed that Paul would have considered himself as fulfilling the ministry which he had received, if when he had enlightened men, and by means of the gospel, persuaded them to turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, he had there left them—*secretly saints*—to mingle still with the world as before—not submitting to the two express commands of Christ, *Be baptized every one of you; Do this in remembrance of me*. And furthermore, can it be thought, that he would encourage such disobedience, and contempt—at least disregard—of the great Christian Lawgiver, his precious Saviour, as to teach that disregard to any of his positive precepts is *non-essential*. Methinks not. To such as might have lingered after they had believed and repented, especially if they dreamed of comfort or of heaven, without going into visible Christianity, I almost fancy that I can hear him, in the mild, but stern and powerful language of the scriptures—powerful, because the authoritative language of God, chiding such baseless dreaming, in the language of reproof and instruction, thus—*Mistaken men! With the heart man believeth unto righteousness: this is true—and this you admit—but remember, that it is with the tongue that man makes confession unto salvation*. If any man will be my disciple, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and come and follow me. The promises of God are not made to *invisible Christians* in the scriptures, no more than the Bible contemplates such Christians. The candle is not lit to be put under a bushel; and the promise of parental care is only made to such as come out and are separate: to such, and such only, God says, *I will be a father, and ye shall be my sons and daugh-*

ters, saith the Almighty. Not, however, to be tedious, let it be seriously asked, who can expect to get to heaven? What is the answer? Is it not he, and he only, who is forgiven, whose sins are remitted? Ans. Yes. But whose sins are forgiven? Are they not the sins of that man who believes as far as he knows what God, in his word, teaches him to believe; who represses every feeling and sentiment that God has taught him, in his word, to repress; who cherishes every feeling and sentiment God has taught him to cherish; and who does every duty, as he is enabled by the grace of God, that he finds commanded by his Lord,—not preferring one above another, or holding to one and despising another,—but doing all for one reason—one simple reason only—it is the will of the great King? I surely must think that this is the blessed man to whom the Lord doth not impute iniquity, and whose sins are covered; and I can predict of such an one, that while he continues to act upon his principles he shall never fall; and I wish I had time to tell how happy such an one must be. But reverse this picture, and select one single truth, and say that a man will not believe that one truth, although attend with scriptural evidence; one feeling only which is interdicted that he will not repress; one religious feeling he will not warm and cherish in his bosom, although urged to it; one duty he will voluntarily continue to decline, although positively commanded to perform it; and can you find evidence in the Bible to believe such an one is forgiven? Although such an one uttered seraph words of Christian experience, spake of ecstasies celestial, aye of the very time and place of conversion, and of the inward witness to the forgiveness of sins, I should still be unmoved by the rapturous story of his espousals, if I knew, at the same time, that it was a part of his plan to stand aloof from the trials, and duties, and fellowship of the Christian family.

But to return from this digression, which has been forced upon us by the light and irreverent manner in which we have heard the duty of Christian baptism spoken of sometimes, we return with deep interest to the question, what connexion has baptism with remission of sins; for, that it has some connexion, must appear to all who are not wholly purblind to the plainest language. The meaning of a word is sometimes of great service in settling a difference, or terminating a controversy. What, then, are we to understand by the word remission, the phrase remission of sins? I turn to the original word; I look at its etymology; at the definitions given of it by lexicographers; at the *usus*

loquendi, or common use of it at the time the Old and New Testaments were written; examine its meaning in the connexions where it is found in classic usage, and am happy to find that it has a fixed meaning, a uniform meaning: that this word (which is *aphesis*) first and primarily signifies dismissal, or release from captivity; its secondary and kindred meanings, all evidently borrowed from this original one, are numerous. Among them, are, divorce; manumission of slaves, as in the year of Jubilee; and remission, or dismissal from the power and dominion of sin. Will not the original meaning of this word, and its kindred analogies, help us to understand precisely the connexion which baptism has with the remission of sins? Take the first meaning, the original meaning—dismissal, or release from captivity. In every release from captivity, there must be,—1. A release. 2. A subject released. 3. Reasons of release. 4. The releasing act. And there ought to be appropriate names for every one of these ideas in a copious and expressive language. And so there is in the Greek language, which is as remarkable for its precision, as it is for its copiousness and beauty. The Greeks called the releaser *lutrotes*; the captive *aichmalotes*; the reasons of his release, if money *lutrion* or *lutris*; if negotiated in some other way, *lutrosis*: the releasing act, or the actual and visible release and turning out, *aphesis*. This word conveys the idea of that act whereby he ordinarily changed condition, countries, and masters. Changed his condition: the dungeon for the cheerful light of day. Changed his country: the country of a slave, for the homeward step of one who is bent for his native land. Changed masters: the ownership of an oppressor, for the obligation and service of his deliverer. Now the Bible borrows all these figures taken from captivity, to represent the release of a sinner. One under the influence and dominion of sin, is called *aichmalotes*, a captive. The Lord Jesus Christ, the sinner's deliverer, is called *lutrotes*. His blood, which is the reason why the penitent, obedient believer may be released, is called *lutrion* or *lutrion*. His actual release is called *aphesis*, remission of sins—that releasing act—the word that conveys the idea of that act whereby a captive changed his condition, country, and master. Now, whatever may have been the usual ceremony of turning the captive out in ancient times, after the other preliminaries were settled, that ceremony was the one in which he obtained *aphesis*, dismissal from captivity, and went henceforth free and happy. To such a ceremony, real or supposed, bap-

ism is *analogous*. It is that ceremony in which, and by which the penitent sinner is allowed to come forth, by virtue of the interposition and blood of Christ, and change his condition, his country, and his master. His condition, from being a poor, miserable captive under the power and dominion of sin, to be a free man. His country, from being on exile from home and from the commonwealth of Israel, henceforth to number himself with the people of God. And his master, from being the slave of sin, to be a cheerful, grateful servant of Jesus Christ, his great deliverer. Baptism, then, is that solemn and delightful ceremony in which the prison doors are set open to penitent believers, their liberty is proclaimed, and through which they are put into the possession of all the rights and privileges of the people of God. It is not the ransom; for he is the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor is it the release price, or meritorious means; for that is the blood of Christ; nor yet is it that which makes one fit to be released; for that is faith, repentance, and intentional obedience. But it is that solemn ceremony through which Jesus Christ proclaims and gives to the penitent believer (who submits to it, the *full remission of his sins*). To prevent misconception, I must again allude to the old distinction made between qualification for a thing and the thing itself: as in adoption we have said, that faith, reception of Jesus Christ, and being born again, were necessary qualifications for worthy adoption into the family of God: so repentance, faith, and submission to baptism, are necessary qualifications for the remission of sins. The remission of sins itself, is the act of God, bestowed upon one who, in the scriptural sense, repents, believes, and commences to obey the Lord Jesus Christ. The first public Christian act which he ought to perform, is baptism, if he has not been baptized before; and thereby testify at once his full submission to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ; his entire separation from the world; his consecration of soul, body and spirit to Jesus Christ; his attachment to the family of God: and thus give visibility, and thereby strength, by a simple act, to all the feelings of his new born nature. Is he done with sin? Thus he shows it. Is he henceforth separated from the world? That is the meaning of the water of separation, which he uses. Does he love the people of God? It is then he takes them by the hand and says, "Thy people shall be my people; thy God, my God." What are the happy reflections which he is allowed to cherish in such a delightful hour—obedient to Christ—engrafted into the

living vine—adopted into the heavenly family—fully pardoned as he is, are beautifully described by the poet:

"What a mercy is this!
What a heaven of bliss!
How unspeakably happy am I!
Gathered into the fold,
With believers enroll'd,
With believers to live and to die."

* * * * *

Why, in the face of the holy scriptures, do we hear such unguarded language as the following: "Water baptism can do no good. Pshaw! I do not care, so my heart is right, whether I am baptized at all or not. Water baptism has no effect upon a man's salvation: he can be saved just as well without it as with it," &c. &c. Acting out this opinion fully, the Quaker refuses water baptism altogether. Now I ask leave to inquire, if there is not something to be suspected in such light and irreverent views of this ordinance, as we have hinted at above? Do they not nullify the plain command of Jesus Christ? Do they not separate, and set aside the conditions on which God has promised the comfort of the Holy Ghost here, and salvation hereafter? *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;* and who dares to say the contrary? Repent, and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. And who, while he refuses to do both these things, can claim the remission of sins or the promise of the Holy Ghost? Farthermore, these views of baptism set aside the necessity of visible Christianity, contrary to the whole tenor of Christ's instructions, and the inspired instructions of his apostles. They stop not here: they impeach the wisdom of Christ in organizing a church in the world. Nor is this all: they teach a course of reasoning disastrous to these precepts of morality and religion, as were the vain glosses and traditions of the Pharisees. For the same course of reasoning that is sometimes used in reference to baptism, would make void all the law and commandments of God. If it is written, that we must "not neglect the assembling of ourselves together," it may be replied that it will not save us—not essential to salvation—therefore we would be excused. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. But keeping the Sabbath will not take us to heaven. Husbands, love your wives. But loving our wives will not take us to heaven. Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. But paying a man's dues will not take him to heaven. And thus we may say of every command, that obedience to that command, being alone, will

not take us to heaven, and thus set them all aside. But the question is not, how many commands is it necessary or essential to obey in order to get to heaven; but the question is, what is the principle upon which every man sets out, and upon which every man practises, who will get to heaven. Is it not this!—to obey Christ in all things—in all things that he “has threatened, commanded, said, without exception.” The Bible direction upon this subject, is not difficult to be ascertained. It tells us to be baptized, and tells us what to be baptized for. Let us follow its directions. Let us be *baptized*, if we have not been; and thus escape the disobedience and presumption of those who make void the law of God by their vain reasonings. And let us do it for the purpose the Bible tells us, and for no other purpose; and thus escape the error of those who pervert its intention, or misapply it.

Dialogue between an Atheist and Universalist.

(Extract from my “Christian Evidences.”)

Atheist. Good morning, friend Universalist. I have been informed that you have become religious of late, and I have called to ascertain what are your views concerning religious matters. There are so many religious sects at present, all professing to be led by the Spirit of God, and who are nevertheless led in opposite directions, that the world is full of uproar and confusion; and as to my own part, I believe in none of them. But, an Atheist, an acquaintance of ours, has recently informed me, that he is mightily pleased with the Universalists. He says that he considers them as pioneers for the army of Deists and Atheists, which is now marching with slow, but sure pace, to the universal empire; and that he has been a close observer of the tendency of Universalism for many years, and knows, that when any person becomes a Universalist, of which he calls the Ballou school—that is, denies all punishment of the wicked after death—the transition to Deism is very small; and that, as no man can, with any consistency, rest in Deism—the idea of a Deity being stolen from the Jewish and the Christian scriptures—Atheism is the next, and the last abiding place.

Universalist. I am happy to see you, and feel disposed to give you any satisfaction which you can reasonably ask of me.

It is true that the world is at present in an uproar, by the contradictory and unscriptural doctrines of the sects; and this is exceedingly discouraging to many very honest and well disposed persons. But, such is the march of mind, in this generation, that the superstition of the ages of ignorance will soon give place to the religion of reason, and we shall all become rational and liberal Christians. As to what you have said of the tendency of Universalism, you must excuse me if I deny it. So far is Universalism from tending to Infidelity, it has, to my certain knowledge, an opposite tendency. Many Infidels have, within a few years, become believers, under the influence of our preaching, and joined our societies, and are now the ornaments of that religion which they once blasphemed. The contradictory and anti-scriptural dogmas of the sects, are much better calculated to make Infidels, than is the rational, consistent, scriptural, charitable doctrine of Universalism! We, however, think that both Deism and Atheism are more consistent than are many doctrines now popular in christendom; and we would rather be a Deist than a Trinitarian; and an Atheist, than an advocate for endless punishment. We would not, however, willingly be pioneers for either of them, nor, indeed, for any sect under heaven.

Atheist. Will you be so good as to communicate to me your opinions relative to a few important doctrinal points? You believe, I suppose, in a future state, as it is called? What is your opinion concerning a judgement, and a limited punishment after death?

Universalist. Punishment after death! Why I think that if there be *any* punishment after death, it will be endless! We believe that all mankind will be saved in the resurrection; and that in the future world, there will be no moral discriminations, but that the whole race of Adam will be equal to the angels of God, and will be children of God, being children of the resurrection. We limit all punishment to this life!

Atheist. What is your opinion with regard to the evils, physical and moral of the present state? If there be a God, and this God be intelligent, wise, benevolent, and almighty, would he not have prevented the

introduction of evil into the world? Why does he permit one thing to live by the destruction of another? Could he not have prevented the shedding of blood among the bestial tribes, and made some other provision for their subsistence? Why does he permit some of the human species to be born blind, some deaf, some in a state of idiocy, and liable to all manner of diseases? Why are there storms, volcanoes, famines, pestilences in the world? Why do moral evils of almost every imaginable description prevail wherever human society exists? If there is a God, and if he possess the perfections which Christians, and even Deists attribute to him, would he not have been good and powerful enough to have prevented all these evils, and to have placed every living thing in a state of happiness in the beginning of its existence, and to have secured to it the enjoyment of happiness throughout the whole of its life?

Universalist. The way in which we remove all such difficulties is this—that with God there is no such a thing as evil!—That is, God does not view those things as evils which appear to be so to us. We believe that all the evils of the present state, moral as well as physical, are absolutely necessary, and will terminate in the highest possible good of all mankind. The will of God is infinite, that of man is finite, and must, therefore, at all times, and in all things, be controlled by the will of the Almighty; so that no man ever did, or ever can act counter to the will of God. All the crimes committed by men, are just as necessary to the best good of the moral system, as the giving of alms, or the entertaining of strangers!

And spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever is, is right.

Atheist. This is strong meat; and although I am an Atheist, I must acknowledge it is too strong for me! I fear, my dear sir, that your doctrine will serve to increase the evils of the world rather than to diminish them. If I understand you, it is your opinion, that no man can do any thing which will not, in some way, be productive of good. If, then, this is a part of the faith of the Universalists, when any man shall have become illumined with the wisdom of the Universalian school, he need not be very scrupulous in his system of

morals, as he will have the assurance of doing good, even when he is perpetrating what the common sense of mankind has led them to denominate evil. According to my system of ethics, which is founded in the reason and fitness of things, Atheists must ever possess stronger motives to the observance of what men denominate good morals, than Universalists can have! We do not believe in the existence of God, and we believe, consequently, that all the evils of the present order of things, took their rise, partly from the unavoidable imperfections of this state, and partly from the ignorance of mankind. We, also, utterly deny your doctrine of a future state, and the universal salvation of mankind by a resurrection of the dead. Consequently, this life is our all. We expect no other. We have our portion in this life. Now we have learned by experience, that if we would enjoy the most, and the best of this life, we must avoid all those excesses which are productive of physical evils; because all physical evils have a tendency to shorten life; and consequently, our motive to temperance, and to the avoiding of all kinds of excess, must be as strong as is our love of life, and fear of death. But there are motives with which Universalism can never inspire a man. You teach that all evil will eventuate in good. We believe, that evil is nothing but evil, and evil continually. You believe that if a man by intemperance, or even by the pistol or the halter deprive himself of his mortal life, there is another and a better life awaiting him beyond the grave. We believe that we can never enjoy any but the present life, and that we should, therefore, be as careful of it as possible. But prodigality of life, and consequently the not shunning of those physical evils by which life may be abridged, will but hasten *you* on your heavenward passage. Now, sir, judge which system, Universalism or Atheism, is calculated to inspire with the strongest motives for the practising of what men call virtue?

Universalist. I have never before thought of these things. I have, however, one advantage which you do not possess. I can enjoy the hope of immortality, and live rich in anticipation, while I do live, and this is what no Atheist can do. I would not lose

the hope of immortality for all the world. It would fill my mind with horror to contemplate the shortness and uncertainty of life, the certainty of death, and the eternal loss of conscious existence. I cannot bear to think of such things!

Atheist. All that is very possible. I was not, however, asking what you would like, nor what you would dislike. I was showing you the inevitable moral effects of Universalism. That very immortality in which you so much delight, is, in the way in which you hold it, the root of many evils. If I believed, sir, as you profess to believe, I should be always cautious not to speak of immortality as a life to be bestowed upon the wicked; because if any wicked man would or could believe such a doctrine, with all his heart, he might hasten his mortal life to a close as soon as possible, that he might leap out of his sins here, and his wretchedness, the effect of sins, into everlasting glory. Why might he not? If he should feel any scruples of conscience while closing his mortal career, he might quell them by saying with you,

In spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever is, is right.

Universalist. Our opponents have often said that if they believed as we do, they would kill themselves, in order that they might get to heaven sooner. But it is evident that they do not know what they would do. One thing is certain—that there are not more instances of suicide among us than among other denominations. We consider suicide as contrary to the law of God, and hence good Universalists cannot commit it.

Atheist. Is God's law contrary to his own will?

Universalist. No.

Atheist. Then if suicide is contrary to the law of God, it must also be contrary to his will, and if contrary to his will, then the will of God can be opposed; and if the will of God is opposed in one violation of the law, it is opposed in every violation of the law; and if it is opposed in every, or in any violation of the law, your whole theory concerning the origin, as well as the consequences of evil, falls to the ground.

A. RAINES.

NOTE.—The reader will observe, that the arguments urged against Universalism

in this dialogue, are directed exclusively against those systems of Universalism, which deny all punishment after death: a doctrine, in our estimation, more demoralizing than even Atheism!!

A. R.

Paris, Ky., June 1st, 1836.

Abner Kneeland and Infidelity.

We find that we were not mistaken in our last, in regard to Abner Kneeland, when we said, "From what we have learned he was once a Universalist, a preacher of that sect." He has been more than that. Bro. A. Campbell in "Notes on a tour to the North East—No. 1." says of a "little blind oracle, called the "Ohio Watchman," published at Ravenna; "The association of gentlemen which edits the semi-demi grey sheet, having upon their hands law, literature, and other county affairs, are constrained to enrich their columns by occasional drafts on the sophistical and filthily columns of the apostate Kneeland, now of the "Boston Investigator," who has boxed the compass of all errors, from the extreme of hypercalvinism to the extreme of ultra atheism." So he has boxed the compass of all errors in religion! And this is the man who now stands at the head of the Infidel party in the United States! Really such a man is worthy to be the head of such a body! What confidence can be reposed in the judgement and discrimination of a man who has thus veered to every point of the compass of error? He may be well acquainted with the errors and perversions of religion, but not real religion itself. We suspect that he has been so bewildered and bewarped by the systems of error through which he has passed, that he cannot tell what the Christian religion is; and does not know what he is opposing.

In our little article on "Infidelity" in our last, we omitted some remarks which we intended to have made. They were, that the infidels in pretending to oppose the Christian religion, were not really contending against Christianity but against the sectarian errors and perversions of it; and were thus endeavoring to overthrow the religion itself, by exposing these! This is unfair, unjust, and ungentlemanly in the extreme; and reflects badly upon the judg-

ment, honesty and integrity of those engaged in such a course. Sectarian systems may quake before them, but Christianity fears them not. Panoplied in the armour of fact and truth, she has withstood their single and combined assaults for eighteen hundred years, and come off victorious from every contest, adding new trophies to her triumphs. Her greatest victories are perhaps yet future. She shall march from conquest to conquest until she achieves a universal victory.—The follow-observations from the "Notes" alluded to above, shall suffice here upon this subject.

"These crusaders against the hope of immortality pride themselves in their ability to expose some of the weaknesses, and follies, and waywardness of sectarianism; as if the errors and obliquities of the rival creeds and antagonist parties which have grown up in days of apostacy and degeneracy, were identical with the truths of the Bible; or as if the refutation of these necessarily impaired the pillars of revelation, or diminished its claims upon the understanding and the affections of mankind. Inconsiderate sophists they doubtless are, who imagine that the truth of the New Institution, now almost two thousand years old, can be affected by the fates or fortunes of any sect or tenet which originated centuries after the religion was divinely established. As rationally might some driveller in a new theory of nature attempt the reputation of Newton's Principia because of the quarrels of some students in the junior class in one of the academies of the state of Ohio, or by exposing their errors in logic while quoting the words of the prince of natural philosophers. The gospel which promises the friendship and favor of the Almighty, which opens to us the eternal future, and places within our reach the bliss of immortal life and glory, rests not upon ingenious theories or speculative doctrines on things celestial, terrestrial; but on the strong basis of incontrovertible facts and the faithful testimonies of a host of peerless witnesses, the consecrated martyrs of Jesus the Messiah.

"This, though a more inquisitive age than some which preceded it, is, nevertheless, neither so intelligent nor discriminating in religion as its own interests demand, or its means and opportunities of improvement would seem to afford. How far the substitution of partizan tenets for the words of eternal truth, and the adoption of human standards of thinking and speaking in room of the Divine Scriptures, may have contributed to this state of things, we do not now

inquire; nor is it so useful or important as to ascertain how these evils may be remedied, and a more salutary and reviving order of things introduced.

"On all hands it is agreed that the existence and multiplication of sects and parties has greatly impeded the onward march and triumphant career of the true gospel. This we attempted to illustrate and enforce in our first speech in Ravenna; as also the necessity and utility of a more rational reading and examination of both the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. In other addresses in this place it was shown that Heaven's plan always terminated in making partial evils universal good—or rather in educating out of evil good, "and better still in infinite progression:" so in the case of this mammoth evil, it appeared he was about to destroy sectarianism by sectarianism—aided and supported by the cavils and oppositions of atheists and sceptics and the whole herd of scoffers who now sit in the high places of the scorners, and feast upon the putridities of the morbid frame of sectarian christianity.

"In the prosecution of the probabilities of this consummation of all rivalries amongst God's children, it seemed to gain in the estimation of all, that in the struggles of the discordant spirits of the age the partition walls of the sects will all be shattered to pieces, and an era of united faith and harmonious concert succeed ages of discord and distracted effort. But we are not to imagine that the mere tendencies of this strife, or that the agencies now among the sects will thus terminate, or secure so desirable an issue to the cause of truth and human happiness. The opposition of infidelity will compel the advocates of faith against atheism to betake themselves to original ground, to abandon the war of rival opinions, called doctrines and tenets, to betake themselves to the facts of the apostles, and to their method of stating, illustrating, and proving them. Again the advances already made towards the ancient order of things, together with the clear exhibition of the original gospel, so far as moral means are concerned will no doubt, in conjunction with those singular and unintentional allies, introduce a new and happier era in society."

EDITOR.

The religion of Deism.

[From Bishop Hopkins' "Christianity Vindicated."]

Some of the ancient philosophers believed in many gods; some thought there was none; and others, that there were gods, but that

it was beneath their dignity to take any notice of human affairs. And amongst the moderns, the same variety of sentiment exists. Some have been actual Atheists, as Spinoza and Mirabeau. Some have been Deists, as Herbert, Rousseau, Volney, Hume, and many others. Some teach that there is no difference between vice and virtue, that there is no future state, and that this life is the whole of our existence. Others believe that the soul is immortal, and that there is a judgment to come, but only because it seems to them a more reasonable belief than the opposite. All agree in vilifying the Bible in some way or other, although some of them praise its morality and its sublimity in the warmest terms; but no one pretends to give any proof that his system is the true one, beyond the arguments of his own reason. Now, if our objector designs to cast off Christianity, in order to take his notions of religion from the philosophic school, we ask, which of them he will select, and on what principles he will make the selection? They all agree in pulling down the Christian system, but they differ, egregiously, in the structure which they would build upon its ruins. They all deny that our proofs are sufficient, and then modestly ask us to adopt their notions, without any proof whatever. They scorn the evidence of miracle and prophecy, and talk about the superior claims of reason; but the reason of one proves that there is a God, and the reason of another proves that there is none. The reason of a third establishes the immortality of the soul, and the reason of a fourth laughs at it, as an absurd superstition. Where is the guide—where the teacher, upon whose system the heart and understanding of a searcher after truth can repose with security? Alas! bewildered and lost must be the mind, that attempts to follow the mazes of extravagance and impiety, set before him by the infidel philosophers of the world. Many of them were men of splendid talents, commanding eloquence, and extensive learning; but the pride of intellect, and the thirst after fame misled them. They lost the docility and candor so necessary to every searcher after truth; and instead of being friends to the happiness, the morality, and the eternal welfare of their fellows, they spread around them the infection of a moral pestilence, and scattered the flowers of genius upon the path of ruin and despair.

We repeat, therefore, my brethren, that the choice we have to make in this matter, is between the religion of the Scriptures, and none. There is no religion of nature. This is but a delusive title, given by men to systems of their own devising; in which the

little good they contained, was stolen from the Bible; but put together, after their own fancy, without a shadow of proof or authority. The philosophers who have distinguished themselves in this way, differed among themselves, and their notions were utterly useless to direct the conduct, to guide the aims, to restrain the passions, or to console the hearts of men. Who ever saw a congregation of Deists established in the worship of the God whom they pretended to acknowledge? Who ever saw the family of a Deist gathered together, to unite with him in praise and prayer? Who ever heard that the belief of a Deist had power to assuage the pains of a dying bed, and enable the spirit to depart in the confidence of hope and joy? Oh no! my brethren; it is only the religion of Christ, which possesses those characters of true conviction. It is only the Gospel of Christ which can purify and strengthen the soul. Other systems may amuse the fancy, but this alone can take hold of the affections and the will. The religion of the Deist may engage the intellect, but it is only the religion of the Bible that can warm the heart.

Awful consequences of Atheism and Infidelity.

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO SOCIETY.

Few men suspect, perhaps no man comprehends, the extent of the support given by religion to the virtues of ordinary life. No man perhaps is aware, how much our moral and social sentiments are fed from this fountain; how powerless conscience would become without the belief of a God; how palsied would be human benevolence, were there not the sense of higher benevolence to quicken and sustain it; how suddenly the whole social fabric would quake, and with what a fearful crash it would sink into hopeless ruins, were the ideas of a Supreme Being, of accountableness, and of a future life, to be utterly erased from every mind. Once let men thoroughly believe that they are the work and sport of chance; that no superior intelligence concerns itself with human affairs; that all their improvements perish forever at death; that the weak have no guardian, and the injured no avenger; that there is no recompense for sacrifices to uprightnes and the public good; that an oath is unheard in heaven; that secre-

crimes have no witness but the perpetrator; that human existence has no purpose, and human virtue no unfailing friend; that this brief life is every thing to us, and death is total, everlasting extinction; once let men thoroughly abandon religion, and who can conceive or describe the extent of the desolation which would follow? We hope perhaps that human laws and natural sympathy would hold society together. As reasonably might we believe, that were the sun quenched in the heavens, our torches could illuminate, and our fires quicken and fertilize the earth. What is there in human nature to awaken respect and tenderness, if man is the unprotected insect of a day? and what is he more, if atheism be true? Erase all thought and fear of God from a community, and selfishness and sensuality would absorb the whole man. Appetite, knowing no restraint, and poverty and suffering, having no solace or hope, would trample in scorn on the restraints of human laws. Virtue, duty, principle, would be mocked and spurned as unmeaning sounds. A sordid self-interest would supplant every other feeling, and man would become in fact, what the theory of atheism declares him to be, a companion for brutes.

It particularly deserves attention in this discussion, that the christian religion is singularly important to free communities. In truth we may doubt whether civil freedom can subsist without it. This at least we knew, that equal rights and an impartial administration of justice, have never been enjoyed where this religion has not been understood. It favors free institutions, first, because its spirit is the very spirit of liberty; that is, a spirit of respect for the interests and rights of others. Christianity recognises the essential equality of mankind; beats down with its whole might those aspiring and rapacious principles of our nature, which have subjected the many to the few; and, by its refining influence, as well as by direct precept, turns to God, and to Him only, that supreme homage which has been so impiously lavished on crowned and titled

fellow creatures. Thus its whole tendency is free. It lays deeply the only foundations of liberty, which are the principles of benevolence, justice, and respect for human nature. The spirit of liberty is not merely, as multitudes imagine, a jealousy of our own particular rights, an unwillingness to be oppressed ourselves, but a respect for the rights of others, and an unwillingness that any man, whether high or low, should be wronged, and trampled under foot. Now this is the spirit of Christianity; and liberty has no security, any farther than this uprightness and benevolence of sentiment actuates a community.

In another method religion befriends liberty. It diminishes the necessity of public restraints, and supersedes in a great degree the use of force in administering the laws; and this it does, by making men a law to themselves, and by repressing the disposition to disturb and injure society. Take away the purifying and restraining influence of religion, and selfishness, rapacity, and injustice will break out in new excesses; and amidst the increasing perils of society, government must be strengthened to defend it, must accumulate means of repressing disorder and crime; and this strength and these means may be, and often have been, turned against the freedom of the state which they were meant to secure. Diminish principle, and you increase the need of force in a community. In this country, government needs not the array of power which you meet in other nations,—no guards of soldiers, no hosts of spies, no vexatious regulations of police; but accomplishes its beneficent purposes by a few unarmed judges and civil officers, and operates so silently around us, and comes so seldom in contact with us, that many of us enjoy its blessings with hardly a thought of its existence. This is the perfection of freedom; and to what do we owe this condition? I answer, to the power of those laws which Religion writes on our hearts, which unite and concentrate public opinion against injustice and oppression, which spread a spir-

it of equity and good will through the community. Thus religion is the soul of freedom, and no nation under heaven has such an interest in it as ourselves.—*Dr. W. E. Channing.*

Pitts' Book on Baptism Reviewed and Exposed.

NO. I.

A Book on Baptism: chiefly designed as a refutation of the errors and infidelity of Campbellism. By F. E. Pitts. Nashville: Printed at the Western Methodist Office 1835. 24 mo. pp. 185.

It has been remarked by the intelligent and observing, that every book has a *spirit*; and the observation is consistent with what we know of spiritual operations. It is through the medium of oral and written language, that mind or spirit operates upon mind, and produces all the various, multi-form and wonderful effects which we are daily in the habit of witnessing. Through the influence of *language*, the civil and military powers of countries have been set in array and roused into action, nations have been convulsed, empires overthrown, and political, religious and literary revolutions effected, which, perhaps, will be felt until time shall be no more.

That there is a spirit in every book may be inferred from expressions which have become common from their truth. We say of an author sometimes, that he has inspired his readers with his *spirit*; and of a reader, that he has drank deeply into the *spirit* of an author's writings. Writers have sometimes so deeply imbibed the spirit of a favorite author, that they come to habitually imitate him in the style and language of their productions, and the imitations are sometimes so close that they can with difficulty be distinguished from the originals. This propensity to imitate may often be detected in communications in periodicals, which the authors of them are in the habit of reading much. Man, in fact, is the creature of imitation and education; and being thus under the influence of minds alike constituted but farther advanced than his own, he falls into the same trains and modes of thinking and writing.—If there is not a *spirit* in every book, why in reading a dull and prosing author, do we be-

come dull?—why in reading an animating and fervid writer, do we become animated and excited?—why in reading an imaginative and fanciful author, do we become imaginative and fanciful? Every one who has read much knows that well written works exercise a wonderful influence over the mind.—Books are like company. When in company, we are very prone to imbibe its spirit and fall into its conversations and amusements.—That there is a spirit in a book, would seem to be very probable from the wonderful influence which books often exercise over the conversations, actions and conduct of people. Good books excite them to good, and bad books to evil.

If every book has a spirit, how many *evil spirits* have gone out into the world! How cautious should we be about what we read, and how we read and suffer ourselves to be influenced by it! How very cautious should we be, about what we influence and induce others to read, and the books we throw in their way or place in their hands! These numerous spirits have done a world of injury, and there is much, great danger of being seduced and led astray by them! "Beloved," says John in first epistle, "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." He has furnished us with an infallible rule by which to try them, whether they are of God or not. "We [apostles] 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." It is in the New Testament, the word of God, that we hear the apostles; and it is by their writings that we are to "try the spirits." As every book has a spirit, so has "THE BOOK," the Bible, its *Spirit*. The writers of the Bible being inspired by the Holy Spirit, and the Bible having been written under the influence of that Spirit, the HOLY SPIRIT is the *Spirit* of the Bible. In trying all other books by this Book, we are trying all these other spirits by this Spirit.

The little book, the title page of which we have prefixed to this article, like all other books has its *spirit*, and a very evil and false spirit it is! Pardon the severity of the expression. We speak plainly,

for the subject which we are now upon requires plain speaking. The book where it has had any influence seems to have infused, we do not say the same kind of spirit that is in it, but, a very bad spirit of some sort, into those who have read it, manifested by a mad, blind and unreasonable opposition to the Reformation.

It is difficult to review a *bad* book in a *good* spirit. The continual provocations with which we meet, will irritate us, unless we have a greater command over our minds and tempers than people generally have. We will however try to review this "book on baptism" in the best spirit and temper we can.

It may be inquired of us, what business have we reviewing and exposing a work which seems to be written in opposition to the sentiments of another and a particular individual? To this we reply, that the obvious design of the book was to injure and prostrate a common cause, in which we, in common with that individual, are engaged; and that hence we consider ourselves perfectly justifiable in reviewing and exposing it. How unfair are the means which have been here used, will be shown as we proceed.

We may be also asked, why have we taken up this work now—and let it alone so long? why not have reviewed it earlier? To this we reply, that before this year our situation was such, that we could not probably have reviewed it at all, or at least as we wished, and even this year our situation has not permitted us to do it until now.

Added to this; it is perhaps almost impossible to review a production of this kind as calmly and dispassionately as it ought to be done, when the impressions of a first perusal are fresh upon our minds, and the excitement by it has not abated; and it is perhaps equally as impossible for such a review to be read or listened to by others in a different state of excitement upon the same subject, as calmly and dispassionately as it ought to be.

Besides, this is a *Tennessee* production, published in the state in which this paper is published, dedicated to the preachers of the Methodist annual Conference, and circulated principally in this State. To notice and review it, then, would fall more

properly within our sphere, than that of any of our periodicals.

We shall endeavour to show, God being willing, that Mr. Pitts has grossly misrepresented bro. Campbell; that he has perverted and misapplied the Scriptures; that he has been guilty of the very same things which he condemns in bro. C.; and that he has asserted positive falsehoods.

EDITOR.

For the Christian Reformer.

Dr. Fishback and the Reformation.

Bro. Howard;—In the 3d No. of the "Reformer" you have published a piece on "Religious Enthusiasm," taken from the "Philosophy of the human mind, &c." a book published by Dr. James Fishback, of Lexington, Ky. in 1835; upon which you make some remarks, predicated upon intelligence which I think incorrect.

You observe, that the most recent accounts you have had of him, is "that he now is, and has been for some time past, one of our opposers, strange as it may appear from the tenor of his writings." Now, bro. Howard, what are we to understand by "one of our opposers?" Do you mean that he is "opposed" to the pious orderly professors of the Christian Religion? Or whom do you include in the word "our?" With whom are you identified? Is it not with the Christians? If so, why should you be tempted to say, he is one of "our opposers?" You cannot certainly mean that he is opposed to the system of Christianity—the philanthropy and benevolence of God towards a lost world! This no one who knows him will venture to say. His piety and uprightness are above suspicion. His long and entire devotion of time, talents, and money to the cause of God and man, prove that so far from being "opposed" to the interests of Christianity, or its professors, that all his energies "are now, and have been for many years past," devoted to advance both.

I apprehend that your meaning is, that the Doctor is opposed to the "present reformation." If this be your meaning, you ought, in justice to yourself and the Doctor, to have made some explanation, at least told in what this opposition consists, or whether he is opposed in part or in whole to the reformation, or whether or not, his opposition is not directed to the correction of some one or more leading ideas or opinions held by some of the reformers. I think some such course would have suited the case better. Our object is *truth*, whether it comes from

friend or enemy; and when we speak either, they should have their due.

Had you told your readers, that this same "able writer among the Baptists," was "opposed" to one of the leading sentiments contended for by many of the reformers, you would have hit the "opposition" exactly. Although a reformer himself, yet his candour and love of truth move him to oppose and endeavour to correct error wherever found. He is for a thorough reformation, one that begins in our own hearts first, extends to our families, then to the church, and finally to the world. His fellowships upon a broad basis—he fellowships all in Christ, and the test of that fellowship, is the pious *doer*, and not the hearer only of God's word.

The sentiment incorporated in this reformation, and to which the Doctor is opposed, is thus expressed by Mr. Campbell, in answer to a query sent him from Lexington, Kentucky.

"Query. Is it, or is it not, through faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, that we receive the remission of our sins in the act of immersion?"

"Answer. I had thought, that in my Essays on immersion, this point was fully settled. Every single blessing, and all blessings collectively appertaining to salvation, flow to us from the sacrifice of Jesus the Son of God. The value and efficacy of his sacrifice, is the very document itself which constitutes the burthen of the testimony. Belief of this testimony is what impels us into the water. Knowing that the efficacy of this blood is to be communicated to our consciences, in the way in which God has pleased to appoint, "we stagger not at the promise of God;" but flee to the sacred Ordinance, which brings the blood of Jesus, in contact with our consciences. Without knowing and believing this, immersion is empty as a blasted nut. The shell is there but the kernel is wanting."—*Christian Baptist*, vol. 6. page 160.

Here you have the *sentiment* to which the Doctor is "opposed," and his opposition to it has been uniform. There is no doctrine, in the Christian economy, for which he contends more earnestly, than he does for the old protestant principle "justification by faith;" and he maintains, that this doctrine is a test, as it held "either soundly or unsoundly of a rising or falling church." Is it not reasonable then, that he should have opposed the introduction of a *principle*, which, in his judgement, was fraught with so much evil to the church? And is it not unreasonable in us, to speak of this opposition, in whole-sale way?

If the *reception* of the opinion, that the

remission of sins is obtained alone through immersion, is necessary to the constituting of a reformer, then I have erred in saying that the Doctor was a reformer, as he rejects this opinion; and it does seem, from the conversation, preaching and writing of some, that no man can be a reformer without he receives this doctrine, in its length and breadth. And with too many, it seems to be *alone* the test of fellowship.

No man in the community, regretted more than the Doctor did, when he saw in Mr. Campbell's writing, the gradual preparation for the full development of his exclusive views relative to immersion. His mortification was unfeigned, for he had felt a lively interest for the progress of a thorough reformation, which he had been struggling to advance for more than Twenty years. And when Mr. Campbell commenced writing, and advocating the doctrine of a reformation the Dr. was more than gratified, for he saw in him a clearness of intellect,—a power of mind, together with an independent bearing, that promised much; and in him he expected to find a co-worker under God, in advancing the good cause he had at heart. He wrote many pieces in the "Christian Baptist" which met with the undivided approbation of all the intelligent who felt a solicitude for a reformation.

But when Mr. Campbell gave his views in full upon immersion, suspending the efficacy of the blood of Christ, as he avowed it was according to God's appointment, upon the act of immersion,—"adding "that without knowing and believing this (viz. "that in this sacred ordinance the blood of Jesus is brought in contact with our consciences,") "immersion is as empty as a blasted nut, the Shell is there but the kernel is wanting." When the Doctor read this, he laid down the pamphlet, expressing his sorrow that after so many years labour—Mr. Campbell should now make it necessary that all the correct principles which belong to the reformation, should be brought to bolster up this exclusive view of immersion, and thus clog the wheels of the reformation. He regretted that ever Mr. Campbell had "disinherited," this sentiment, which Mr. Campbell said "had lain in the rubbish of ages," and which the Doctor thought would have, in all probability, slept until the rubbish was consumed by the purifying fire of the last day, had not Mr. Campbell waved his magic wand over it. And that in his zeal he had erred; for instead of raising a Christian "relic," he had brought up the Ghost of a Roman Catholic error, and one too (when animated by a correspondent spirit) of no small magnitude. In the mind of a Catho-

lic it clothes the priest with more authority than God has ever conferred upon any mortal. It was made a source of revenue, both to the priests and mid-wives, who under this view, administered the ordinance of baptism, in every form, and to all classes of people, and to all conditions,—even the unconscious and dying infant was made to receive the benefit of this efficacious sacrament. Such were the effects of this *sentiment* among the Roman Catholics, when it was unguarded by faith and repentance, and a want of the knowledge of the word of God.

"The Council of Trent decreed, that whosoever shall say that the infant in Baptism is not purified from sin and regenerated let him be "accused."

But the abuse of a principle, is no reason for its rejection; if so, the Christian system might, long since, have been cast aside. The Doctor felt that an old error was about to be revived, and attached to the car of the reformation, which would, to some extent, paralyze the labours of many years. He was admonished of this by a knowledge of the 16th century, when this same sentiment, was one of the obstacles that Luther and others had to contend with, and he was fearful that its blighting influence might retard the present revival of primitive Christianity.

You may take all the leading scriptural "Items," of the reformation and compare them one by one with the writings of Doctor Fishback since 1809, up to the last Book published in 1834, and you will find a singular correspondence.

He has formally exploded natural religion, or rather a system called natural religion. No system has more obstructed the glorification of the word of God than this. It was maintained, by the clergy, of all orders, in every age, for the last fifteen hundred years, and for a man to call the truth of it, in question, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, hazarded his reputation for common sense. In fact a Rev. D. D. said the Doctor was a fool; that he certainly had gone beside himself; for he was in the face of all, the highest authority. But sir, the Doctor loves truth for truth's sake and is not to be seduced from it by the loaves and fishes, or the trappings of party.

Upon the subject of *faith*, according to common sense, he has been more lucid than any other man who has ever written. A piece published in the Christian Baptist, taken from a defence made by the Doctor in behalf of the Elkhorn Association in 1822, received the highest praise from bro: Campbell and his numerous readers. The above corresponds with the extract you made, and both contain sentiments which I have heard

him express, perhaps, a thousand times, and no doubt, he still entertains and expresses the same when ever he speaks or preaches upon this subject.

My object in writing, is to relieve you and your readers from error, and to remove any imputation which may have fallen upon the Doctor, arising from your misinformation relative to him; as his dissenting from one of the leading ideas of the Reformation, ought not to bring him in collision with the whole,—except its friends think the idea he opposes, contains the whole reformation.

I have in my possession nearly all the writings of the Doctor, from his first production, up to this time, from which I can furnish you occasional extracts; and which I feel convinced will entirely refute the charge which some have been pleased to prefer against him; which is, that he has repeatedly *changed* his views of the word of God, since he made a profession of religion. He has improved, which every religious man ought to do.

E. R. O.

Reply to the preceding Letter.

Brother E. R. O.—It is with cheerfulness that I give a place to your communication in my paper. My real and avowed object being *truth*, I can have no interest in propagating error or misrepresentation of any kind, or in sustaining and defending it when I once have been instrumental in its dissemination. And it is certainly the duty of our brethren, when we have been the occasion of misrepresenting others, to inform us of it, that it may be corrected. If I have cast any unjust imputations upon Dr. Fishback, it was in consequence of misinformation; and I will most cheerfully remove them.

The assertion which I made about the Dr. was predicated upon the following information from an article in the March no. of the Gospel Advocate, published at Lexington, Ky.; by bro. John T. Johnson, one of its editors:

"The reformation principles have been so grossly traduced and caricatured by Doctor Fishback in his fourth number published in the Baptist Banner, that we design to place his conduct before the public, that they may know what reliance is to be placed in his word or promise, however solemnly pledged. He adverts to and adopts the following sentiment of Luther in regard to justification—"the doctrine of justification or forgiveness

of sin, is the test of a standing or falling church. If right in this we cannot be far wrong in any thing else." "Now (says the Doctor,) I do not hesitate with full consideration of the subject to pronounce that the reformation is wholly wrong on the subject of justification and forgiveness of sins, and therefore it is not easy to suppose it right in any thing else. It would be just as unreasonable to look for an humble, orderly, prayerful, pious life to grow out of it, as to look for an angel of light supported by a cloven foot."

"A division had taken place in the congregation at Mt. Vernon, Woodford County, Ky.—Each party was in the occupancy of the house two Lord's days in each month. On one occasion when our friends had assembled to worship according to previous notice of some weeks, and a large audience was in attendance to hear us, the Doctor took possession of the meeting house early in the day and before our usual time for commencing worship, with the design of preventing us from using the house. He ascended the pulpit about 11 o'clock without any ceremony and was about to commence, when, at the request of some of the Brethren, the undersigned [John T. Johnson] approached him to know his designs. After bestowing upon our Brethren of that congregation several abusive epithets, for which he was reminded he would have to answer his Master, he remarked that his brethren and himself had always been prepared to adjust the difficulty by a reference. To which I replied, that our friends had expressed a similar desire and preparation to me—not however to leave it to him or his friends, but to a disinterested umpire to be chosen by the parties. The Doctor expressed great gratification in private, stating that he would then make a statement of the circumstances to the audience—occupy till 12 o'clock and retire. We concluded under that pledge to remain. The Doctor however, arose and expressed his gratification at learning, as he said for the first time, that our friends were willing to submit the difficulty, the law and facts of the case as before stated. He was however abusive and severe upon our brethren.—And I availed myself of the occasion as offered by the Doctor, to state the terms of the proposition, and that our Brethren assured me that they had been ever ready to take the course then agreed on. That in consequence, however, of the abuse of the Brethren just then heard, we would retire to the woods and worship—which we accordingly did; and it must have been a deep

source of mortification to the Doctor that so few were left to hear him."

"He has induced one of his friends to swear a Bill in chancery, which seeks to restrain our friends from the present use of the house, until a final decision can be had: And if I have not been misinformed, applications to Judge Wilson of that circuit, and to Judge Hickey, for an injunction had proved unsuccessful—of which, an application to Judge Robbins succeeded—and our friends are for the present restrained from worshipping in the house."

Thus you see, bro. E. R. O., that my information is from an eye and ear witness of the Dr.'s conduct, and extracts from his own writings; and thus you see that he is opposed to us in every respect, that he will not admit us to be right in any thing, and that he opposes us in our worship as well as in our sentiments, showing by his conduct that he does not even allow us to be right in that! (If we are wrong must not he be wrong in all the points in which we agree?) If our brethren are pious and orderly, does not this look like he is "opposed to the pious, orderly professors of the Christian religion?" I profess to be identified with "the Christians." I regard those with whom I am connected as Christians, because they believe and obey the Lord Jesus Christ, not in a few, but in all things. With me, faith and obedience are the great tests of Christian character and conduct; not the one without the other, but both united. And in opposing us, then, if we are what we profess to be, is not Dr. Fishback opposing "Christians?" And in opposing the sentiments of such, is he not opposing the "system of Christianity?" Can we, in the face of such conduct as we see he has been guilty of, besides other that I have not brought forward, say that "his piety and uprightness are above suspicion?"—You understand me now, when I say that the Dr. is opposed to the "present reformation;" and you know the grounds that I have for saying so.—When our brethren are both hearers and doers of the word, and he not only refuses to fellowship them, but opposes them in every way he can with all his might does he fellowship all in Christ; and is the test of his fellowship, "the pious doer and not the hearer only of God's word?" Is his fellowship on a broad or narrow basis? Is not opinions and not facts, theory and not

practice, the bond and test of his fellowship?—We plead for as thorough a reformation as he can; and one that commences in the heart, and extends to the conduct, the church, and the world! Those well acquainted with our sentiments are compelled to admit this. The objection made to us, is not that we plead for too little, but for *too much*, too thorough, a reformation!

I think that Dr. Fishback and yourself have both entirely misunderstood bro. Campbell; that is, if he understands him as you seem to do. You say that his views suspend the efficacy of the blood of Christ upon the act of immersion. Now I do not understand this to be his meaning at all. Notice well the quotation above, which you have made from him, and you will see that it is the virtue of immersion which he suspends upon faith in the blood of Christ, not the virtue of Christ's blood upon faith in immersion. "Without knowing or believing this, *immersion* [not faith in the blood of Christ] is as empty as a blasted nut."—The following extract from his review of "Dr. Fishback's Book—No. 2," Mill Harbinger, No. 5, (May) 1835, shows that Dr. Fishback has wholly misapprehended and misrepresented bro. Campbell:

"The most uncandid thing in the Doctor's book, is his repeated efforts to affix upon the disciples of Christ the stigma of disparaging the sacrifice of the Son of God, by substituting a gospel ordinance for the blood of the New Institution. "*Belief in something, and in baptism in order to remission, and obedience by baptism, or by immersion,*" says he, "secures the remission of *their* sins, or justifies them as sinners without the blood of Christ." And, he adds, "Remission of sins, in their judgement, is, by divine appointment, suspended upon faith and the act of immersion, to the exclusion altogether of the sacrificial death, and expiatory offering of the body and blood of Christ." A more reckless and unfounded calumny was never penned, as far as known to me. I neither know nor acknowledge any man as a christian brother, who teaches or practices such principles.

"We have published and republished, from Dan to Beersheba, that faith, repentance, and baptism, without "the sacrificial death, and expiatory offering of the body and blood of Christ," however sincere and scriptural they may be, are not worth more than a blue bead in the affair of remission of sins, or acceptance with God. And I have yet to be

introduced to the first evangelist in these United States, who preaches faith, repentance, reformation, baptism, as of any value without the acknowledgement and cordial reception of the blood of Christ, as the only procuring and efficient cause of remission."

This shows the indispensable necessity of faith in the blood of Christ as the alone procuring cause of the remission of sins, in order to the reception and enjoyment of pardon; and that the efficacy of the blood of Christ is not suspended upon immersion, but that of immersion upon the blood of Christ. Now I think that you must admit, as much as bro. C., that faith in the blood of Christ is indispensably necessary to pardon? But so far is bro. C. from making baptism what you endeavor to show he does, that he admits that the baptism of a person regarding Jesus as the Messiah and having faith in his blood, will secure to that person, or put him into, the possession of the remission of his sins, although he may at the time have been ignorant of the real design of the institution. The following part of a "dialogue on re-immersion" exhibits his sentiments. The dialogue is between Alexander (bro C.) and Rufus, who had been re-immersed, in consequence of not understanding the meaning of the ordinance when first baptized.

R.—I was about that time [referring to his first baptism] immersed without understanding the meaning of it, and had no respect to the remission of my sins in immersion: for I believed that I was forgiven six months before my immersion, through faith in the blood of Jesus:

A.—you had faith, then, in the blood of Jesus, and consequently regarded him as the Messiah.

R.—yes: I had faith in him, indeed; but I was not immersed for the remission of my sins. I was immersed because Jesus was immersed in the Jordan, and because he commanded all believers to be immersed.

A.—And such a baptism as this you now say is no better than no baptism or infant sprinkling. Does an infant act at all, does its understanding, will, affections, or conscience feel or act in reference to the example, authority, command, or promise of Jesus Christ? Surely you confound things that differ, the breadth and length of heaven!

R.—Oh! there is some difference, indeed! But as touching the remission of sins, an infant as much expected it in its sprinkling, as I in my first immersion.

"A.—That may be; for you said that you thought; nay, were assured, that your sins were remitted six months before you were immersed. But this, in my judgment, constitutes no reason why you should, after ten years citizenship in the kingdom of Christ, be again immersed. When I was naturalized a citizen of these United States there were certain immunities and privileges attached to citizenship which I had not in my mind at that time; nor were they any inducement to me to be naturalized, any more than to that child now sleeping in the arms of its mother. But did that circumstance annul my naturalization, and leave me an alien?" * * * *

"The not understanding of this institution has prevented many christians from enjoying its benefits; but the not understanding it does not make them *aliens* from the kingdom of Jesus." * * * "I was constitutionally naturalized, though I did not understand all its benefits, nor seek all the privileges of a citizen. My political new birth, and your christian new birth were pretty much alike. I had thought that living on the American soil, and being well disposed to the government, I was, before my naturalization, entitled to certain privileges of a citizen. But such misconceptions did not annul the constitutionality of the act. I renounced all foreign allegiance in the words of the act. I ask you, then, did you not confess that Jesus was the Messiah, and did you not cordially renounced every other mediator, prophet, or king? And were you not immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? And can you think that you supposing your sins were pardoned before your baptism, or that your not having all the meaning of baptism before your mind, made your immersion unconstitutional; and left you an alien from the kingdom of God—indeed, in the kingdom of Satan?" * * * "The meaning of any institution, and the belief in the testimony of God concerning Jesus, his person, office, character, and work, are very different things. Though to the more enlightened they are intimately connected, yet experience proves, and observation attests, that many believe in him who do not understand his institutions."

You say that it seems from the conversation, preaching and writing of some, that no man can be a reformer, without he receives the doctrine that remission of sins is obtained alone through immersion, in its length and breadth; and that the reception of this "opinion," as you are pleased to call it, with

too many seems to be *alone* the test of fellowship! Now, I think that you are very much mistaken here. Is not every man who reforms any, a reformer in some sense of the word, a reformer in a greater or less degree? And I must say that I have never met with the first brother yet, who made the reception of any opinion or sentiment a bond of fellowship. Were this the case with us, we might receive into our union, some of the most wicked and profane men in the country, who profess to receive the sentiment that baptism is for the remission of sins. The test of fellowship with us is not the mere holding of certain sentiments or "opinions," but belief *and* OBEDIENCE of the truth, the reception of Jesus as the Messiah by submitting to his government and laws.

You seem from some of your remarks in regard to Dr. F. and bro. C. inclined to look upon baptism for remission of sins, as the "ghost of a Roman Catholic error." Now, my dear brother, how unwisely are we acting when we refuse to receive any point of doctrine, or condemn an institution because it has been abused and perverted from its real meaning and design! And hence you very truly observe, that "the abuse of a principle is no reason for its rejection, if so, the *Christian System* might long since have been cast aside." The best institutions when perverted and abused, become the worst. The very idea, that baptism is for the *remission of sins*, is sufficient to exclude *infants* from the ordinance, as it cannot be proven that they have any sins imputed to them to be remitted, or a guilty *conscience* to be cleansed from their pollution. You say, speaking of the Roman Catholic abuse of the meaning of baptism, "Such were the effects of this sentiment among the Roman Catholics, when it was unguarded by *faith* and *repentance*, and a *want* of the knowledge of the word of God." In this, I entirely agree with you. Guarded by these, the design of Christian baptism never can be abused or perverted.

You observe that, "this same sentiment [baptism for remission of sins] was one of the obstacles that Luther and others had to contend with." Now would it not seem very strange, if Luther held this sentiment, which constituted such an obstacle to his exertions? Yet such was the fact, as we

are prepared to show.—Luther dissents from Dr. Fishback, and is with us here. The following contains extracts from a faithful translation of his Catechism by Charles Artz of Pittsburgh:

“1st. What is baptism?”

“*Answer.* Baptism is not common water all alone, but it is a water of God’s institution, and combined with the word of God.

“*Question.* What is that word?”

“A. It is the testimony of Matthew, last chapter, where our Lord says: Go ye out into all the world, and teach all nations, and baptize them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

“2nd. What gift is bestowed, or what advantage obtained by baptism?”

A. *By its effects our sins are forgiven*, our souls are delivered from the power of death and Satan, and eternal happiness is bestowed upon all who believe that God means to do what he has said and promised.

“Q. Which are these sayings and promises of God?”

“A. Our Lord Jesus Christ says, according to Mark’s record, in the last chapter:—He who believes and is baptized, shall be saved; but he who believes not, shall be condemned.

“3rd. How can water do such great things?”

“A. Sure enough, it is not the water that does it, but the word of God which is with and by the water, and the faith which believeth that such word of God in the water is true: for without the word of God, the water is simply water, and no baptism; but by the word of God it is become a baptism; that is, a most gracious water of life, and bath of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, as Paul says in the epistle to Titus, chapter iii. ‘God saves us through the bath of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour. That being justified by his favour, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.’ This doctrine is true.

“4th. Such water immersion, then, what does it mean?”

“A. It means that the old Adam within us, through daily repentance and reform, must be drowned, and die with all the sins and bad affections; and that daily there must come out and rise up a new man, to live in righteousness and purity before God to all eternity.

“Q. Where is this written in scripture?”

“A. Paul in the epistle to the Romans, chapter vi. says: ‘We have been buried to-

gether with him by immersion into his death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so also we shall walk in a new life.’”

So you see that Luther coincides with us in this “opinion.” Perhaps you meant that he did not oppose the sentiment itself, but its *perversion*?

As to “justification by faith,” nothing can be more plainly taught in the word of God; but it no where teaches that we are justified by “faith alone.” It teaches the very reverse of this; that “we are justified by works and not by faith only.” Although baptism is not a work of the subject, we are no where said to be justified without it, and never find justification spoken of before, but always after it, as is plain from the characters of those addressed in the epistles, as the justified. Faith is a *principle*; justification is a release or acquittal from sin, by having it forgiven, and implies *action*. It would be anomalous to be justified by a mere *principle*, without an act of some kind. Pardon takes place with God. It is he who forgives. But if it be by faith alone, then it takes place with man entirely, if such a thing can be. It is by obedience to God in baptism, that we are justified upon the principle of faith. Luther did not say that “justification by faith” was the test of a standing or falling church; but “the doctrine of justification or forgiveness of sin.”

You moreover say in conclusion that Dr. F. has been accused of repeatedly changing his views about the word of God, but that he can be defended from this charge of inconsistency.—The following from the same no. of the “Gospel Advocate” containing the extracts made in the commencement of this article, by one who ought to be well acquainted with the Dr.’s former life, shows what his course has been:

“First, the Doctor *was made* a Presbyterian; secondly, he *was made* a Baptist—thirdly, he was discarded by the Baptists and thus *made an Independent*—fourthly, he was very friendly with the reformers, so called, and if not full blooded, was supposed to be quite three fourths—fifthly, he fellow-shipped brethren Palmer, Rogers, Fleming, and even the now despised B. W. Stone, as well as your humble servant, [John T. Johnson,] if frequent solicitations to preach for them at Mt. Vernon is any indication of

fellowship—sixthly headdressed and treated Bro. A Campbell as a Brother long after his views were known on these topics—seventhly, the Doctor produced schisms in the churches at Lexington and Mt. Vernon—eighthly, he healed the breach at Lexington with the view of again uniting with the Association—ninthly, he solicited and obtained admission into the Association. Thus he almost returned whence he first started. And in regard to this great question he contradicts all their creeds.—If we were to judge from the rule adopted by the Doctor, we should be compelled to pronounce him ignorant of the principle of forgiveness of sins, for according to his own shewing, he is seldom right; for he is almost continually changing his positions.”

If the Dr. has been honest in all these changes, must he not have changed his views of the word of God every time?

I acknowledge that I have been indebted to the Dr. for valuable information; and I expect to be his debtor for much more. He has written much that is able and good. Would, that he could agree with his favourite Luther about “the doctrine of justification or forgiveness of sin.”

And now, in conclusion, bro. E. R. O., I think that you and I have said enough about him, at least upon these subjects.

EDITOR.

The Gospel Restored.

This is the title of the volume of the Evangelist for the current year, edited and published by bro. Walter Scott of Carthage, Hamilton Co., Ohio. The Gospel Restored is a regularly written work and the production of bro. Scott. It is a handsome vol of 576 pages, printed with excellent large type on fine good paper. It is altogether worthy of bro. Scott, and contains much valuable and edifying matter, written in a spirit and style truly evangelical, for which bro. Scott's writings have generally been remarkable.—In a letter to me, he says, “It has been a very expensive work truly.” And he has the following remarks concerning it on its cover: “It will readily occur to our subscribers that this work, The Gospel Restored, could not be got up in its present form but at great expense.—Promptitude on their part will of course be very acceptable. Terms, \$2 if paid within the present year. Such as pay \$10 shall

have six copies. All letters must be addressed—WALTER SCOTT, Carthage, Hamilton county Ohio.” The brethren generally would do well to obtain this work; and assist our beloved brother in this his labor of love and for the Lord. But few of them would miss the paltry sum which it costs; and the postage is only 36 cents under 100 miles, and 60 cts. over.—They would here get collected together in a well digested and connected volume, most or all of the most valuable and interesting matter scattered through the preceding vols. of the Evangelist.—The interest and variety of its contents may be inferred from the “Index,” which we here subjoin:

THE FALL.

Introduction.

The Primitive State Considered

Of the Three States, the First State in General, the Religious Principle in the First State, the Nature of Man Generally, Human Life in Particular, Man in regard to Knowledge and Duty, Man's capacity for Happiness, Concerning our First Parents in Paradise, of the Trial of Adam in Knowledge, the Trial of our First Parents in Duty, Law in General, and the Law in Paradise in particular, Trial and Temptation, the Tree of Life, and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, the time our First Parents continued in Paradise.

The Evil State Considered.

Of the Evil State in General, the Temptation by Satan, the Fall of our First Parents, Sin, Opening the Eyes, Conclusion.

The State of Respite Considered.

Of Respite, Reprieve, and Commutation of punishment, God's Address to Satan, Address to the Woman, Address to Adam, the Clothing of our First Parents, the Expulsion from Paradise, the Religion of the State of Respite, the Mosaic account of the Creation, a Succession of Worlds, Satan, Seven kinds of Justice, Remission, the Holy Spirit, Eternal Life, Conclusion of Section First.

THE MESSIAHSHIP.

Introductory, the Recognition of Jesus by his Father, the Messiah's person identified with that of the Son God, Vindication of his Divine Rank by Jesus himself, Testimony of John the Baptist, Moses, Elias, and the Messiah, the Proposition Considered in relation to Adam, Proposition considered in relation to our Lord's Mother, of certain Evangelical things connected with the Pro-

position, the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, the Proposition in regard to the Miracles, the Proposition in regard to the Jews, touching corrupted forms of Christianity, the Proposition considered as a creed, Faith and Confession, Faith and Evidence, the Kingdom of Heaven, an Epistle from a distinguished Christian, Answer to the same.

FAITH.

Introductory, of the person appointed to give an answer to the question "What shall we do to be saved?" Faith, and the General and Special proposition, Diverse Observations concerning Faith, Faith and corrupted Religion, Faith and False Religion, God's Benevolence in selecting Faith as the Religious Principle, Faith and Flesh or Abolished Religion, Indispensible Nature of Faith, Congruity of Faith with Men's capacity for Knowledge, a Definition of Faith in word and fact, figurative use of the word Faith, design of Faith, Faith and Grace, Faith and Love, Faith, Election, Sovereignty, &c, Faith and Justification, &c, Primitive preaching.

REPENTANCE.

Repentance defined, Reformation in regard to the Scriptures, Reformation towards God, Reformation in regard to Christ, Reformation in regard to the Holy Spirit.

BAPTISM.

Introductory, The Apostle Peter, Doctor Doddridge's Answer to the question "What shall I do to be saved?" Dr. Beecher's answer to the same, Mr. Hannam's Answer, Mr. Deacon's Answer, John Bunyan's Answer, The Subject of Baptism put in train for the investigation of the Reader, Modern preaching.

REMISSION OF SINS.

Introductory, Sacrifice considered in Relation to Men generally, Sacrifice in relation to the Jews in particular, Sacrifice in regard to God, Sacrifice in regard to Christ, Sacrifice in relation to its design, Sacrifice, its necessary Nature, Sacrifice of Christ in regard to Law.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Introductory, the subject Divided, Christ's Mission, the Apostles' Mission, Mission of the Spirit Mission of the Spirit more particularly, Distribution of gifts by the Spirit, Objections Removed.

THE RESURRECTION.

Regeneration settled by facts, the Resurrection of Jesus, the General Resurrection, to the Reader.

Modern Theory of Conversion.

The editor of "THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER," published at Paris, Tenn., has inserted in his number for March, extracts from the writings of Andrew Fuller and J. S. C. F. Frey, under the head of "*Baptist Testimony against the Modern Theory of Conversion.*" In these passages the authors were guarding their readers against deceptive evidences of personal religion; and their views are in accordance with the writings of the great body of evangelical writers from the Reformation of Luther till now. They are in accordance with the views of the great body of the Baptist denomination in the United States at this day. But the editor of the Christian Reformer says of the extracts, that "they are entirely subversive of the modern theory of conversion, the main pillar of sectarian theology, and which occupies so prominent a place in what is said and written on the subject of religion." Now we have a special request to make of the editor of the "Reformer:" it is, that he will bring forward an authorized statement of the "modern theory of conversion," which "the sects" approve, and which yet will be subverted by the writings of Frey and Fuller. We doubt whether he can find any such thing.

Cross and Bap. Journal.

The editor of the "Cross and Baptist Journal" makes a "special request," that we "will bring forward an authorized statement of the modern theory of conversion which the sects approve."—Where are we to get this authorized statement? From the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith?" But the Baptists, Methodists and other sects might object to this, as it would not be authorized by them. Besides, the Presbyterians themselves are almost as much divided about its meaning, as are the different sects about that of the Bible; two parties, in views and sentiments as far apart as the antipodes and the very reverse of each other, both claiming it as their "confession." Shall we go then to the Methodist "Discipline?" The same objections lie here; and, besides, the late "General Conference" has amended it, and a new edition has been published, and we do not know what or how many alterations have been made. Will the "Philadelphia Confession" do? But the Baptists refuse to acknowledge this; and it now ranks only among "Tracts," with, we believe, no more authority in religion

than one of them.—The sects differ among themselves as much as the features of the country over which they are scattered; and the Baptists vary with the climate from Maine to Florida.—Moreover, these “creeds and confessions” being mere obstacles of opinion, could not perhaps supply us with this “authorised statement.”

The modern theory of conversion, if we are not mistaken, makes it consist principally in a *change of the animal feelings*, produced by some supposed naked, secret, mystical, physical or metaphysical operation of the Holy Spirit; and not an assurance of pardon, change of state, &c., from the word of God, written under the inspiration of that Spirit. It was against this that we brought up the testimonies of Frey and Fuller, as any one can see by reading them; and if they have written differently elsewhere it only proves that they are inconsistent and contradict themselves. Of this theory the extracts we made are entirely subversive.

But will the editor of the Cross and Journal inform us where we can get an “authorised statement of the modern theory of conversion, which the sects approve?”—Or will he make one himself for us? If he will; and it accords with the understanding of it which we have expressed, we will show, if the Lord will, that the writings of Frey and Fuller subvert it. Perhaps we can do it any how. In the mean time we present him for his consideration, another “Baptist Testimony” against this modern theory or any other he may offer, which he must be compelled to admit is *subversive*, entirely so. Will he publish it?

EDITOR.

ORTHODOXY ABOUT A CENTURY AGO.

Extracts from a Serious Reply to the Rev. John Wesley, by Gilbert Boyce, a Baptist.

“Upon the whole. I may safely, and without erring, conclude that, let a man pretend to what he will, 'tis certain he can never be led by the *Spirit* of God who is not led by the *Word* of God: for the *Word* and *Spirit* are one, and agree in one: they speak the same thing. Whosoever, therefore, opposes and contradicts the *Scriptures*, opposes and contradicts the *Spirit*—The *Spirit* doth not say and unsay—hath not said one thing by the *Apostles*, and an-

other by the *Methodists*. No, no; he cannot be guilty of self-contradictions; therefore whoever are led by the *Scriptures* are led by the *Spirit*; for the *Scriptures* are the divine breathings of the *Spirit* of God. And whatever *secret whispers* any one may pretend to have as an *overplus*, if those *whispers* contain any thing in them which is contrary to the plain spoken words of the *Scriptures*, they are not the *whispers* of God's *Spirit*, but of the *Devil*. Every man, therefore, ought to be very careful how he entertains a *whispering spirit*.—

“Thirdly—Baptism is necessary to penitent believers to entitle them to the promise of *forgiveness of sins*, which is freely given to all such, through the redemption which they have in in Christ, through his precious blood, according to the riches of God's grace. Ephes i. 7. Accordingly St. Peter says to his new-made converts at Jerusalem, ‘*Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.*’ Acts ii. 38. It ought to be observed that remission of sins is not promised to repentance only, but to repentance and baptism. The Apostle seems to make baptism as necessary as repentance, to entitle them to the promise—not to either of them singly and separately, but to both conjointly. Therefore, it appears plain that baptism is to be an inseparable companion with repentance, as faith is to be with them both, in order to receive the promise. If any man will be so venturesome as to cast out baptism from the above text, and declare remission of sins to repentance only, I may, by the same authority he can produce, cast out repentance, and declare remission of sins to baptism only.—But I will only add the case of *Paul*, which seems plainly to confirm the necessity of baptism to entitle penitent believers to the promise of forgiveness of sins. Acts xxii. 16; *Ananias* undoubtedly understood the necessity of baptism to answer its designed end, or he would not have expressed himself in such terms. Now suppose the three thousand mentioned in Acts ii. 41. and Paul in the above text, had objected against and refused to have been baptized, would they, think you, have been received as members of the church of Christ? Would the *Apostles* and the rest of the brethren, the church, have admitted them into fellowship with them? Or would they without such admission and baptism, have received remission of their sins? If not, then what I have said of the necessity of baptism under this head is just and right. Therefore if it was so in the *Apostles*' time, it must be the same, the very same in our time; and I ap-

peal to you, sir, and every serious knowing christian, for a decision on this point.

"Fourthly—Baptism is also previously necessary not only to entitle penitent believers to the promise of forgiveness of sins, but also to the promise of receiving the *Holy Ghost*, Acts ii. 38. as above cited. Nor do we certainly know of any one person besides Cornelius and his friends, that ever received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized. As to the wild enthusiastic notions of some about their having received the Holy Ghost, I am sure no wise and judicious Christian—no sober, thinking person, will pay any regard to them.

"Wherein may we not this day expect to receive remission of sins and every spiritual blessing in the same way, or in using the same means as they were wont to do in the days of the Apostles? Why not? Do you know of any man who lived in the Apostles' days who received remission of sins, &c. before he believed, repented, and was baptized? Or can you show me any promise that God has made that it ever should be so in any age of the world? If not, what reason have you to think it is so now? Have a care that you are not led by an *enthusiastic spirit*."

Extracts from Andrew Fuller.

"The first scriptural consolation received by the believer arises from the gospel and not from reflecting on the *feeling* of his own mind towards it."

"If the attention of the awakened sinner, instead of being directed to Christ, be turned inward, and his mind be employed in searching for evidences of his conversion, the effect must, to say the least, be uncomfortable, and may be fatal, as it may lead him to make a righteousness of his *religious feelings*, instead of looking out of himself to the Savior.

"Nor is this all:—If the attention of Christians be turned to *their own feelings* instead of the things which should make them feel, it will reduce their religion to something vastly different from that of the *primitive Christians*. Such truths as the following were the life of their spirits.

"Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.—Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and was buried and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.—Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel.—We have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, *Jesus the Son of God*," &c. But by the

turn of thought, and strain of conversation in many religious connections of the present day, it would seem as if these had lost their influence. They are become "dry doctrines" and the parties must have something else. The elevation and depression of their hopes and fears, joys and sorrows, is with them the favorite theme. The consequence is, as might be expected, a living to themselves rather than to him that died and rose again; and a mind either elated by *unscriptural enjoyment*, or depressed by miserable despondency. It is not by thinking and talking of the sensations of hunger, but by *feeding* on the living aliment, that we are filled & strengthened."

"Neither the company addressed by Peter or the Phillippian jailor were encouraged from any thing in the state of their own minds, though both were deeply impressed, but from the *gospel only*."

Clerical Titles and Distinctions.

The disrepute into which clerical titles and appellations of distinction are falling, is one of the most favourable of the "religious" signs of the times. It goes to show that the power and influence of the "Man of Sin" is waning more and more rapidly among the Protestant Sects of these United States; and that the influence of the principles of this Reformation which we are advocating, are beginning to be deeper and deeper felt, far and wide, throughout the length and breadth of the land. Men are not such blind bigots and fanatical enthusiasts as to keep their eyes always shut against the light. It *will* open them some in spite of themselves; and they *will* be guided by it in some degree, when it so plainly and obviously reveals to them their situation, and advantages of which they may avail themselves.—These titles are not only unauthorised by the word of God, but incompatible with the genius of Christianity, and forbidden by its spirit. We do not see how any body of men, possessing and wearing the Christian character, can confer them, or how any such man can wear them. We do not see how the *humility* of the Christian character can be reconciled or be compatible with the pride of distinction which they engender and the vanity of ostentation which they prompt. But the extracts given below will themselves speak, and perhaps

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

give as good reasons against wearing these titles as we can offer. EDITOR.

Clerical Titles.

It would seem that titles of distinction among the clergy are becoming unpopular. Several denominations of Christians have expressed their aversion to them. Our General Assembly, in May last, resolved to discontinue the use of REVEREND, in their Minutes, and substitute that of BROTHER. The Baptist General Tract Society, at a meeting in Philadelphia in December last, adopted the following report and resolution:

"On the subject of complimentary titles to ministers of the Gospel, and others holding important stations in the Christian Church, the Baptist General Tract Society has heretofore adopted a uniform course of simplicity and moderation. It has from the first been the aim of that body, to abstain from all flattering titles and appellations and to confine its methods of addressing individuals to such courtesies only as may find warrant in the Word of God; therefore,

"Resolved, That in the future intercourse of the Board of Managers of the Society with each other, and with its friends; as also, in the correspondence and publications carried on and sustained under its sanction, the titles, REVEREND, D. D. and A. M., as applied to ministers of the Gospel, shall be discontinued—and all addresses and modes of individual designation shall be so guarded and shaped as to be no longer offensive to those who consider complimentary adjuncts to human names, as an infringement of Christian humility.—Cumberland Presbyterian.

Title of D. D. or Doctor of Divinity.

Within a few years past, a number of gentlemen, upon whom this title has been conferred, have declined accepting it—a thing wholly unknown in former years.—This honorary degree has been recently conferred upon the Rev. James Culbertson, of Zanesville, Ohio, who declines accepting it; and gives the following reasons, which, in our views, are characterised by mature judgment and sound sense.—B.

1. Because I have long been doubtful, whether such titles were compatible with the LETTER or SPIRIT of Christianity. The LETTER is exhibited in such passages as the following; "Be ye not called of men Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

But if we have mistaken the letter, can we be mistaken in the spirit of Christianity?

Is it not a lowly, unassuming, unostentatious system? I am far from ascribing pride, ambition, or a love of show to those who wear these honorary titles, for many of them are among the humble and unobtrusive. But, still it is a question, whether these distinctions do not, in the estimation of the world, clothe Christianity in a worldly livery, which does not belong to her.

2. Because these titles, even if strictly compatible with Christian principles, are not, in their present application, confined to original and appropriate design. It cannot be doubted they were, originally, intended as the honorary testimonials to eminent attainments. It is equally unquestionable that these titles have STOOPEd, in their requirements, below their original demands, and have thus lost their VALUE and SUNG their REPUTATION.

3. Because they have become too popular, and are, in this way ensnaring. This is a delicate point, and I shall not dwell upon it.

4. Because the prevalence of these honorary badges in the church, prejudices acute and discerning men in the world, and creates embarrassment in the efforts of the Church to do good. This is a reason, which I deem of vast importance. We believe as private Christians, we unfold, as ministers, a system which calls for CRUCIFIXION to the world. What will be the effect, when the world beholds us investing each other with honorary appendages and flattering distinctions? Doubtless it will produce distrust in our honesty, and so far interfere with our usefulness.

5. Because these distinctions partake too much of the character and spirit of Popery, and identify Protestants to too great an extent with the "MAN OF SIN," encircled with splendid titles. I admit that many clothed with these honors, have no affinity to the Popish system; but still their position before the public involves too great an assimilation.—Zion's Herald.

Pitts' Book on Baptism Reviewed and Exposed.

NO. II.

This work consists of 185 pages, 64 of which profess to be devoted to what Mr. Pitts calls the "nature of baptism," 85 to what is called the "mode," and 35 to the "subjects of baptism." Thus about two thirds are in vindication of pouring or sprinkling and infant baptism; and as the

book professes to be "CHIEFLY designed as a refutation of the errors and infidelity of Campbellism," is not this making out immersion and adult baptism to be "Campbellism," and "errors" and "infidelity?" In fact our opponents of Mr. Pitts' caste, have called immersion "Campbellism!" (Do they not practice "Campbellism" then, when they immerse?—and is it not great inconsistency for us to practice what we oppose, as they do?—and if they are in the habit of doing it in this, can we expect them to be free from it in other things?) Immersion seems to be a very annoying & tender subject of Mr. Pitts. Near the commencement of the part of his book on 'the nature' or design of baptism, he introduces what he calls an opinion of immersion, as the first thing to be examined, wholly irrelevant to the subject he was upon. "The first opinion to be examined as held by the immersionists of the present day, is, that water baptism is an emblem of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord." Waiving the examination of this assertion here, we will merely observe, that he thus confounds Baptists, Methodists, and all together, who believe that immersion is baptism! (If he believes it, must he not hold this opinion too?) On the same pages with the above he calls bro. Campbell "the modern immersion Controversialist!"—The quantity of pages in his book, devoted to the "mode of baptism," (at least one fourth more than to either of the two other subjects,) sufficiently shows what was one of its chief designs.

Mr. P. says in the commencement of his book:

"The very forms and ordinances of Christianity, although in themselves NON-ESSENTIAL are nevertheless in their divine institution so happily adapted to direct the mind and guide the heart to a true and vital apprehension of the sacred subjects of which they are significant, that a misconception of their nature and design, must indeed be, to those who are seeking salvation, an unfortunate blunder."

Such a parcel of anomalies and absurdities, were never perhaps huddled together! NON-ESSENTIALS of DIVINE institution!—non-essentials directing the mind and guiding the heart!!—non-essentials directing and guiding them to a true and vital apprehension of sacred subjects!!!—

non-essentials having nature and design!!!! Thus we have directing non-essentials!—guiding non-essentials!!—true non-essentials!!!—VITAL non-essentials!!!!—SIGNIFICANT non-essentials!!!!—in short, ESSENTIAL non-essentials! How a misconception of the nature and design of NON-ESSENTIALS, can be an unfortunate blunder to those who are seeking salvation, seems to have been reserved for the deep, sagacious and penetrating mind of Fountain E. Pitts to discover!—The God of heaven has appointed the "forms and ordinances of Christianity;" and to call them "non essential" is a direct insult to the wisdom of Jehovah, and one of the characteristics of the "Man of sin;" "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." We cannot, we dare not, call any thing, even the very least, that God has commanded or enjoined upon our observance, non-essential.—Does it not seem very strange, that Mr. Pitts should be at the pains and trouble to write a whole book, and perhaps the only "book" he ever wrote, against what he looks upon and terms, a non-essential?! If, a non-essential, why write upon it at all?—why not let it alone? But these non-essentials seem to trouble and annoy the opponents of reformation very much!

Passing by here the next part of this book which deserves consideration, and which we will reserve for examination in our next no. not having the room for it here which we wish, we quote the following assertions:

"Come, Mr. Campbell, be consistent. The book says, "this is my body and this is my blood," and although it no where says that water baptism is either the conversion or the regeneration of the soul, yet as you have taken it for granted without authority, surely you might, and to be justified as a public teacher, you ought to receive the Romish notion, on the bread and wine, as there is scriptural authority for it, provided it be construed as you construe EVERY thing else in the Bible that is literally. The truth is, Mr. Campbell's mode of interpretation would make many scriptural expressions not only unintelligible, but absolutely ridiculous. He contends for a literal meaning EXCLUSIVELY, for EVERY passage, while he hoots at spiritual meanings and "spiritualizers," as he

calls them, and throws them into the mass of mysticism together."—page 17.

A more reckless, unfounded and false assertion, was perhaps never penned! We say *assertion*, for he has not produced a single passage from bro. C.'s writings in proof.—The following extracts from the Millennial Harbinger, positively and completely contradict it:

"That as God had spoken to men in their own language, by his Son and by these Apostles, it followed that, in order to make his communications worthy of the character of a REVELATION, he must have used our words in the *commonly received sense*; for to have taken our words and to have appropriated to them a peculiar and hidden meaning, would have been not to enlighten, but to confound the human understanding.

"The inference was, that the words and phrases found in the New Testament were to be interpreted by the common rules of interpretation applied to all writings of the same antiquity; or, indeed to any human writings, ancient or modern. That the literal passages were to be understood literally; and the FIGURATIVE passages FIGURATIVELY, as in all human compositions. vol. i. p. 558.

"A *spiritual meaning*," contradistinguished from a *literal meaning*, or a FIGURATIVE or *symbolic meaning*, I confess myself not to understand."—*ibid.* p. 561.

"I now perceive that you call the meaning of a figure of speech its spiritual meaning, and that you suppose the illumination of the Spirit is necessary to understand figures of speech. But will you please consider that all writers, historians, orators, and poets, of all ages, use figures of speech; and do you think that there are not as strong and bold figures as these you have quoted, in Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Demosthenes, Tacitus, and Hume; and does it require any supernatural aid to interpret them? I admit, my dear sir, that in both Testaments *there are many bold figures of speech*, emblems, parables, types, all of which are as intelligible, however, as the figures, emblems, and parables of other writers, and are to be interpreted by the same rules which rhetoricians apply to all such expressions. This is not what theologians call the spiritual meaning. Their spiritual meaning is the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, giving to the words in the book neither a literal nor a figurative meaning; but a mystical or hidden meaning, which man or angel could not discover;—than which there is no opinion more detrimental to true religion."—*ib.* p. 561.

Many other similar passages to these might, perhaps, be produced from the vols. of the Millennial Harbinger and Christian Baptist, but these will suffice from them. As Mr. Pitts professes to give the vol. and page from which he makes his quotations; we ask, how did these escape his notice? If he gave the Harbinger a careful and strict examination, which every man who professes to quote from another as he does from these, should do, must he not be guilty of an intentional misrepresentation and falsehood?—And these extracts were written too, long before he wrote his "book."

It is an insult to *common sense* to suppose that any but the veriest fanatic can be guilty of holding such views as Mr. Pitts here attributes to bro. Campbell. Why, the most illiterate and unintelligent person, who knows any thing about language, knows better; far less a man of the acknowledged talents, attainments and discrimination of Alexander Campbell. It reflects very badly upon the mental character of Mr. Pitts or any other man, to make the assertions which he has of such a man, if he really believes what he says. And wonderful must be the credulity and gullibility of those who can credit and swallow such assertions! We make some more extracts from "Christianity Restored," in addition to those we have made from the Harbinger, which completely disprove Mr. P.'s assertions:

FIGURATIVE MEANING OF SCRIPTURE.

"The turning of a word from its original or primitive meaning, styled the *literal*, is called a *trope*, or figure of a word; because standing in a new attitude before the mind. When words are used not in their proper or literal sense, they are called figurative. In this sort of language, the ancient writings abound more than the modern; and the eastern more than the western.

"In ancient times, language was comparatively poor; and as the poor mechanist who has but few tools, has to apply them to many uses,—so in the poverty of language, orators and writers had to use the same words in various acceptations. This is the philosophy of the exuberance of tropes and figures, in the rudest and most ancient languages of the world.

"In the east, nature is more gay, rich, variegated, beautiful, and gorgeous, than in the west. It is not only in the superior luxuriance of her soil, the number, variety, and

beauty of her vegetable and animal productions; the richness and extent of her metallic dominions; the splendor and brilliancy of her gems and precious stones;—but the sweet serenity and delicious fragrance of her air; the loftiness, grandeur, and magnificence of her heavens, that Asia excels the other quarters of our globe, and becomes the Eden of the whole earth. It is not for us now to trace the connexion between country, climate, and language; but this much we may say, that it is not in the power of man, constituted as he is, to be placed in the midst of such a combination of happy circumstances, and not to partake of them, more or less, in his constitution, mental and physical.—The eye and the ear, those two senses, through which mind has all its perceptions of beauty and harmony, of grandeur and sublimity; through which it has its clearest, brightest, most vivid, and lasting images of things, cannot be constantly feasted upon such objects, without being deeply imbued in all its powers and capacities, by them; and excited to adorn itself in all its manifestations, according to the splendid model constantly before it. As, then, the palaces of the eastern princes greatly excel those of the western, in all the gorgeousness of imperial grandeur; so the oriental languages, in the fulness, splendor, and richness of their imagery; the number, variety, and beauty of their tropes and figures, greatly transcend the occidental.

“When standing either at the base or on the summit of the hills and mountains, once frequented by Ossian, the seats and scenes of his poetic effusions;—while I surveyed the rugged cliffs of cloud-capt mountains, or viewed the tempest-beaten-ship, riding amidst the foam of conflicting waves;—while I listened to the roarings of the mountain stream, as it tumbled from the precipice into the sea; and the rush of the swelling billows, as they dashed themselves to pieces upon the rocks,—I felt the spirit of the son of Fingal rising within me, and my soul labored for words, to give utterance to the feelings of my heart. It was then I began to learn why Homer, the contemporary of Elijah, was so familiar with the sublime, and Virgil with the beautiful. It was then I experienced the truth of that philosophy, which assigns to the different scenes of nature, most of the various charms of song.

“This is not so trivial a matter as the speculating mystic would affect to represent it; for it scientifically explains the reasons, why the oriental languages are so luxuriant in all the flowers of rhetoric; and why the Bible, reaching so far back into remote anti-

quity, and coming from the east—from the land of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, so far excels every other book in the richness and variety, the beauty and splendor of its figurative language.

“But to resume the fact, that the Bible is written in human language, and in the language of countries abounding in all the figures of speech,—in developing the principles of interpretation of this book, a due regard must be paid to figurative language. The rankest error in the business of interpreting Scripture, will be found to consist in confounding the figurative meaning of words, with the literal; or the literal, with the figurative. *Enthusiasm* has two extremes:—the one literalizes every thing; the other extreme, spiritualizes every thing. The Romanist says, the Saviour literally meant what he said, when he said of the loaf, “*This is my body,*” and of the cup, “*This is my blood.*” And hence originated the doctrine of transubstantiation. A lady in new England sometime since, said, that Jesus literally meant what he said, when he said to his disciples, “*If your right hand offend you, cut it off, and throw it away.*” Her right hand having offended her, she literally cut it off, and threw it away. This is one extreme: the other consists in making words figurative, which are not so; thus,—“The walls of Jericho fell down,” means, “that the arguments which sustain false religion, were demolished before the approach of the new church of God under Jesus.” “And they blew the trumpets seven times,” means, “that the divine truth was brought down upon the bulwarks of error, complete and perfect.” &c. &c.

“Here, then, we have the two extreme systems: the former making “the scriptures always mean what they literally say;” the other making them never literally mean what they literally say, but always speaking in figurative analogy. Both these systems are alike hostile to the Bible, as a revelation from God; for they both represent its language as unlike the language of every other book,—as a language to be interpreted arbitrarily by special rules, in which, neither words nor phrases are to be understood according to the dictionary, grammar, or rhetoric of human language. Our position, it will be remembered, is, that the language of the Bible is human language.—*That God spoke by men, to men, for men.* That this volume has in it all the peculiarities of language,—is constructed upon the ordinary principles of language,—has in it all the tropes, figures, and forms of speech, found in the language of the age and country

in which it was written,—and is to be interpreted by the laws of interpretation, universally acknowledged in the commonwealth of letters.”

This entirely contradicts Mr. Pitts. The very same “Romish notion” to which he alludes is exposed here. And had Mr. P. paid the attention which he ought to have done, to the extracts we have made from the Harbinger, it would have saved him a page or two of very uncalled for and absurd remarks upon this phantom error conjured up by his imagination. Mr. P., if we are not mistaken in him, belongs to the class of “spiritualizers;” and hence his great repugnancy to the *literal* meaning of scripture. It is inconsistent with his system. He knows that if the scripture be suffered to speak its literal sense, where it should be literally understood, his system must fall. It is by thus hoodwinking the people with their spiritual meanings, that the “clergy” keep them in error, ignorance and darkness, and maintain the unauthorised power and influence which they have acquired and assumed over their minds and consciences, and occupy the seats upon the thrones of the Apostles which they have usurped.

EDITOR.

State of the Congregation in Nashville.

During the last half year reports have occasionally gone abroad from Nashville, at least, to this place, that the Church of Christ there, was declining and losing its members, that they were leaving it and uniting with the sects, &c. Knowing the source from which these reports emanated both from what we were told and the persons who bore and circulated them, that they came from one whom we are led to conclude owes us no good will, an enemy of reform and the pure gospel of Jesus Christ, knowing these things, we never placed any confidence in them. Their design is easily seen: to injure the cause and lessen its influence both there and abroad. These are the means which it seems have to be resorted to now, since the attempt to fix the charge of injustice upon our brethren there for retaining possession of their Meeting-House, has failed. Those who seldom or never read our writings, hear our

preachers and teachers, or converse with our brethren on religion, are generally the most busy in hatching and circulating these reports. The statements of such persons can seldom be right, and deserve little or no credit.—Numbers of the brethren, as we have been informed, have been dismissed to form other congregations in the neighborhood; and we expect that the decrease thus occasioned in their numbers, has been seized upon to misrepresent and injure us.

The following letter from our beloved, talented and devoted bro. (Dr.) Davis, exhibits the real state of things in the Congregation in Nashville. * It shows how much credit is to be attached to such reports as those alluded to above.

EDITOR.

Nashville, July 18th. 1836.

Dear Brother Howard;

Though, personally unacquainted with you, I take the liberty of addressing you a few lines, giving an account of the progress of the Redeemer's cause amongst us; the state of this congregation &c.

There is no great deal of excitement on the subject of religion, but our meetings generally are well attended, and we hope there is some good doing. We meet two or three times every Lord's day, besides occasionally through the week. Most of the Disciples are punctual in their attendance, and seem to take great delight in the worship of God. The apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, prayers, and praises are regularly attended to by them, on that blessed day that brings to every Christian's memory, the morn on which the Saviour conquered death, and arose triumphantly from the grave. And, we are happy to say that there are *only* a few who are habitually delinquent in their attendance upon these delightful services. Would to God, we could say there were none. We view all such persons as evidence against that religion which has its seat in the passions and is produced, (not by a national conviction of truth) but, by momentary impulses.

The only persons, upon whom reliance can be placed in the hour of temptation; and amid the seducing influences of this world, are those who have coolly, and deliberately *counted* the cost, and in view of all the facts and circumstances connected with christianity, resolved to serve God. Every day's experience and observation tend to convince us more and more of the impropriety of the *popular* method of trying to convert people by addressing their passions instead of their reason.

I have been here about three months, during which, several persons have been added to the congregation. One excluded. Some have taken letters, and removed to other parts; still faithful we trust to their righteous sovereign, *None* have left us to join any of the sects that we know of. If any; it has been some coloured persons who have *slipped* off without our knowledge.— I know of no such occurrence, however, since I have been here; but the brethren tell me, that the like has occurred in time past. I do not know the precise number of members belonging to this congregation, nor have I the means now before me of ascertaining. There are four or five hundred, I have no doubt. And, I think I may say the Church is, as harmonious, and prosperous now as it has been for several years. And judging from the number and seriousness of those who attend our meetings as spectators, we are led to hope it will not be long till many of them will obey the Gospel, and enter into the enjoyment of its exceeding great, and precious promises. I attended a meeting a few miles above this, last evening; where Brethren Claiborn and Sweat addressed a large and attentive audience in the A. M. when two made the good confession, and the prospect is flattering for many more.

Through the politeness of Brother Eichbaum, I have enjoyed the privilege, within a few days, of reading your paper up to the present time. I am much pleased with the spirit in which it is conducted, and the matter it contains. May God speed you onward in your pious undertaking.— My dear Brother, we are engaged in a glorious cause. It is that of primitive, apostolic Christianity. The word of God, is all I see on earth, worth pleading for. If Jesus, and all his holy apostles and prophets, were now here in person they would plead no other. May we be enabled to plead it, with humble, and pious zeal and may heaven give success to our efforts.

Your friend, and Brother in Christ Jesus.

J. W. DAVIS.

The Baptist and the English Version.

Most of our readers are aware, we expect, of the late decision of the American Bible Society, in refusing to aid with their funds in printing and circulating the translation of the Bible, by Mr. Judson, into the Burmese language, because he had *translated*, instead of *transferring*, as in our English version, the Greek term *baptizo*

and its cognates, into appropriate terms in the Burmese. Mr. Judson acted independently and consistently; and the Baptists in America are doing the same in aiding and sustaining him. They are all commendable for so doing. But the effects of this decision have not, it seems, ended here. It has opened the eyes of the Baptists to the defects of King James' Translation; and they begin to talk of the necessity and importance of having a corrected and amended *English* Version! But they seem of late to have let alone saying much about it, and to have quit urging its importance. We hope it will not turn out *Vox et preterea nihil*, all words and nothing else. Mr. Meredith, of the "Biblical Recorder" uses the following manly and independent language in reference to this subject:

After a careful examination of the late proceedings of the A. B. Society, in the various bearings and tendencies in which those proceedings had been presented to view, we gave it as our opinion, that the time had fully come when we should have a corrected version of the Scriptures in the English language. Subsequent consideration, and subsequent remarks chiefly adverse to the measure, have strengthened our first conviction. We are, therefore, prepared now not only to repeat what we have before stated, but to add, that what is thus plainly required, will, in our opinion, be accomplished.

It was our belief at first, and it is our belief now, that the recent measure of the Bible Society, be the motive what it might, was an event in the Providence of God, which called upon Baptists to take a higher and bolder stand than they had ever done before. And this conclusion derives no little weight, in our mind, from the fact, that the time has come when the imaginary sacredness which has so long invested translations, must give place to the supreme authority of the original Scriptures. Of the common version we respect the antiquity and the general correctness, but we allow it no authority more than what is due to any other *human* production. The original is the only sure word of prophecy—the only infallible standard—the only authoritative exhibition of the divine will. Every thing else is human, and necessarily secondary and imperfect. Accordingly, while Roman Catholics cling to their venerated Vulgate, and while modern Pædobaptist adhere, with perhaps a no less rigid tenacity, to their Common Version, the great inquiry must now be, and we believe will be, what hath

been written by the pen of inspiration?

Under these circumstances we must be allowed to repeat, that the late attempt of the Bible Society—whether designed or not we do not say—to place the Common Version above the original Scriptures, and to blind the eyes of men by getting an unauthorized reverence for a merely human production, first convinced us of the fact, that there was a principle in operation which demanded a firm and fearless resistance. Men, if they choose, may cry, “heresy,” “sacrilege,” “Great is the Diana of the Ephesians,” but none of these things shall deter us from a free expression of our opinion, and a fearless exposure of what we believe to be wrong.

As it regards the managers of the Bible Society, we have already said that we believed those gentlemen aimed to do what was right. We believe so still. We have no idea that their motives should be impeached. Nor do we wish to see them nullify or alter what they have done. We are entirely willing that every thing should stand precisely as it is, and that all censure every where should be laid aside. But we wish to see an American Bible Society, and a correct version of the Sacred Scriptures.

The People of the Lord.

The Lord has always had a people ever since he “at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.” He has had a people in every age and generation since Christianity was first established, however small their number may have been in the dark, gloomy and corrupt periods of the history of the world.

But where are the Lord’s people now, when there are so many claiming their character? How are we to know them, when there are so many different and differing sects, one crying out that they are here and another that they are there? Are there no characteristics by which they can be known and recognised? These are the same now that they have always been.

In order to ascertain who are the Lord’s people now, let us examine and see who they were in the first age of Christianity, when that divine system came forth pure and uncorrupted from the hands of its Author.

In the first place, they had but *one* book, the Bible, as their only guide, directory and rule in faith and practice. They had no *separate* creeds, confessions of faith, books

of discipline, rules of decorum, or abstracts of doctrine of any sort. These are all of later invention. The Bible is the invention of God, these of men. Neither their faith nor their practice were recorded in a *separate* book from the Bible, either in their own language or that of scripture.

In the second place, they had all been buried with Christ by baptism into his death, had been baptized into Christ and put him on, had been baptized for the remission of sins, had been baptized and washed away their sins. So says their Book. “Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism into death*; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. * * * Ye have obeyed from the heart that *form of doctrine* which was delivered you. Being then made *free from sin*, ye became the servants of righteousness.” *Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him* through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead.

* * * Having forgiven you all *trespasses*.” “As many as have been *baptized into Christ* have put on Christ.” “Repent & be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.” “Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord.”

In the third place, they wore no other name but that of “Christian,” the name of their Lord and Lawgiver, and in which they had been baptized. “The *disciples* were called Christians first at Antioch.” They were not distinguished from the world or each other by any other names.

In the fourth place, the preacher baptized individuals without consulting any body else about it and upon the simple confession that “Jesus Christ is the Son of God,” made at the water. “And as they went on their way, [Philip and the Eunuch.] they came unto a certain *water*: and the eunuch said, See, *here is water*; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both *into the*

water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." They never required people to tell that their sins were forgiven; for they baptized them "for the remission of sins," and to "wash away their sins." They also baptized people in the night as well as in the day. "And he [the Jailor at Philippi] took them [Paul and Silas] the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway."

In the fifth place, they never received persons into the church or congregation, and the church had nothing to do with them, until they were baptized. It is said of the conversion of those on the day of Pentecost, "Then they that gladly received his [Peter's] word were baptized: AND the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," or as the original (Greek) is, "The Lord daily added the saved to the congregation." They were saved before they were added; and who were the saved?—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

In the sixth place, they met together every Lord's Day to observe the Lord's Supper. "And we [Luke, Paul, &c] sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week [Lord's Day] * * the DISCIPLES came together to break bread." Thus, "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers." To continue steadfastly in the breaking of bread or Lord's Supper, is to meet together every Lord's Day to attend to it, as did the disciples under the immediate instruction of the Apostles.

In the seventh place, each congregation was in its government and proceedings independent of every other, and not constituted with others into a regular combination of any sort, but only co-operated occasionally, and that without surrendering any of their independency. Each one had a plurality of bishops or elders, (the same officer,) and they could only rule in one congregation, and had no control of any other of which they were not members. The

Elders as preachers or the preachers as preachers, had nothing to do with the care or government of any church or congregation. No preacher as such ever had the care of a church, and no preacher as an Elder, and no Elder ever had any thing to do in the care of more than one church.

As seven is a sacred and perfect number, we will quit with these seven characteristics. Reader, where you find such a people as the above; who have no book but the Bible; have been buried with Christ in baptism; wear no name but that of Christian; their preachers baptizing day and night upon the good confession without consulting the church about it; having nothing to do in the church with persons until baptized and then receiving them; meeting together every Lord's Day to attend to the Lord's Supper; and having a plurality of Elders or Bishops who have nothing to do with any congregation but their own; where you find such a people, you will find the "People of the Lord."

EDITOR.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In consequence of the irregularity of our subscribers in sending us their names, and some other things connected with it, we have concluded to receive two dollars for their subscriptions during this year,—\$2, 50 after for those who have taken it six months. The end of the year is not far off, and we hope they will remit us as early as possible the little sums which they owe. We need them much, as we have paper and printing to pay for. Post Masters can remit for them.

EDITOR:

SECTARIAN LIBERALITY.

A gentleman who is a sectarian preacher or exhorter, and a subscriber to my paper, in a letter to me, uses the following language:

"I have been reading the Christian Reformer, in which I find much good matter. I have been doing all I could to get subscribers, with convenience."

Such men are to be met with but seldom. Here is an admonition to our brethren who are neglecting to exert themselves for us. Brethren, will you suffer yourselves to be thus outdone?

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME 1.]

PARIS, TENN. AUGUST, 1836

[NUMBER 8.

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark xvi. 15, 16.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS
Jude, 3.

Primitive Christianity.

(From the "Christian Baptist.")

In the first commission Christ gave to the twelve, with particular instructions to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, (Matt. x. 46.) he sent them forth with this declaration, "*He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.*" Again, in his instructions preparatory to his last and great commission, addressing his heavenly Father in their behalf, he saith, "*As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.*" John xvii. 18. And addressing them, he saith, "*As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.*" John xx. 21—23. Thus instructed, qualified, and commissioned, they were sent forth into all the world, as the ambassadors and representatives of Jesus Christ to the nations, to disciple them in his name, with the assurance of his continual and manifest presence with them. "And they went forth, and preached every where, *the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.*" Mark xvi. 20. Thus it appears that they were, in the most strict and proper sense of the terms, the representatives of Jesus Christ to the world—even as he was of the Father. He identifies them with himself, even as he identifies himself with the Father. And as he, the Great Apostle of the Father, received from him the Holy Spirit, with power also to acquit, or hold guilty, according to the tenor of his commission to a guilty and rebellious world; so he likewise imparts the same powers and

privileges to his apostles. See the above citations. With the strictest propriety, may all who received them in character; and, through faith in their testimony concerning Jesus, became obedient to their doctrine, be called the disciples of Christ: for they preached not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and whatsoever they did, taught, or commanded in the accomplishment of their commission, it was all in the name of the Lord Jesus.

But it farther appears, from the history of this ancient sect, that the disciples at Antioch, who first received the christian name, did not receive the gospel immediately from the apostles. See Acts xi. 19—24. Nevertheless, they received it, as all did, who, from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, that is, from the day of Pentecost, believed in Jesus, and were baptized into his name. We mean, they received the gospel in consequence of the apostolic commission; upon the execution of which the apostles were fully instructed and authorised to enter on the day of Pentecost, but not before. Compare Luke xxiv. 46—49. with Acts i. 4—8. and the second chapter throughout. We say, then, that all who received the gospel from that day to this, received it by means of the execution of this commission, which actually commenced on the day of Pentecost, by the preaching of repentance and remission of sins, in the name of Jesus, to all nations; a sample of which was, *that very day*, providentially assembled at Jerusalem. Some of all these, it appears, gladly received the word, were baptized, and afterwards, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, being scattered abroad, went every where preaching the word. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cy-

rone, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the *hand of the Lord* was with them: and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord. Acts viii. i. 4. with the xith. 19—21. Thus the Antiochians received the gospel, not immediately from the twelve, but from persons whom they had disciplined. But these also had the *promised presence*, for "*the hand of the Lord was with them*;" which plainly shews that the commission was so limited as to confine the whole work of evangelizing, or discipling the nations, to the twelve or thirteen primary apostles, (adding Paul to the number;) but was intended to include all who, receiving those in character and believing their testimony, were thus qualified and disposed, by the grace of Christ, to co-operate for accomplishing the grand object of the commission; and these also it appears were made partakers of miraculous powers, (see Mark xvi. 17, 18. with Acts viii. 5, 6.) some of one kind, and some of another; but none of them were equal to the apostles; for they, as the complete and immediate representatives and plenipotentiaries of Jesus Christ, possessed, in the most eminent degree, all the powers he had received of the Father, as the great Preacher and Apostle of God. He had power on earth to forgive sins—so had they. He had power to communicate the Spirit to empower others to work miracles—so had they. He had power to work all kinds of miracles himself—so had they, &c. &c. &c. And all who, after them, received the Spirit, received it through their ministry, either mediately or immediately. Hence they are enthroned heads, judges, and lawgivers in the christian church; and, in this sense, the founders or foundation of it, next to Christ himself; for they also labored, suffered, and died for its sake: but in all things he must have the pre-eminence, who purchased the church with his own blood. In short, Christ had so completely identified the apostles with himself, that whosoever received them, received him; that whosoever persecuted them, persecuted him; and that whosoever kept their sayings, kept his also; for the words they spake were not theirs, but the words of him that sent them. Hence, even in the most difficult circumstances, they were not to premeditate what to say; for, upon every emergency, it should be given them immediately what they ought to say. These things being so it necessarily follows that whosoever received the word which they preached, upon the confirmatory evidence which the Lord by them exhibited, received Christ and his word; submitted to him, and were taught by him, and so became, to all intents and purposes, his

real and genuine disciples, (whoever the immediate preachers might be,) and were therefore justly entitled to the new name of Christian. And here let it be strictly noted, that all who were divinely called to co-operate with the apostles, in the first instance, under their commission for evangelizing and discipling the nations, were also indued with a portion of their spirit, enabling them to speak the necessary languages, and to work miracles for the confirmation of the word.—See the above quotations, with 1 Cor. 12th and 14th chapters.

Having thus briefly substantiated the claims of the Antiochian converts to the discipleship of Jesus, and of all others who received the word as they did, not immediately from the lips of the apostles, but from some of those whom they had disciplined, or that had heard and believed their word—we come now, in the last place, to investigate more particularly the religious principles and practice of those primitive disciples; and this we shall attempt through the medium of the commission itself, and of those authentic documents which we have on record respecting its execution. For this purpose we shall advert to the items of the commission in their natural and proper order. To proceed, then, we find it prefaced thus: "And Jesus came, and spake unto them (the eleven) saying, All power (that is, all authority,) is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore," &c. Here we perceive that the commission is predicated upon the unlimited authority of Jesus. "Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature," or disciple all nations, "baptizing them (the disciples) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them (the disciples) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. And, lo! I am with you always, unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 18—20, with Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Here, then, in the first place, it is evident that whosoever believed what the apostles were commissioned and commanded to preach throughout all the world, to every creature, (that is "the gospel,") and were baptized as above, the same were disciplined, that is were made disciples of Jesus, and became thereby entitled to the promised salvation.

In the second place, it is equally evident that the disciples were to be farther instructed; namely, to observe, that is, to keep in mind and reduce to practice the "all things" that Christ had commanded, or should command his apostles to teach the disciples.—Farther (with respect to the duties either of

apostles or disciples) *the commission saith not*. Consequently the religious principles of the disciples were principles of faith and obedience; to believe the gospel which the apostles preached, and to reduce to practice what they enjoined in the name of Jesus, completed the character of a disciple. So much we evidently learn from the commission itself: for farther particulars we must have recourse to the execution of it; that is, to its actual accomplishment in the preaching and teaching of the apostles. In this part of the investigation two important points respecting christianity necessarily come to be determined, viz. What is the Gospel, and what the Law of Christ? The belief of the former, constituting *the faith*; and the obedience of the latter, the *duty* of the christian. "For the christian is not without law to God, but is under law to Christ."

It has been already observed that the preaching of the apostles under this last and great commission, the object of which was the evangelizing the world, commenced on the day of Pentecost. On that memorable day repentance and remission of sins began to be published in the name of Jesus, to all nations, at Jerusalem, viz. that whosoever believed in him and was baptized into his name, should receive the remission of his sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. See Acts ii. 22—39. In the course of this sermon Jesus of Nazareth is proclaimed as "a man of God—by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him:" that, "being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God—he was taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain"—that God raised him from the dead—that he exalted him to his right hand—that "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit," he had poured forth upon his apostles and the other disciples assembled with them, the wonderful things which were then apparent: in a word, that he had made that same Jesus, which they had crucified, both Lord and Christ. As many as appeared convinced of the truth of this testimony, were exhorted to repent; that is, to be of another mind; to cease from their opposition; and be baptized into his name, in order to the remission of their sins. The result was, as many as believed the things thus testified concerning Jesus, gladly embraced the invitation, and were baptized; and so became his disciples, and were added to the hundred and twenty: and the Lord continued to add to *their* number daily such as should be saved. The effect of the next sermon, (recorded Acts iii.) is the addition of five thousand. In the viiith we are informed that the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem

greatly, and that a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith; that is, became baptized professors of the truth which the apostles testified concerning Jesus; for all the obedience the gospel calls for, in order to salvation, is, that men believe it, upon the evidence which God has afforded, and so be baptized. "He that *believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.*" We have only yet advanced in our inquiry from the beginning of the 2d to the 8th verse of the sixth of the Acts, and we find ourselves introduced to a great multitude of disciples, the great majority of whom afford the most striking evidence of entire devotedness to the truth, and of its most blissful effects: they afford, we say, the most convincing marks of genuine discipleship. Are these not christians? Are they not justly entitled to this new and distinguishing name? Are we not justifiable in considering them as a sufficient sample or specimen of christian character? We certainly think we are. If not, we despair of finding their superiors upon record. If ever the gospel was purely preached, they did it. If any thing believed amongst men could produce supernatural and heavenly effects, sure they were in possession of it. We speak of the mother church, the church of Jerusalem, which at this time was exceedingly numerous—full of benevolence, of hospitality, of brotherly kindness, and charity. Let us then pause here a little, and review with all possible attention the history of those wonderful people that we may distinctly apprehend what was preached and believed amongst them that produced such wonderful effects.

It was preached that Jesus of Nazareth, with the fame of whose character they were well acquainted, as "a man approved of God by the miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him," was the great prophet predicted by Moses. That he was the Messiah, the Son of God, whom they had wickedly crucified; that God had raised him from the dead; that he had exalted and glorified him at his right hand, a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; that the Father had constituted him Lord of all; had conferred upon him the promise of the Holy Spirit, that he might send him down upon his disciples; that he must reign until all his enemies be made his footstool; that heaven must be his residence till the times of the restitution of all things; they also preached through Jesus the resurrection, and, of course, the final judgment; and that there is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved; that whosoever believed in him and was baptized, should receive re-

mission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. These various items, taken in connexion with the proper arguments, will be found to be the amount of the apostles' preaching concerning Jesus, in the portion under consideration, down to the 8th verse of the 6th chapter. And, indeed, the *whole* of their preaching, in as far as we have any specimens upon record, is concerning Jesus.— And if we should add all that is found in the Acts of the Apostles to the above items, it would scarcely add a new idea. Thus we find the apostles preached, and thus the primitive disciples believed. How simple! how comprehensive their faith!

As to their practice, they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in the fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers. Thus they manifested the stedfastness and reality of their faith, by their cheerful and persevering obedience.— But were we, in the mean time, to condescend to all the particulars relative to their practice, according to the injunction in the second item of the commission, it would lead us to transcribe the greater part of the epistles afterwards addressed to the churches. This, however, we shall not attempt. But, taking for granted, what all must grant, viz. that they were obedient *in all things* to the commands and exhortations of the apostles, with the exception of some incidental irregularities, which, upon being reprov'd, were speedily corrected, we may justly view their character through the medium of those epistles, placing to their account all the commendations, with the obedience of all the commands and exhortations contained in them. This being granted, we have before us on the sacred page the most precise view of the religious principles and practice, or of the faith and obedience of the primitive christians. For whatsoever the apostles preached concerning Jesus and the blessings to be enjoyed through him, or concerning the punishment by him to be inflicted upon the unbelieving and disobedient, constituted *their faith*, in contradistinction to all others, whether Jews or Gentiles. In like manner, whatsoever the apostles taught them, in the name of Jesus, to observe and do, constituted *their obedience*. And here let it be carefully noticed once for all, that faith and obedience comprehend the *whole* of christianity; and that, upon the premises before us, we have a distinct and complete view of the gospel and law of Christ, the belief and obedience of which constituted the religion of the primitive christians. These things being so, we can be at no loss, with the New Testament in our hands, to attain to the pure, original, uncorrupted religion of Je-

sus; if we only attend to *it*, and place all our religion in the belief of what the apostles have declared concerning him; and, in the obedience of what they have enjoined in his name, as *therein recorded*. We think it, therefore, needless to be more particular, as it is by no means our intention to transcribe the New Testament; but only to exhibit the leading and comprehensive outlines of the religious character of that ancient and famous sect, called "*Christians first at Antioch*." We shall therefore conclude with a review of the characteristic outlines of the picture which we have drawn.

In the first place, then, considering this ancient sect in the light of the descriptive epithets by which they were originally distinguished before they received the appellation of "*christians*," we found they were at first called "*the disciples*" in relation to Jesus of Nazareth, on account of their exclusive adherence to him as their *only* master or teacher in all matters of religion and morality; next, that they were also called, "*the saints*," and "*they saints*" in relation to Jesus as separated unto him, and sanctified by the belief of his word: afterwards, that they were called "*brethren*," as united by those bonds under one head into one family; the aggregate, or assemblage of which, in one place, was called "*the church*," that is, the assembly of the called or chosen out of the common mass of mankind, in that place.— And lastly, upon the union of Jews and Gentiles into one associate body, which appears to have taken place first in Antioch, they received the new, appropriate, and distinguishing name of "*christians*," as partakers *with Christ* in that divine unction wherewith he was anointed; the great Prophet, High Priest, and King of his church; by a participation of which they also became a *royal priesthood*, being thereby made kings and priests unto God. This, then, was that new and royal name by which the Lord was graciously pleased to designate and distinguish his people.

In order to a more full developement of the religious principles and practice of this distinguished people, we had recourse to the apostolic commission, the execution of which gave birth and being to christianity, being persuaded that *whatever these were*, they were *such* in consequence of the accomplishment of this commission. In this part of our investigation we found the apostles authorised and instructed to preach the gospel throughout the world, to every creature; to baptize the believers of it; and afterwards to teach them to observe all the commandments of the Lord Jesus, with the gracious promise of his presence to be with them continu-

ally in so doing; that, therefore, to believe the gospel which the apostles preached, and to reduce to practice what they commanded in the name of Jesus, completed the character of a disciple; faith and obedience being all that was contemplated and required in the commission: consequently, that the religious principles of the disciples were principles of faith and obedience.

In order to determine more particularly the subject matter of their faith and obedience, or what they believed and practised, we had recourse to the authentic record of the apostles' preaching and teaching from the beginning of the 2d to the 8th verse of the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Upon the whole, without resuming particulars here, we found that the entire subject of their preaching was Jesus Christ, and him crucified; and that the whole of their teaching was brotherly kindness and charity, with a steadfast and persevering attention to the ordinances; viz. to the fellowship, to the breaking of the bread or of the loaf, and to the prayers. See the original, Acts ii. 42. For the continual observance of all which, it appears they were pre-eminent. Hence we clearly perceive what they believed and practised; namely, that the subject matter of their faith was the gospel, or every thing the apostles preached concerning Jesus—and of their practice, every thing the apostles commanded them to do in obedience to his authority. Neither more nor less than this was required in the commission, nor exhibited in the execution of it, as to faith and obedience. As to farther particulars respecting the moral and religious practice and conduct of those primitive saints, we think we have justly placed to their account the observance of all the practical injunctions contained in the epistles to the churches. Reader, if you would contemplate them in the beauty of a full drawn character, extract from the Holy Scriptures whatever is clearly asserted concerning Jesus, and place the sum total to the account of their faith:—next proceed in the same manner, from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, (Acts ii.) to the end of the book, and place to the account of their obedience every injunction, moral and religious, you can collect; and you will have a complete picture of a genuine and approved disciple. "If ye continue in my word," said Jesus to those Jews that believed on him, "then are ye my disciples indeed." John viii. 31. And when you have done this, see that you realize the same faith, upon the same evidence, and that you reduce to practice the same injunctions, in obedience to the same authority: so shall you also be a disciple indeed; suppose you

had never seen a religious book but the Old and New Testament; and, in so doing, you will not lose your labor.

Lastly, for the detection of error, please to contrast this full drawn picture of pure primitive christianity with its present exhibition in the world; and you will see how vast the difference, both in principle and practice. In the former, the gospel preached by the apostles, and believed, was the faith: their commands, directions, and exhortations, delivered in the name of the Lord Jesus, was the law. The belief of the former, confessed in and by baptism, constituted a disciple, and entitled the person to the enjoyment of the remission of his sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit; the grand, comprehensive, and essential principles of salvation. The obedience of the latter evinced the reality of his discipleship, recommended him to the esteem of his brethren, kept him in the love of God, and in the enjoyment of that peace which passeth all understanding but of him that hath it; nourished up and ripened his soul for a blissful and glorious immortality. Here all was evident, certain, and satisfactory; founded upon a divine testimony, divinely attested; God himself, by signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness to the truth and certainty of every item of the faith and obedience inculcated. Here was nothing of human authority—nothing of the opinions or inventions of men. No contested propositions to be first proved by human reasonings, and to be believed or practised by the disciples who acknowledged apostolic authority. But how is it now? Surely the very reverse. Alas! when will it be so again? Never, surely, until the professors of christianity return to the original standard of christianity—the New Testament; and until they be persuaded, with the primitive disciples, to place the whole of christianity in believing what the apostles preached and taught concerning Jesus, and in obeying what they enjoined upon disciples individually and collectively—that is, upon individuals, and churches.

THEOPHILUS.

Divine Origin of Christianity.

NO. III.

CHARACTER AND OFFICES OF THE APOSTLES

The character and offices of the Messiah, in reference to the divine origin of Christianity, engaged our attention in our last. We propose now considering the character and offices of his Apostles. If

the Messiah was as he claimed and proved himself to be, the Son of God, by whom as the eternal Word all things were created and are upheld and sustained, then we are bound to receive him in that character and to submit to his government and authority. And if his Apostles were what they claimed and proved themselves to be, his Ambassadors and Ministers penipotentary to the world, then are we under as much obligation to receive them as such and to yield obedience to them in all things pertaining to their sacred offices.—They exhibited to the world the same proofs of the divinity of their mission that the Messiah had done, of his; and gave the only evidences that can be given of a supernatural mission and message, and in confirmation of supernatural testimony.

The term Apostle is translated from the Greek *apostolos*, which is from *apostelloo*, compounded of *apo*, from, and *steloo*, to send, to send from, and simply means *one sent*.

Jesus Christ is the Apostle of God, and the only one direct from him to the world. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou (*apesteilas*) hast sent." "They [the twelve disciples] have believed that thou (*apesteilas*) didst send me." "As thou (*apesteilas*) has sent me into the world, even so have I also (*apesteila*) sent them into the world." "That the world may believe that thou (*apestalke*) hast sent me." John xvii. 3, 8, 18, 21. xx 21. The first of the above passages in rendered by Dr. Geo. Campbell, "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus the Messiah thy apostle." He has also rendered the third, "As thou hast made me thy apostle to the world, I have made them [the twelve] my apostles to the world."

The twelve attendants of the Messiah during his personal ministry on earth, the eye and ear witnesses of his doings and sayings, who were commissioned by him to the Jews; and Paul who was commissioned by him to the Gentiles, are the Apostles of Jesus Christ and the only ones direct from him, to the world.

In order for them to be Apostles of Jesus Christ, it was prerequisite that they should be personal attendants on the Mes-

siah from John's baptism until the day of his ascension into heaven. This Peter declared in his statement of the qualifications necessary for a successor to Judas. "Wherefore of these men which have accompanied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." They must have been *hyperetees*, personal attendants on the Messiah; "witness of his resurrection, eye witnesses of the doings, and ear witnesses of the sayings of Jesus." "They must have a special call and commission from the Messiah as his asbassadors." This we learn from what Annanias told Paul when sent to him: "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men, of what thou hast seen and heard." Paul, in consequence of his not having been a personal attendant of the Messiah, an eye witness of his doings and ear witness of his sayings, represents himself as one "born out of due time." After saying that he was seen of the twelve and above five hundred brethren at once, he says, "And last of all he was seen of me also, as one *born out of due time*." "Paul although he both saw and heard the risen Lord, and received from him in person a call and mission to the nations—although supernaturally endowed with all the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon all the others—infallible in all the mystery of Christ, felt himself so *seemingly* (not really) deficient in one respect, (not having been the companion of the Messiah during his earthly ministry,) that he represents himself as an Apostle "*born out of due time*." It has been imagined by some, that the Apostles in selecting Matthias to fill the place of Judas, done what that were not divinely authorised to do, that the Lord never recognised him as one of the twelve, and that Paul was chosen at last to fill the vacancy. But we think that we can show to the contrary. Luke who wrote Acts under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, records this circumstance, (the selecting of Matthias) as fulfilling a prophe-

cy, in which it was predicted that the place of Judas should be filled by another: "His bishopric let *another* take." It was not taken by Paul but by Matthias, and the prediction did not meet its fulfilment in the call of Paul. Our Saviour told his disciples that at the Regeneration or renovation when he should be seated on the throne of his glory they should sit on *twelve* thrones. This took place on Pentecost when the Reign of Heaven commenced. Paul was not made an Apostle until years afterwards; and if Matthias was not an apostle there must have been *eleven* instead of twelve thrones; there must have been a *vacant* throne. But the twelve thrones were filled; for Luke informs us that *Peter* stood up with the *eleven*. Matthias had also all the qualifications declared by Peter to be necessary for one of the twelve. Paul not having these qualifications, could not be one of the *twelve*. There was a difference too in their mission. The twelve were first commissioned to the Jews; Paul, to the Gentiles. But although Paul was as much an Apostle of the Messiah to the world, as really divinely called and *sent*, he had himself to come under the Reign of Favour which had commenced on Pentecost under the ministry of the twelve, before he could enter upon or exercise his apostleship. He had first to go to Annanias in order to be introduced into the Kingdom of Heaven, although he had been called to be an apostle as were the twelve, before their entrance into that kingdom. The Messiah had been predicted, his character and offices, by the Prophets. In order to accomplish the present salvation of the world from the guilt, pollution and dominion of sin, and their eternal salvation from its punishment, it is necessary that he be believed upon and obeyed. In order to this it must be proven that he is the Son of God, and that he has been exalted to the throne of the Universe and constituted Lord and Saviour of the world. And this cannot be done without witnesses or attendants, ear witnesses of his sayings and eye witnesses of his doings, who both heard his words and saw the miracles by which he confirmed his claims and proved the divinity of his mission, and who saw him after his resurrection and beheld him

ascend to heaven; and who could report these to the world and confirm their report in the same maner, and leave their testimony in writing for the conversion of succeeding generations. Hence our Saviour chose the twelve Apostles to be the attendants of his person on earth and his witnesses after his death, resurrection and ascension. "Ye have not chosen me," says our Lord to the Twelve in John, "but I have *chosen* you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." And after promising them the Holy Spirit to testify of him and with them, "And ye also shall *bear witness*, because ye have been with me from the beginning." And in Luke after his sufferings and resurrection, "And ye are *witnesses* of these things;" and in Acts, "Ye shall be *witnesses* unto me, both in Jerusalem and all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." In accordance with these declarations we hear Peter telling the Jews on Pentecost, after proving him to be the Son of God and citing the prophecies concerning his resurrection, "This Jesus hath God raised up *whereof we are all witnesses*;" and again after healing the cripple at the beautiful gate of the Temple, ye "killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; *whereof we are all witnesses*; and to the Sanhedrim when brought before them. "The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. And *we are his witnesses of these things*;" and at the house of Cornelius, "The word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all;) that word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Gallilee, after the baptism which John preached: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; and who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him. And *we are witnesses of all things which he did*, both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day, and

shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." Thus the Apostles having been the companions of Jesus, were to be his witnesses, to testify concerning him in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria and to all the world.

But as their memories were not infallible, as they were liable to forget what they had seen and heard, and as it was necessary that they should have a knowledge of Jesus in his glorified state, that he was made Lord, and of his will in regard to the affairs in which they were to be engaged, and also of what should happen in the future, it was necessary that they should be qualified for all this, when they should be deprived of the personal presence of their Master. Accordingly when He had informed them that he must leave them and they were filled with sorrow, he promises them the assistance and comfort of the Holy Spirit, to supply his place to them when he should be gone, and to supernaturally aid and instruct them. The sorrowful state of mind in which the disciples were placed by the information of his intended departure which Jesus had announced to them, occasions him to speak of the Holy Spirit more particularly in the character of "the Comforter," or Advocate.—"I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, [or Advocate] that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth in you and shall be with you. I will not leave you comfortless [or forlorn;] I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also." "The Comforter, 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, whatsoever I have said unto you." "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me; and ye also shall bear witness because ye have been with me from the beginning." "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 judgement." "I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew 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 shew it unto you."—Thus was the Holy Spirit, by a supernatural operation, or communication, to bring to the remembrance of the Apostles all things which they had heard from the Lord, his sayings, of which they were the ear witnesses; to teach them all things which it was necessary, for them to learn after his ascension; to be a witness for him; to guide them into all truth; to disclose unto them the things of the future; and to receive of Christ's, and shew unto them. Thus were they to be prepared and qualified for bearing testimony to the character and claims of the Messiah.—From the scriptures which we have quoted, we see that the Holy Spirit, in the personal absence of Jesus from the world, was to occupy the same place towards the apostles as he had previously done, in teaching them, guiding them into the truth, and testifying of him. Not only did the Apostles have the promise of the Holy Spirit to thus prepare and qualify them, but that of his aid in the performance of miracles for the confirmation of their testimony and of the truths which they promulgated, and in proof of the divinity of their mission. "He that believeth on me," says our Savior to them in the same connexion with the above which we have quoted, "the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." "The Father, that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." Speaking of these works or gifts, Paul tells the Corinthians that they were the work of the Holy Spirit. "Now

there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit;" and, "But all these *worketh* that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." Jesus, it will be recollected, told his disciples, when promising the Spirit to them, that the world could not receive it, because it neither perceived nor knew it. The personal mission of the Messiah was to the Jews, to whom he was "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." When importuned by a Canaanitish woman to expel a demon from her daughter, he replied to his disciples who urged him to send her away, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The mission of the Holy Spirit was to the apostles, and through them to the Church. By referring to the scriptures already quoted, it will be seen that the promise of the Spirit was made to *them*, concerning which Jesus said, when he told them the world could not receive it, "but *ye* know him; for he dwelleth in *you* and shall be with you;" and the promise of his gifts or works was to the *believers*, "he that *believeth* on me, the *works* that *I do* shall *he do* also," &c. The mission of the *apostles* was to the *world*; and this takes us from the promise of the Holy Spirit to the commission given unto them.

Matthew records it; "Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach [convert] all nations, baptizing them in [into] the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world [the conclusion of this state.] Mark records it; "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. And 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." Luke records it; "Then opened he their understanding,

that they might understand the scriptures, [Old Testament,] and said unto them, Thus it is written, [in the Prophecies, &c.] and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance [reformation] and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." John records it; "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." In accordance with the commission as recorded by these four writers, Luke says in the first chapter of the Acts of Apostles, "To whom [the Twelve] also he shewed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, Ye have heard of me." "But 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 part of the earth." The mission of the Apostles, we see, was to the whole world. But they had to remain at Jerusalem after the ascension of the Messiah, until he was crowned Lord of all, had assumed the Lordship of the Spirit, and had taken his seat on his Father's and the throne of the Universe and was glorified, before they could be invested with power from above. They dare not act upon their commission until then, although already given and defined. In fact, had they attempted such a thing, their labour would have been vain, as they could not have confirmed the truth of their message by any divine and supernatural attestations. It was on the day of Pentecost, when the disciples being unanimously assembled in the same place, the Holy Spirit descended from heaven and

the sound of a rushing violent wind, when cloven or separated tongues resembling fire rested upon each disciple, and when they began to speak in other languages as the Spirit gave them utterance, that the apostles received authority and power from above to act upon their commission and confirm their testimony by supernatural evidence, and that the Reign or Kingdom of Heaven commenced. The apostles were to be witnesses for the Saviour, as we have already seen, and the Holy Spirit was to testify with them. They were to testify to what they had *seen* and *heard*. Annanias told Paul when sent to him, that he should be our Saviour's "witness unto all men, of what thou hast seen and heard;" and when the Sanhedrim commanded Peter and John not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus, the Apostles replied, "whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak of the things which we have seen and heard." The Holy Spirit was to bear witness with the apostles to our Saviour, by the miracles performed by them. "He shall testify of me," says Jesus in promising the Spirit to them, "and ye also shall bear witness because ye have been with me from the beginning." And when the Apostles were arraigned before the Sanhedrim for disobeying them and teaching in the name of Jesus, Peter replied to them, "We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance [reformation] to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him." On Pentecost the apostles standing up with Peter, testified with him for Jesus, as did the Holy Spirit by the miraculous displays of divine power upon that occasion. It was then that the Holy Spirit began to convince the world through the Apostles, concerning sin, because they believed not on Jesus; concerning righteousness, because he went to his Father and his disciples saw him no longer; and concerning judgement, because the prince of this world is judged. It was for the purpose of establishing the

truth of that grand and sublime proposition of Christianity, that Jesus Christ is the Messiah and Son of God, and of the great facts of his resurrection and ascension, with the facts and truths connected with all these, that the various gifts of the Holy Spirit seem to have been conferred on the Apostles. To them the Spirit was given as it was to the Prophets, "by measure," for particular and definite purposes; but to Jesus God gave the Spirit not by measure, for he was always filled with the Spirit, and was constantly under its influence in all that he thought, said and done, or was pleased to say and do. The Apostles only said and done what they were instructed and commanded, through the Spirit; Jesus done what he would, for he is "Lord of the Spirit." To Jesus as Lord they owed all the power and authority with which they were clothed; and all that they said or done as his apostles, they said and done in his *name*, or by his authority. In accordance with the fulfilment of the promise which our Lord made to his *Apostles*, that he would be with them to the end of the world or "conclusion of this state," Mark adds, after the commission as recorded by him and which we have quoted, "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And *they* [the apostles] went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following;" and Paul to the Hebrew Christians, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will?" It was by the proclamation of the gospel, attended and confirmed by these miracles, that the Apostles, like Paul to the Gentiles, were sent to the people, "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in" Christ. When the Apostles left the world, their offices ceased, and the various miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit were withdrawn, the Chris-

tian Institution having been "set up;" for the completion and perfection of which they had been conferred. But under the influence of that Spirit by whom they were inspired and performed miracles, they committed their testimonies and their teachings to record. It is through the medium of these records that we behold them by the eye of faith, that we hear them speaking, and that we see the miracles which they performed. It is through this medium that they still continue to be the witnesses of Jesus, and that the Holy Spirit continues to testify with them, and will continue to testify to the end of the world.—It is through that medium that the Holy Spirit continues to convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. The words which we there have are not those of the Apostles, but of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. "I have given unto them," says our Saviour in his prayer to his Father, "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." "Now we have not received the Spirit of the world," says Paul to the Corinthians, "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 [Apostles] speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual," or "explaining spiritual things in spiritual words." Our Saviour prays to his Father, that his Apostles may agree in their testimony and that those who believe on him through that testimony may agree or be united. "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. * * * * I have given them thy word. * * * As thou has sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. * * * Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." It was necessary that the Apostles should agree in their testimony or word, in order that it may be credited or believed; and that those who

believe and obey it, may be united or agree together, in order that the world may believe. As the Apostles have left behind them no successors, and as the Holy Spirit no longer exerts a miraculous or supernatural influence, it is through their testimony, combined with that of the prophets, that the world must be converted to Christianity. As that testimony contains the record of the facts and truths which constituted the fulfilment of the predictions of the prophets concerning the Messiah, those who, convinced by the writings of the prophets and apostles that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, believe upon and obey him, are said to "be built upon the foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

The whole of the office of the Apostles is included in their being the witnesses of Jesus as it regards every thing which required their testimony, and their setting up the Christian Institution and making all the revelations concerning it to the world. In the first of these they could have no successors; for who ever heard of so anomalous a character as a successor to a witness? The thing is impossible. In the second they can have none; for they set up the Christian Institution and completed and perfected all its revelations. For the second or last of these, they were invested with as much authority and power as Jesus himself, (for he gave them the glory which his Father gave him,) and were authorised to do every thing in this part of their office in as full and as ample a manner as he himself, with authority equally as perfect and binding. He predicated their commission upon the omnipotency with which he himself was invested. "ALL POWER [authority] is given unto me in heaven and upon earth." He then says to them, "Go"—"Go YE"—"Go ye into ALL the world, and preach the gospel to EVERY creature"—"Go convert ALL nations." Not an individual or nation is excluded from their commission. We have already quoted their commission and adverted to their qualifications. They were invested with one power which constituted in a peculiar manner, the proof of their apostleship; conferring spiritual gifts by the laying on of their hands. These could be received only by the hands of an apostle, for none but an apostle could con-

fer them. The Samaritans could not receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit after their conversion by Philip, until Peter and John went down and laid their hands upon them; and it was by the laying on of Paul's hands that the disciples with whom he met at Ephesus, there received the Holy Spirit. Paul in his epistles, particularly the introductory part of them, makes frequent references to them in establishing his authority as an apostle and in asserting and vindicating his apostleship. He tells the Corinthians, "Truly the *signs* of an *apostle* were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein you were inferior to other churches?"

Clothed by the Lord Jesus Christ with all necessary power and authority, the Apostles became his Ambassadors and Ministers plenipotentiary, and his only ones, to the world; and in Christ's stead, or in his behalf, prayed them to be reconciled to God, and commanded them to believe, reform, and be immersed for the remission of sins. They are the only Stewards of the mysteries of God, as it was by or through them that these mysteries, which had been hid or kept secret from every age and generation of the world since its beginning until the Christian age, were to be dealt out, made known or revealed. "Let a man so account of us, [Apostles,] as of the *ministers* of Christ, and *stewards* of the mysteries of God." "Not that we [Apostles] are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing, as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us [Apostles] able *ministers* of the New Testament [Covenant;] not of the letter [Law,] but of the spirit [Gospel;] for the *letter* killeth, but the *spirit* giveth life. But if the *ministration* of death [the Law,] written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall the *ministration* of the *spirit* [the Gospel] be rather glorious? For if the *ministration* of condemnation be glory, much more doth the *ministration* of *righteousness* exceed in glory." "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us [Apostles] the *ministry* of *reconci-*

liation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and hath given to us [Apostles] the *ministry* of *reconciliation*. Now then we [Apostles] are *ambassadors* for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in *Christ's* *stead*, Be ye reconciled to God." We have no "ambassadors of Christ," "ministry," or "ministers of the Gospel" now. Those who claim to be such characters, do it without any authority from God, and are usurpers of what belonged to the Apostles only. The Apostles as Ministers ministered the Gospel, and as Ambassadors bore the message of salvation, peace and life, and communicated it to a lost, alienated and dying world. We might as well and could with as much propriety call the politician, who publicly comments or speaks on a Treaty of any kind, a minister or ambassador, as the preacher who does the same with the word of God. The office of ministers and ambassadors both ceased with the Apostles. They in their writings are the only ministers and ambassadors to whom we are to attend. We are to regard no others. Neither have we any stewards to open, disclose, or deal out, *mysteries* to us. We are not in the least to regard the claims of those who assume to be such. Their assumptions are utterly unauthorised and unfounded. The Apostles as the stewards of Christ have revealed every thing necessary to be known, in language plain and intelligible. All other "stewards" only serve to "darken counsel." One individual now is no more a "minister," "ambassador," or "steward," than another; for upon the same ground that one claims, all may claim, these characters.—The Apostles acting in "Christ's stead" could pray the people to be reconciled to God; but none in "Christ's stead" can do it now.—The Apostles by revealing and propounding the terms of pardon and announcing the condemnation of those who refused to submit to them upon their authority, are said to remit and retain sins, to bind and unbind. "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

The Apostles are under Christ the only

lawgivers to the church. "Ye which have followed me," says Jesus to the Twelve, "in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." All others who assume to give laws to the Church, usurp the thrones of the Apostles, and are to be treated as usurpers and utterly disregarded. No other laws but those promulgated by the Apostles and contained in the New Testament, are binding upon us by the authority of God;—whether emanating from the Pope, a council, synod, assembly, association or conference, or comprised in a creed, confession of faith, or discipline of any kind. "We [Apostles] 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."

EDITOR.

Note to the preceding Essay.

In further illustration of the authority of the Apostles and the regard due their testimony in consequence, and of the impossibility of their having any successors, we add the following extracts; the first from the July No. of the "Apostolic Advocate and Prophetic Interpreter," containing bro. Thomas' excellent and admirable essay on "The Christian Religion;" the others from bro. Campell's Letters to Bishop Otey in the June, July, August and September Nos. of the "Millennial Harbinger" for 1835.

ED. C. R.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTLES.

Jesus, though sinless himself, was put to death for the offences of the world. On the third day he was raised from the dead by the spirit or power of God. After his resurrection he appeared to many persons at different times, and in divers places, during forty days. He submitted himself to their inspection, so that they might be thoroughly assured that it was the same Jesus whom the Jews had put to death, by a crucifixion. Among these persons were the Apostles, whom he had chosen to be the witnesses of the things pertaining to his life, death, resurrection, ascension and doctrine. Before he was removed from this planet, he assembled them together, and gave the full power to remit sins, to teach, and to give laws to the believers, saying—*All authority is given*

to me in heaven and upon the earth; in virtue of which he ordered them to "Go and convert all nations," in the following manner,—by baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THE THINGS WHICH I HAVE COMMANDED YOU.—Matt. xxvii. 19, 20.

"Whatever village or city you enter," said Jesus, on a former occasion, to these same Apostles, inquire what person of worth dwells there, and abide with him until you leave the place—*Wheresoever they will not receive you, nor regard your words, in departing from that house or city, shake the dust off your feet.* Indeed, I say to you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrha shall be more tolerable on the day of (its political) judgment, than the condition of that city.—When they deliver you up (to councils,) be not anxious how, or what you shall speak: *for what you shall speak, shall be suggested to you in that moment.* For it shall not be you that shall speak; but the spirit of my Father, who shall speak by you. What I tell you in the dark, publish in the light; and what is whispered in your ear, (see 1 Sam. 9. 15. on this phrase,) proclaim from the house tops. **HE THAT RECEIVES YOU, RECEIVES ME; and he who receives me, receives Him who sent me:**—Matt. x.

To Peter, one of the Apostles, he said—*I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: whatsoever you bind on the earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on the earth, shall be loosed in heaven:*—Matt. xvi. 19.—and to them all he said,—*"As the Father has sent me, so send I you.* After these words he breathed on them, and said to them, receive the Holy Spirit. *Whose sins soever you remit, they are remitted to them; and whose sins soever you retain, they are retained.*" John xx. 22. Again, he said—"Whatsoever you shall ask in my name, I will do."—ch. xiv. 14.

From this testimony, it is clear, that they were the Apostles—*not of men, neither by men; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.*—Gal. i. 1. What they taught was the very truth which they received of Jesus, the great Apostle of God. The Apostleship and authority of Jesus being admitted, that of his Apostles cannot be disowned. Hence then, the claims of the Apostles themselves to the obedience of the faithful, are equally entitled to respect with those of the Lord himself. In brief, we plainly learn from the scriptures adduced, that in respect to authority, there is no difference between the inspired testimony of the Apostles; and the testimony of their divine Master. The fol-

lowing quotations deserve the greatest attention:

"Though you have ten thousand teachers in Christ, yet you have not many fathers; for to Christ Jesus, THROUGH THE GOSPEL, I have begotten you; therefore, I beseech you, BE IMITATORS OF ME. I have sent to you Timothy, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, for this purpose; *that he put you in mind of my ways, which are in Christ, EVEN AS I TEACH EVERY WHERE IN EVERY CONGREGATION.* Now some are puffed up, as if I were not coming to you. But I will come to you soon, if the Lord will, and shall know, not the speech of them who are puffed up, but the power. FOR THE REIGN OF GOD IS NOT IN WORD, BUT IN POWER.—What do you incline? Shall I come to you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?" 1 Cor. iv. 15, 21. This is the language of one having great authority.—Again, "as God has distributed to every one, and as the Lord has called every one, so let him walk; and so, in all the congregations, I ORDAIN. Ch. vii. 17. *Become imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ—hold fast the traditions as I delivered them to you—the other things I will set in order when I come.*" Chap. xi. "God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, has shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. WE HAVE THIS TREASURE in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of God, and not of us. 2 Epis. ch. iv. 6, 7.—*God has given to us (apostles) the ministry of the reconciliation—we, therefore, execute the office of AMBASSADORS for Christ, as of God beseeching you by us; we pray you, in behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God. 2 Ep. ch. v. 18, 20. Being absent, I write these things; that, when present, I may not act sharply, according to the power which the Lord has given me for edification, and not for destruction. 2 Ep. ch. xiii. 10.*

"Yourselves know, brethren, our entrance among you, that it was not in vain. For although we had before suffered, and were shamefully handled, as you know, at Phillippi, we were bold through our God to speak to you the gospel of God, amidst a great combat. (See Acts xvi.) Besides, our exhortation was not from error, nor from impurity, nor with guile. But as we were approved of God, to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, *not as pleasing men, but God, who tries our hearts.* For neither did we, at any time, use flattering words, or a pretext for covetousness; God is witness. Neither sought we honor from men, neither

from you, nor from others. *We might have acted with authority, as Apostles of Christ; but we were gentle amongst you, as a nurse cherishes her children: so, having a strong affection for you, we were all pleased to have imparted to you, not only the gospel of God, but our own lives also; because, you were become dear to us. For you remember, brethren, our labor and toil, that laboring night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you, we preached to you the gospel of God. 1 Thess. ii. 1, 9.* "We beseech and exhort you, by (the authority of) the Lord Jesus, that as you have received from us, how you ought to walk, and please God, you would abound more therein. For you know what *commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus. Ch. iv. 1, 2.* To salvation God called you, *by our gospel,* that you might obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well then, brethren, stand firm, and hold fast the traditions you have been taught, whether by our word or letter. 2 Ep. ch. ii. 14, 15.—We have confidence in the Lord concerning you, that you both do, and will do, *the things which we command you. Ch. iii. 5.* Now, *if any one do not obey our command in this letter, point out that man, and keep no company with him, that he may be ashamed. v. 14.* "He who despises us, despises not man, but God, who certainly has given his spirit—the Holy Spirit, to us." 1 Thess. iv. 8.

Be mindful of the words before spoken by the Holy prophets, and of the commandments of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour. 2. Pet. 3, 2. The commandments of the Apostles, being the things Jesus ordered them to teach the believers, this passage applies equally to the commands of the Apostles, as of their Lord;—"By this we know that we have known him, (Jesus,) *if we keep his commandments. He who says, I have known him; and does not keep his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in this man. 1 Jno. ii. 3.* "WE, (Apostles,) ARE OF GOD: HE WHO KNOWS GOD, HEARKENS TO US; HE WHO IS NOT OF GOD, HEARKENS NOT TO US. *By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. 1 Jno. iv. 6.*

But, most of these passages the clergy have applied to themselves. Now, concerning the individuals of whom this order of men is composed, the Apostle says, "For such are false Apostles, deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ. And no wonder; for Satan himself transforms himself into a messenger of light, (or truth.) Therefore, it is no great wonder, if his ministers also transform themselves as

ministers of righteousness: Whose end shall be according to their works. 2 Cor. xi. 13, 15. These are therefore, not to be obeyed; nor in the least to be regarded by the faithful.—*Apostolic Advocate.*

Our, and all political governments in civilized countries, have three departments—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. In the christian community Jesus is lawgiver and judge—his apostles announce his laws and statutes—and the executive part is all that belongs to the ordinary communities, built upon the foundation, *not of bishops and deacons*, but of apostles and prophets—Jesus himself the chief corner.

* * * * *
The word *Apostle* means no more than one sent from or by another, *on any business whatever*. Of Apostles we have three orders, if you please, in the New Institution:—

1. Jesus Christ is the *Apostle of God*, and his only *Apostle direct to the world*.—John xvii. 3, 8, 18, 21. xx. 21.

2. The twelve attendants, eye and ear witnesses of the Messiah, whom he commissioned first to the Jews; and Paul, whom he commissioned to the Gentiles, are the *Apostles of Jesus Christ*.

3. Those sent by men, by the Apostles of Jesus Christ, by the *congregations of Christ*—are also *Apostles of men*—Apostles of *Apostles*—Apostles of churches. Of these were such agents as Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, Andronicus, Junia, and the *apostolorum ecclesioon*, found in the Epistles.

The last class may have successors, but not by ordination, but from mission. Jesus Christ, God's *Apostle to the world*, had no successor—has no vicar. The Twelve *Apostles of the Lamb*—the *Apostles of Christ*, have no successors. *The Apostles appointed by them, or by men, or by one or more churches, never were an order by themselves; and, therefore, could have no successors by descent and ordination*. We have still such officers amongst us—when any thing is to be done abroad, which the bishops and deacons cannot perform, because extra-official to their duties—they being *permanent and stationary* officers of one single congregation. But neither Bishop Onderdonk, nor any other Bishop, diocesan, seems to be solicitous to be the successor to the *third class* of servants, to whom the title "*Apostles*" legitimately applies.

* * * * *
According to the Book, the Apostles never were one of three orders, nor one of two orders of officers in the kingdom of the Messiah, but all orders in one as respected the administration of the Reign of Heaven. In-

deed, theirs was the authority to *create and fill offices* in the church. Under Christ they instituted the offices and gave directions for the filling them with suitable persons. They originated the offices and gave instructions for the election and appointment of bishops and deacons in the christian communities. The Messiah gave them all his authority as respected the temporal and earthly affairs of his kingdom. While on earth himself he ministered to all, and was the only lawgiver to his subjects. They also, when left as his Apostles to the world and gifted with the Holy Spirit, officiated as preachers, teachers, deacons, bishops, lawgivers; and if there were any other work necessary to the building of the christian temple, they performed it. It is, then, in our judgment, highly derogatory to the standing of the Apostles, to regard or speak of them as one of three orders of public functionaries in the christian communities.

They condescended to be what is sometimes called deacons, and attended to the serving of common tables in the Jerusalem church. They also condescended to discharge the duties of elders or bishops in particular congregations, though they had "*the care of all the churches*." But all these duties they assigned to the two offices of bishops and deacons as soon as they found persons competent to discharge them. Till then they were, as the occasion required, servants of Christ in every capacity in the church. They were, indeed, not one of three orders distinct and separate, but all orders of officers in one, as being the stewards of Christ and his ambassadors to the world.

There is yet remaining in the true nature of their office as *Apostles*, one argument, which, of itself, seems to preclude even the possibility of their having any official successors.

The essential attributes of an *Apostle* are found in the following prerequisites:—

1. They must have been personal attendants (*hyperetes*) on the Messiah, from "his immersion by John until the day of his ascension into heaven," as Peter declared in his statement of the qualifications for a *successor of Judas*.* They must be witnesses of his resurrection, eye witnesses of the doings, and ear witnesses of the sayings of Jesus.

2. They must have a special call and mission from the person of the Messiah as his ambassadors; they must have heard his voice saying, *Go*.†

3. They must have all the authority in

*Acts i. 22.

†Acts xxii. 14.

every church and in every affair pertaining to the church, that Christ himself would have were he present in his own church. So that in hearing and obeying them, we are hearing and obeying God. "We," says John, "are of God. He that is of God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth us not." "Whose sins," says the Messiah, "you remit, they are remitted; and whose sins you retain, they are retained." In one word, infallibility in all things pertaining to the constitution, doctrine, and administration of the Reign of God was assential to their work and office.

Now, without these qualifications, can any one be a successor of these Apostles of Christ? And are these not the Apostles from whom succession is claimed? Is it not, then, impossible for them to have any official successors?

Paul, although he both saw and heard the risen Lord, and received from him in person a call and mission to the nations—although supernaturally endowed with all the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon all the others—infallible in all the mystery of Christ, felt himself so *seemingly* (not really) deficient in one respect, (not having been the companion of the Messiah during his earthly ministry) that he represented himself as an Apostle "*born out of due time.*" If, then, Paul, with every other qualification, was in one respect born out of due time, though this was amply compensated by his superabundance of visions and revelations—may we not affirm that all the men now living are born too late to aspire to that order of men whom Christ designated his Apostles to the nations? And can any person be a successor of those Apostles, destitute of not only one, but of all the essential attributes belonging to such officers?

* * * * *

Now if it should appear that the office of Apostles has wholly ceased, no logic can show that there is any such office on earth as a successor of the Apostles. Having in our second letter particularized the order of officers called Apostles, succession to whom is pleaded, we now institute an inquiry into the nature of this office.

Jesus of Nazareth was the Apostle of God the Father. The twelve appointed by Jesus, and Paul afterwards sent by him, are the only Apostles of Christ. Messengers sent by christian communities are the Apostles of churches. The Pope contends that Christ has a successor on earth as the one only Apostle of God. The Episcopalians contend that the Apostles of Christ have successors. We contend that neither Jesus as the Apostle of God, nor the Apos-

les of Christ, as his ambassadors to the nations, can, from the very nature of their office, have successors. There is no debate between us concerning the Pope as the successor of Jesus. The controversy is, whether Christ's Apostles could have successors. That they cannot is to us evident:—

1st. Because they were ordained to be witnesses of the sayings and doings of Jesus, and to attest his resurrection from the dead. Luke xxiv, 48. Acts i. 21, 22. ii. 32. x. 39, 41.

2d. They were ordained not only to prove that Jesus was the Messiah—that he died for our sins, was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; but also to set up the Christian Institution, as Moses was commissioned to set up the Jewish. Hence Paul said he was ordained to be a *preacher* and a *teacher* of the Gentiles in the truth—one that introduced the gospel—an able minister of the New Institution—a steward of the secrets of Christ. 2 Cor. iii. 5—13. iu. 1. 1 Cor. iv. 1. &c.

Such was the office of Apostles, and for such an office their qualifications were the various gifts of the Holy Spirit—the power of uttering infallibly the oracles of God—of confirming their testimony with supernatural powers, and of imparting all spiritual gifts to others.

* * * * *

For two good reasons we argued in our last that the office of Apostles has ceased: First, because it is impossible that persons born after the death and resurrection of Jesus could be witnesses of his sayings, doings, death, and resurrection; and that this was one half of the apostolic office has been proved, and assented to on all sides. Next, because the christian revelation is complete, and the christian institution is reared by the Apostles, which was the other part of their office. It is inexpedient to muster a hundred reasons, when two impossibilities render both office and succession inconceivable. It is impossible that any man living can exercise the office of Apostles in either half of the office which Jesus assigned them.

But that there is an order of Apostles distinct from those commissioned by Jesus, possessing general superintendance, a right to ordain, and the exercise of discipline, destitute of all the qualifications of Christ's Apostles—as eye and ear witnesses of the word—destitute of all the gifts of the Spirit necessary to revelation and the erection of the christian church—a sort of sub-Apostles, such as Timothy and Titus, is all that Episcopalians contend for.

Touching this class of inferior Apostles, one thing must be conceded, and that involves their pretensions in extreme jeopardy. It is this—that their commission is not found written in the canonical Scriptures. In what chapter and verse may we expect to find their commission from Jesus! Or, that being impossible, in what chapter and verse may we find their commission from the Apostles? Bishop Onderdonk would say, 'In the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and to Titus; for these two Bishops were commissioned by Paul.' Grant it, and what then?—They were Apostles of Apostles—not coordinates, but subordinates—agents *pro tempore*, not for life—without a diocese, and without a permanent charge. Their commission was, in fact, no more than this: 'I entreat you, my son Timothy, to remain at Ephesus where I left you—to superintend the affairs of that church—to instruct its teachers—to exercise discipline, and to exhort and teach the congregation, till I call you hence.'

'Titus, I left you in Crete that you might set in order the things left unfinished, and ordain seniors in every city, as I commanded you. I now enjoin you to rebuke the Cretans—to inculcate the things which become wholesome doctrine—to exhort and reprove with all authority—to teach and exercise discipline faithfully while you continue in Crete; but when I shall send Artemas to you, or Tychicus, leave Crete and hasten to me at Nicopolis; for I want your services there during the winter.'

From these commissions it clearly appears that Timothy was not ordained Bishop of Ephesus, nor Titus of Crete, as the apocryphal postscripts found in our common Testaments falsely assert. Timothy is regarded in the Acts of the Apostles as one of Paul's ministers, (Acts xix. 20. xxi. 4.) and as such it was necessary that he should act for Paul and under his instructions.

The following facts are of importance in deciding the question concerning the diocese and jurisdiction of Timothy:—

1. He was not in Ephesus when Paul addressed the Elders or Bishops of Ephesus at Miletus. Acts xx.

2. The address itself proves that the Bishops of Ephesus (for in the original they are called *Bishops*) were under no Diocesan or Archbishop, and that the church in Ephesus was continued by the Apostle without any such superintendency.

3. Timothy was only left in Ephesus while Paul went over into Macedonia, and the first letter to Timothy shows that Paul wrote to him only to continue there for a time. Hence Timothy was never perma-

nently located in any capacity at Ephesus: "Till I come" was the tenure of his ministry at that city; but "if I tarry long," says Paul, I instruct you how, during my absence, you should behave in that church. All these directions had reference to some special circumstances in Ephesus peculiar to it at that time.

4. It is evident that Timothy did not long continue in Ephesus; for he was with Paul in Rome, and is joined with him in his Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, written during his first imprisonment. From all that appears in the Acts and the Epistles, Paul spent more time in Ephesus than ever did Timothy; for he was there first and last about three years, and it is not evident that Timothy was absent from Paul more than two years at most.

5. It is assumed that the second letter to Timothy was written to him while at Ephesus, but this is only an assumption—it ought to be proved. It cannot: for if Timothy were at Ephesus, then why should Paul have said to him in that letter, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus." Again, if Timothy had been at Ephesus, Paul would not have sent him to Troas for his books and parchments before his return to Rome. It is all assumption, & very improbable assumption. Now, let it be carefully noted that Timothy, not being at Ephesus when the second letter was written to him, there is no authority for the opinion that he ever was in Ephesus after Paul's first imprisonment, or that he ever after officiated in any capacity at Ephesus.

6. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written some two or three years after Paul had left Timothy at Ephesus, affords not the least countenance to the opinion that Timothy was there, or then Bishop of that church; for it has no allusion to him whatever.

Without a waste of words in expatiating on these facts before us, which, to you, would, indeed, be wholly superfluous, may we not say, that there is not the slightest scriptural evidence that Timothy was an Apostle of Jesus Christ, or that he was Bishop of the church in Ephesus, in the Episcopal acceptance of the word?

It is needless to spend time on the case of Titus. It is unequivocally evident that the unfinished business assigned him in Crete was by Paul expected to be soon accomplished, and therefore he was commanded to leave that place on the arrival of either Artemas or Tychicus. His was a temporary and not a permanent employment in Crete.

In the next place, it is abundantly clear that Titus was Paul's minister, and not

Christ's Apostle; for in 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. he intimates that he expected him to minister to him at Troas. In 2 Cor. vii. 6—13. we find him waiting upon Paul in Philippi.— Again, we find him (2 Cor. xii. 18.) Paul's minister to Corinth in reference to the collections for the poor. And we find him (2 Tim. iv. 10.) on business for Paul at Dalmatia. All of which is not very flattering to the claims of diocesan prelates. There is, then, do scriptural evidence that Titus lived or died Bishop of Crete.

The case of Timothy and that of Titus, together with the prelatial angels of the seven Asiatic churches, when candidly examined, I trust I need not now say to you, afford no flattering encouragement to those who contend for diocesan episcopacy as a New Testament institution.

That these ministers of Paul did preach the gospel, teach the christians, lay hands on elders elect, and exercise rule over the communities during their sojourn is, I think, undeniably evident. Those who have no system to defend or impugn, will, I presume, not only see, but cheerfully acknowledge this—at least I do.

That there is, however, an order of men in all ages their successors in office, whose sole right it is to do these things, is quite another proposition, and one which never has been (in my judgment) satisfactorily proved; and sure I am that the apostolic writings afford no instructions for the creation and perpetuation of such an order of men as distinct from, and superior to, the Bishops of a single congregation.

That every christian community ought to have its own bishops and deacons, and that it may have its own angels, messengers, or agents, call them almoners, or evangelists, (I am not fastidious about their designation,) I am as fully persuaded as I am that we are to have christian congregations and good order in them. That all officers are to be elected by the whole community, and formally set apart to the work assigned them, is a proposition of easy proof. Besides, the nature of society requires this as the only rational medium between despotism and anarchy, and experience proves that it is indispensable to the prosperity of the christian kingdom.—*Millennial Harbinger.*

Pitts' Book on Baptism Reviewed and Exposed.

NO. III.

Mr. Pitts appears to manifest great sensitiveness on the subject of Baptism, and great antipathy to *Immersion*. His "hy-

drophobia" is easily accounted for. He seems to have been badly bitten by that great monster "Antichrist." And we have noticed that in cases of the kind of "hydrophobia" of which we are speaking, the more badly bitten the individual is, the greater aversion he has to *water* and *vice versa*. This dislike to water is frequently manifested by a disposition to have the application of as little of it as possible; to have a few drops sprinkled or a handful poured, in preference to having the whole body immersed.

One of the most unjust and unfair things in this "Book on Baptism," is the attempt which Mr. Pitts seems to have made, to render baptism for remission of sins as odious and heretical as he could, and to excite as much prejudice against it as possible, by associating it with the Roman Catholic perversions of it which have been made. This he does in the commencement of his book, with the design no doubt to prejudice the reader at the start and thus prepare him as he wished, for his succeeding remarks. After observing that

—"when to an erroneous opinion of these ordinances, ["of Christianity"]* is added some heretical dogmas, [sound points of doctrine,] subversive of the power of godliness, [false modern orthodoxy,] and of the very foundation [enthusiasm] upon which we are divinely [humanly] taught to build our hopes of heaven, we [Methodistic clergy] are called upon at once, to raise up a standard against those sacrilegious sorcerers [restorers of primitive Christianity] who would "remove the ancient landmarks," [of Methodism,] and faithfully to guard against the imposture [honesty] of those false prophets [teachers of truth] that were predicted to come in the last days;"

he takes up the subject of Baptism as follows:

"Baptism has been a theme of critical and protracted disputation with many polemic divines; and to the mere superficial theorist, a ground productive of the wildest whimsies and most dangerous speculations. [A "dangerous" non-essential!] Almost every position and construction that could have been assumed, [a construction "assumed" not "put upon,"] and every appendage and innovation that could have obtained, [an

* The places in brackets thus [] are by ourselves.—Ed. C. R.

appendage "obtained!") have been practised [a "position," "construction," and "appendage" practised!] upon the unsuspecting credulity of deluded mortals. We learn from ecclesiastical writers, that in the earlier ages of the church, the ordinance was abused by many childish notions and superstitious figments, that were attempted by way of improvement upon a divine institution. Such as giving to the baptized, milk and honey, and wine and honey, to which were added extreme unction and the imposition of hands. Also singing [signing perhaps] with the sign of the cross, to which so much virtue was attached, that they supposed the devil could not approach those who had the heavenly sign of the cross upon them. They afterwards introduced the ceremonies of exorcism and abjuration, in order to make evil spirits depart from the persons to be baptized. They also used lighted candles, and gave salt to the persons to taste, and the priests touched the mouth and ears of the candidate with spittle, and blew and spit on his face; and the baptized person wore white garments until the Sunday following. Many other such like foolish vagaries and mummeries were in vogue as mentioned by Milner, Mosheim, Echerd, Watson and others. Some of which have long since been abandoned, but others continue in the Romish Church until this day." pp 6, 7.

Now we do not see what all this irrelevant matter could have been introduced here for, except for the purpose we have mentioned. Every body who knows any thing about the religious principles or practice of those in the present Reformation, know that we are as free from all these "foolish vagaries and mummeries" as Mr. Pitts himself. After making some remarks on the opinion alluded to in our No. 2. he proceeds:

"The next opinion to be examined on the subject, is an old hackened heresy of the Romish Church, but better known in the present day by the title of "Campbellism." It was introduced among the Baptists a few years ago by the gentleman whose cognomen connects itself with the *ism* he advocates. "The Romanists, agreeable to their superstitious opinion as to the efficacy of sacraments, considered baptism administered by a priest, having a good intention, as of itself applying the merits of Christ to the person baptized. According to them baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation. From this view of its efficacy arises their distinction between sins committed before and after baptism. *The hereditary corruption of our na-*

ture and all actual sins committed before baptism, are said to be entirely removed by it; so that if the most abandoned person were to receive it for the first time in the article of death, *all his sins would be washed away.*" Vide Watson's Theo. Insts. p. 430. PERFECTLY in accordance with the foregoing papal delusion in regard to the efficacy of water baptism, is the doctrine taught by the immersion translator."—p. 10.

This entirely confirms what we have said in our preceding remarks. We would ask, is a doctrine to be rejected on account of its perversions? If so, then Christianity itself would be rejected, as is often done by the infidel, as well as what it teaches, in regard to Baptism by the sectarian. How very *unjust* and unfair too, is the attempt to thus do away the real meaning of Baptism! We would also ask, whether the doctrine taught by bro. Cumpbell is in *perfect accordance* with what has been quoted above? Where has he taught that baptism administered by a *priest* having good intention of *itself* applies the merits of Christ to the person baptized? Where has he taught that the *hereditary corruption of our nature* is entirely removed by it? Where has he taught that if the *most abandoned* person were to receive it for the first time "*in the article of death* all his sins would be washed away?" We have never met with such places; and Mr. Pitts has not shown, and cannot, we believe, show them. And yet "the doctrine taught by" bro. C. is "*perfectly in accordance*" with these!—He makes the following note at the place quoted above where he speaks of bro. Campbell's "cognomen" and "ism."

"Mr. Campbell frequently disclaims against being called the *leader* of a party, or the *founder* of a sect. And his disciples profess to discard the term "CAMPBELLISM," and deny that he is their leader. But men are not always fortunate enough to conceal their *true designs*. See the term "Campbellism," recognized and used by Mr. Campbell himself as descriptive of his system of religious faith. Millennial Harbinger, vol. 3, page 100. Where he contends for "CAMPBELLISM A QUARTER OF A CENTURY AGO."—But forsooth, an apologist would say, he only meant the "ancient gospel." Indeed! and is the "*ancient gospel*" only *twenty-five years old!*"—p. 9.

It would seem very strange if bro. Campbell should aspire to be the leader of a par-

ty or to give his name to a system of religion, when he published at the head of every no. of the "Christian Baptist," his first periodical, for seven years, "Style no man on earth your Father; for he alone is your father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Assume not the title of RABBI; for ye have only one teacher. Neither assume the title of LEADER; for ye have only one leader—the MESSIAH." And when he has also constantly protested against both. Of this the following are specimens:

"I will join you [Spencer Clack] in killing Agag or Campbellism, or whatever you please to call it, as cordially as ever did Silas M. Noel, only do not misapply these terms. Call not the weekly meetings of the disciples Campbellism; can not "immersion for the remission of sins" Campbellism; call not immersion, rather than sprinkling, Agag; call not fellowship of the saints, or weekly contributions for the poor saints, widows, and orphans, Campbellism; call not venerating the Apostles Campbellism, and keeping Agag alive. In a word, call not any institution of Jesus Christ, Campbellism. Every Campbellism, every invention of mine which you will point out to me, I will help you to burn, or drown, or exile, as the case may require. I will offer a premium to any man or woman who will produce one instance where ever I made a Campbellism, an opinion of mine, a bone of controversy, a term of communion, or shut out of a church or meeting-house any one for not honoring an opinion of mine. I challenge you and all the world to produce one such instance; and if I do not, when produced, kill that Agag, and denounce that Campbellism, then there is no truth in me."—*Millennial Harbinger*, vol. 1, p. 293.

And again:

"We do protest against christening the gospel of Jesus and the christian religion, by the name of any mortal man. To carry the principle out, we ought to call every man's sentiments by his name. Because we have disclaimed creeds, names, and sects, our adversaries seem to take a pleasure in designating our writings and speeches by the name creed, Campbellism, theory, system, &c. This is both unmanly and unchristian. Men, fond of nicknaming, are generally weak in reason, argument, and proof."—*Mill. Har.* vol. 1. p. 118.

Bro. Campbell has never then, as Mr. Pitts has falsely asserted, "recognized and

used," "the term 'Campbellism,'" "himself as descriptive of his system of religious faith." This has never formed one of his "true designs." What then, it may be inquired, did he intend when he said (not contended for) "Campbellism a quarter of a century ago?" He meant that what our opponents call "Campbellism," the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice without the writings of men, and to the exclusion of all creeds and confessions, was contended for by the Baptists 26 years before, and showed this from one of their Circular Letters. At the end of the note above quoted, Mr. Pitts makes a poor attempt at wit; "Indeed! and is the 'ancient gospel,' only twenty-five years old!" If the saying, "Christianity a quarter of a century ago," would make it "only twenty five years old," then we can make it as young as we please! This specimen of Mr. P.'s logic, makes it very poor indeed; and speaks badly of his intellect. The saying that any thing existed 25 or 30 or 50 years ago, does not imply that it did not exist before; as ought to be obvious to common sense. And yet such seems to be the reasoning of the ex-missionary to South America!

After saying as quoted in the preceding part of this article, that the doctrine taught by bro. C. "in regard to the efficacy of water baptism" was perfectly in accordance with a "Papal delusion," Mr. P. tears out of their connexion in bro. C.'s writings a long list of quotations, and strings them together as his sentiments in regard to the design of baptism.

"Mr. Campbell says, "In and by the act of immersion, as soon as our bodies are put under the water, at that very instant our former or old sins are all washed away."—See *Christian Baptist*, vol. 5. p. 100. He declares again, "we regard baptism as securing to the believing subject all the blessings of the new covenant, and especially the remission of sins, on which we emphasize." *M. H.* vol. 2. p. 485. "Remission of sins cannot in this life be received and enjoyed previous to immersion." *Extra to M. H.* vol. 1. p. 34. Again: "When the baptized believer rises out of the water, enters the world the second time, he enters it AS INNOCENT, AS CLEAN, AS UNSPOTTED AS AN ANGEL!" Debate with McCalla by Campbell. p. 137.

"Again he says, "In being immersed by

his authority into the name of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit, our former sins are blotted out." M. H. vol. 2. p. 8. Again, "Call immersion then a new birth, a burial and resurrection, a regeneration, and its meaning is the same. And when so denominated it must import that change of state which is imported in putting on Christ, in being pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, reconciled, saved." Extra to M. H. vol. 1. p. 42. "Immersion and regeneration are two bible names for the same act." Ib. p. 34. "We are brought down into the water, from this we are brought up again. After this burial we rise to newness of life, or in other words we are born of water, and thus we come into a new state. Pardoned, justified, sanctified and adopted into the family of God." M. H. vol. 1. page 361. Again, he says, "there is no instance of remission not accompanying baptism, except where faith was lacking in the subject." M. H. vol. 4. p. 172. He says, "Tell the disciples that so soon as the name of the Lord is named upon them, so soon as they have believingly been immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of their sins, *they are all made sons and daughters, kings and priests to God.*" M. H. vol. 1. p. 368. He declares—"as certain as I am that Jesus is the Messiah, so certain am I that all my former sins were remitted in immersion." Ib. page 500. Again he says, "Into Christ is a phrase only applicable to conversion, immersion or regeneration." Ex. to vol. 1. p. 9. "All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting the act of Christian immersion, frequently called conversion as that act, inseparably connected with remission of sins." Ibid p. 15, 16. "In the commission to convert the nations, the act by which this work was to be completed, was the act of immersion." Ib. 16. "REMISSION OF SINS CANNOT BE ENJOYED BY ANY PERSON BEFORE IMMERSION." Ib. p. 34. He says, "I beg leave to make a remark or two on the propriety of considering the term immersion as equivalent to the term conversion." Ib. p. 34. "Immersion alone was that act of turning to God." Ib. p. 35. Upon the text, "they have washed their robes and made them

white in the blood of the lamb," Mr. Campbell has the following language: "If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, CERTAINLY WATER CAN WASH AWAY SINS. There is then a *transferring of the efficacy of blood to water*"—"Yes, as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he HAS NOW GIVEN THE EFFICACY OF BLOOD TO WATER."—"And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water, efficacious to the washing away of sin from the conscience."—"The application of water, the cleansing element, to the body, is made in this gracious institution to reach the conscience." Ex. to M. H. vol. 1. pp. 40, 41. Finally he affirms, "YES, IMMERSION SAVES US, by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purged from dead works to serve the living God." Ibid p. 43.—pp. 10—12.

The injustice thus done to an author, by detaching sentences from his writings and connecting them together and presenting them in the worse light possible, can only be imagined by one who reads the articles from which they are taken. An author may thus be made to mean and say almost any thing, and almost any sentiment proven by him or adduced against him. The Bible has thus been misconstrued, misapplied and perverted to prove almost every sentiment and to allow almost every practice. In this way almost any thing may, and has been, proven from this book, in favor and against it. It is thus by text quoting and text preaching, with its general concomitant, *spiritualizing*, that systems of error, almost innumerable, have been generated and sustained.

We will now quote some of the strongest passages adduced by Mr. Pitts in the foregoing extract, in their connexion, and we will place in a parallel column with them some quotations from Mr. Wesley on Baptism, that the reader may see which is the most "heretical" here, and how Mr. P. has misrepresented bro. Campbell.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

"God so loved the world that, unasked, unsolicited, of his own free will, and good pleasure, he sent his only begotten son into the world not to condemn it; but that whosoever believeth in him, or in other words, believes the record he has given of him, might be saved; might be pardoned, acquitted, raised incorruptible, and enjoy eternal

JOHN WESLEY.

"Be baptized, and wash away thy sins—Baptism administered to real penitents is both a MEANS AND SEAL OF PARDON. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this [pardon] on any, UNLESS THROUGH THIS MEANS."—*Note to Acts xxii. 16.*

"For as many of you as have testified your

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

life. He appointed baptism to be, to every one that believeth the record he has given of his Son, a formal pledge on his part of that believer's personal acquittal or pardon: so significant, and so expressive that when the baptized believer rises out of the water, is born of water, enters the world a second time, he enters it as innocent, as clean, as unspotted, as an angel. His conscience is purged from guilt, his body washed with pure water, even the washing of regeneration. He puts himself under the priesthood of Jesus, under his tuition and government."—*Debate with McCalla*, page 137.

"Remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, cannot be enjoyed by any person before immersion. As soon can a person be a citizen before he is born, or have the immunities of an American citizen while an alien; as one enjoy the privileges of a son of God before he is born again. For Jesus expressly declares, that he has not given the privilege of sons to any but to those born of God. John i. 12. If, then, the present forgiveness of sins be a privilege, and a right of those under the new constitution, in the kingdom of Jesus; and if being born again, or being born of water and of the Spirit, is necessary to admission; and if being born of water means immersion, as clearly proved by all witnesses; THEN remission of sins cannot, in this life, be received or enjoyed previous to immersion.—If there be any proposition, regarding any item of the Christian institution, which admits of clearer proof, or fuller illustration than this one, I have yet to learn where it may be found."—*Extra to Millennial Harbinger*, volume 1 page 34.

"To wash away sins" is a FIGURATIVE expression. Like other metaphoric expressions, it puts the resemblance in the place of the proper word. It necessarily means something analogous to what is said. But we are said to be washed from our sins *in, or by, the BLOOD OF CHRIST*. But even "washed in blood" is a figurative expression, and means something analogous to washing in water. Perhaps we may find in another expression a means of reconciling these strong metaphors. Rev. vii. 14. "They have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Here are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments white in blood, and to wash away sins in water! An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess; and, as certainly, an efficacy is ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can whiten or cleanse garments, certainly water can wash

JOHN WESLEY.

faith, by being baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ—Have received him as our RIGHTEOUSNESS, and are therefore sons of God through him."—*Note to Gal. iii. 27.*

'That he [Christ] might sanctify it [the Church] through the word—The ordinary channel of all blessings, having cleansed it—From the guilt and power of sin, by the washing of water—IN BAPTISM, if with the "outward and visible sign," we receive the inward and spiritual grace."—*Note to Eph. v. 26.*

"What are the Benefits we receive by Baptism is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is, THE WASHING AWAY THE GUILT OF ORIGINAL SIN, by the application of the merits of Christ's death.—That we are ALL born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous sense of the ancient church, as it is expressed in the ninth article of our own. And the Scripture plainly asserts, that we were shapen in iniquity, and in sin did our mother conceive us. That we were all by nature children of wrath, and dead in trespasses and sins: that 'in Adam all died: that 'by one man's disobedience all were made sinners: that 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin: which came upon all because that all had sinned.' This plainly includes INFANTS: for they too die: therefore, THEY have sinned. But not by actual sin: therefore, by original: else what need have they of the death of Christ? Yea, 'Death reigned from Adam to Moses even, over those who had not sinned (actually) 'according to the similitude of Adam's transgression.' This, which can relate to INFANTS, ONLY, is a clear proof that the whole race of mankind are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression. But 'as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free-gift came upon all men, to justification of life.' And in virtue of this free-gift, the merits of Christ's life and death, ARE APPLIED TO US IN BAPTISM. 'He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water, by the word.' (Eph. v. 25, 26.) namely, IN BAPTISM, THE ORDINARY INSTRUMENT OF OUR JUSTIFICATION. Agreeably to this our church prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be 'washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing;' and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, 'It is cer-

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

away sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water; and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood.— This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or the cleansing power, of water to blood; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water. This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread— far and wide as water flows. Wherever water, faith, and the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus. Yes; as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is *FIGURATIVE*; but it is not a figure which misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure; viz. immersion for the remission of sins. And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin from the conscience. "From the conscience," I say; for there its malignity is felt; and it is only in releasing the conscience from guilt, and its consequences,—fear and shame, that we are released from the dominion of sin, or washed from its pollution in this world. Thus immersion, says Peter, saves us, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt; yes, immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purged from dead works to serve the living God. Hence, our Lord gave so much importance to immersion in giving the commission to convert the world, "He that believes, and is immersed, shall be saved."

"But, while viewing the water and the blood as made to unite their powers, as certainly as Jesus came by water and blood, we ought to consider another testimony given to this gracious combination of powers, by Paul the Apostle. Heb. x. 24. "Being sprinkled in heart from an evil conscience, and being washed in body with clean water." The application of water, the cleansing element, to the body, is made in this gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the Law.

"Some ask, How can water, which penetrates not the skin, reach the conscience? They boast of such an objection, as exhibiting great intellect, and good sense. But lit-

JOHN WESLEY.

tain, by God's word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved." And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the ancient fathers.

"2. *By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant which he hath commanded forever.* (Psalm cix. 11.) That new covenant, which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel; even to give them a new heart and a new Spirit to sprinkle clean water upon them; (of which the baptismal is only a figure) 'and to remember their sins and iniquities no more;' in a word, 'to be their God,' as he promised to Abraham, in the evangelical covenant which he made with him, and all his spiritual offspring. (Gen. xvii. 7, 8.) And as circumcision was then the way of entering into this covenant, so baptism is now: which is therefore styled by the apostle, (so many good interpreters render his words,) *The stipulation, contract, or covenant of a good conscience with God.*

"3. *By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ, its head.* The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision, so are Christians by baptism. For 'as many as are baptized into Christ,' in his name, 'have' thereby 'put on Christ.' (Gal. iii. 27.) That is, are mystically united to Christ, and made one with him. For 'by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body.' (1 Cor. xiii. 13.) Namely, 'the church, the body of Christ,' (Eph. iv. 12.) From which spiritual, vital union with him, proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized; as from our union with the church, a share in all its privileges, and in all the promises Christ has made to it.

"4. *By baptism we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this REGENERATION which OUR CHURCH in so many places ascribes to BAPTISM, is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made children of God by adoption and grace.'* This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, John iii. 5, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' BY WATER, THEN, AS A MEAN, THE WATER OF BAPTISM WE ARE REGENERATED OR BORN AGAIN; whence it is called by the apostle, 'The washing of regeneration.' OUR CHURCH, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism, than Christ himself has done. Nor

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

tle do they think, that in so talking, they laugh at, and mock the whole Divine Economy, under the Old and New Institutions: for, I ask, did not the sacrifices, and Jewish purgations, some way reach the conscience of that people!! If they did not it was all mere frivolity throughout. And can eating bread and drinking wine not influence, or affect, the soul! And cannot *the breath* of one man pierce the heart of another, and so move his blood, as to make his head a fountain of tears! He, who thus objects to water, and to the import of immersion, objects to the whole remedial institution, as taught by Moses and by Christ, and insults the wisdom and goodness of God in the whole scheme of salvation. And he, who objects to water, because it can only take away the filth of the flesh, ought rather to object to blood; because it rather besmears and pollutes, than cleanses the body, and cannot touch the soul. But all such reasoners are foolish talkers. To submit to God's institution is our wisdom and our happiness. The experience of the myriads who were immersed for the remission of their sins, detailed in the christian scriptures, to say nothing of those immersed in our times, is worth more than volumes of arguments from the lips and pens of those who can only regard and venerate the traditions of their fathers; because it is presumed their fathers were wiser, and more able to judge correctly than their sons."—*Ex. to M. H.* vol. 1. pp. 40, 41.

We can finish our quotations here from Mr. Wesley by saying as Mr. Pitts did when he finished the list he has given from bro. Campbell, and with much more propriety, "Enough of all this outrage upon common sense, to say nothing of the word of God, and the vitality and power of the Christian religion." We would now ask the unprejudiced and impartial reader, which is the stronger of the two on Baptism, and which attaches most importance to it? Has not Mr. Wesley left bro. Campbell far behind? Bro. C. having no faith in original sin or infant baptism, Mr. W. while they agree in the design of baptism, attaches an impor-

JOHN WESLEY.

does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which added thereto, makes it a sacrament. *HEREIN a principle of grace is infused*, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God, by long-continued wickedness.

"5. In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the kingdom of heaven. 'If children,' (as the apostle observes) 'then heirs, heirs with God, and joint-heirs with Christ.' *HEREIN we receive a TITLE to, and an earnest of, 'a kingdom which cannot be moved.'* 'Baptism doth now save us,' if we live answerable thereto, if we repent, believe, and obey the gospel. Supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, *SO INTO GLORY HEREAFTER.*"—*Miscellaneous Works*, vol. ii. pp. 157, 158.

"If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism: seeing in the ordinary way, *THEY CANNOT BE SAVED, UNLESS THIS BE WASHED AWAY BY BAPTISM.* It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that *hereby* they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the Second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed: *THROUGH BAPTISM IN PARTICULAR, which is the ordinary mean he hath appointed for that purpose: and to which God HATH TIED US, though he may not have tied himself.* Indeed where it cannot be had, the case is different: *but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule.* This, therefore, is our first ground; *INFANTS need to be washed from original sin, therefore THEY are proper subjects of BAPTISM.*"—*Mis. Works*, vol. ii. p. 159.

tance to it in reference to infants which the former does not think of. According to Mr. Wesley, where baptism can be had, the infant which is unbaptized "is liable to eternal damnation." And yet while bro. Campbell is continually denounced from the press, the pulpit and fierside, for the sentiments in the above extracts from him, not a word is said against Mr. Wesley! All these heretical sins are passed over in *him!* Why this difference in their treatment? One sentence will perhaps tell. Mr. Wesley was the great *Father* and *Founder* of *METHODISM!* He belongs to Mr. Pitts' party; and he can pass all these

glaring errors over and quote from him as one of his authorities! His party can apologize for Mr. *Wesley*, and denounce bro. *Campbell*! If you want to escape denunciation, attach yourself to a *party* in religion, and you can then avow and express sentiments which out of your party would lay you under their censures and anathemas!—The Discipline of Methodism differs but little if any from its Founder on the article of Baptism.

METHODIST DISCIPLINE ON BAPTISM.

The ministration of Baptism to Infants

The minister coming to the font, which is to be filled with pure water, shall use the following or some other exhortation, suitable to this sacred office.

Dearly beloved, *forasmuch* as ALL men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, NONE can enter into the kingdom of God, *except he be* REGENERATE and born ANEW of WATER and of the Holy Ghost; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant unto *this child* that which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and made lively member of the same.

“Then shall the minister say.”

Let us pray.

“Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptism: and by the baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ in the River Jordan didst sanctify water for this holy sacrament. We beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon *this child*: wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he BEING DELIVERED FROM THY WRATH, MAY BE RECEIVED into the ark of Christ's church, and being stedfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in *this child* may be so BURIED, that the new man may be RAISED UP with him. Amen.”

“Almighty, ever living God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF OUR SINS, did shed out of his

most precious side BOTH WATER and blood and gave commandment to his disciples that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; regard we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; sanctify this water for this holy Sacrament; and grant that *this child* now to be baptized, MAY RECEIVE [in his baptism] the fulness of thy GRACE, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”—*Meth. Discipline*, pp. 102—104. Edition of 1832.

“The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper years.

“The Minister shall use the following, or some other exhortation, suitable to this Holy Office.

“Dearly beloved, *forasmuch* as all men are conceived and born in sin, (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and they which are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions;) and that our Saviour Christ said none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons*, [in baptism] that which by nature they cannot have; that they may be baptized with water [water first] & the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy church, and be made lively members of the same.

“Then shall the Minister say.

“Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succour, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead: We call upon thee for *these persons*; that they COMING to thy holy baptism, MAY RECEIVE REMISSION OF THEIR SINS by spiritual regeneration RECEIVE them, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find: knock and it shall be opened unto you: so give now unto us that ask: let us that seek, find; open the gate unto us that knock; that *these persons* may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, & may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. Amen.

“After which he shall say,

“Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give thee humble thanks, for that thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of thy grace, and faith in thee; in crease this knowledge and confirm this fait

in us evermore. Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons that they may be born again, and be made heirs of everlasting Salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Spirit, now and forever. Amen."

"The Minister shall speak to the persons to be baptized on this wise:

"Well beloved, who are come hither, desiring to receive holy Baptism, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed, that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive you and bless you, to release you of your sins, to give you the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life. And our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his holy word to grant all those things that we have prayed for: which promise he for his part will most surely keep and perform.

"Wherefore after this promise made by Christ, you must also faithfully, for your part, promise in the presence of this whole congregation, that you will renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy word, and obediently keep his commandments."

"Then shall the Minister say,

"O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in these persons may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in them. Amen."

"Almighty, ever living God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side, both water and blood; and gave commandment to his disciples that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of this congregation: and grant that the persons now to be baptized may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."—*Method. Discip.* pp. 105—111.

Does the Methodist Discipline teach any where, that the persons to be baptized had received the remission of their sins, or were regenerated or born again, before their baptism? If so, why pray, that coming to baptism they may receive the remission of their sins and may be born again? Where is the difference between the Discipline and Mr. Wesley? If we are in error and heretical, as our Methodistic opponents contend, in holding this point of doctrine, baptism for remission of sins, what would we gain by abandoning it and subscribing to this *their* Discipline in which it

is so plainly taught? Would it not present the strange anomaly of forsaking an error to embrace the very same? If they believe what their discipline says, and take it for their rule of faith and practice, how, we would ask, can they consistently oppose baptism for remission of sins and as a part of the process of regeneration, and not be with us here?

And how very inconsistent and absurd is it in Mr. Pitts, to call this doctrine, "an old hackneyed heresy of the Romish church," when it is so plainly taught by the Founder of the church to which he belongs and in the Discipline to which he has subscribed? In subscribing to the Discipline, has he not then subscribed to "an old hackneyed heresy of the Romish church?!" And how very inconsistent it is too, to learn the son of one of the grand-daughters of the "Mother of Harlots," saying of bro. Campbell; "how humiliating to the compiler of the translators, must be the discovery, when he comes to himself, that instead of trumpeting in the latter day glory with the notes of his Millennial Harbinger, he finds himself groping amid the thick darkness that mantled the mother of Mysticism a thousand years ago." May we not with more propriety say, that it will be humiliating to Mr. Pitts, when he comes to himself. For his infant baptism, his sprinkling, his spiritualizing, &c. all had their origin with the "mother of Mysticism."—The perversion of the real design of Christian baptism constitutes the very error in Romanish for which we have seen Mr. Wesley so zealously contends in his arguments for infant baptism.—Mr. Wesley's works and the Discipline, from which we have so largely quoted, are published "for the Methodist Episcopal Church," and therefore as publications have its sanction.

EDITOR.

Altering the Scriptures.

TRUE, BUT RATHER COSTLY.—A Campbellite at Mt. Vernon, Illinois, recently sent us a communication for insertion, over the signature of J. J. P. taxing the publishers with the postage, contrary to their standing rule, which contained the following wise saying:

Men have become wise above what is written. They are too proud to take the word as it was given, therefore they must alter a little from the original."

The truth of this assertion, as it applies to the "proclaimers of the ancient order of things," no one doubts who has read the "new version" by A. Campbell.—*West. Christ. Advocate*.

We copy the above from the "Western Christian Advocate" of March 25, sent to us in exchange. Many persons seem to be so simple, stupid, ignorant or something else, as to call the "New Version" an alteration of the scriptures, meaning thereby the old or king James' version! And among these Bishop Morris, one of the bench of the seven bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States! An ounce of discernment should be sufficient to convince any one the least acquainted with the English language, that the term "*new version*" implies that it cannot be an alteration or amendment of the old. It professes to be, not an alteration of the old, but an entirely new version or translation into the English language as now spoken, from the original (Greek) from which the old version was made into the same language as spoken in king James' time. The title page is; "The sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly styled the New Testament, translated from the original Greek, by Doctors George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge. With Prefaces, various Emendations, and an Appendix, containing various translations of difficult passages—some Critical Notes on the Language, Geography, Chronology, and History of the New Testament—and Miscellaneous Tables designed to aid every candid reader of the volume in acquiring a satisfactory knowledge of its contents. By A. Campbell."

Thus the reader can see that there is no alteration of the Old Version; and the charge brought against A. Campbell, of altering the Scriptures, has its foundation in the ignorance or want of common discernment in those who make it. Bishop Morris says, "the new version by A. Campbell." This the reader can see is not so. It is by Drs. Geo. Campbell, Macknight and Doddridge. He intimates that no one who has read the new version doubts that it is an alteration. This is no more so than his other assertion. None can be prepared to say that it is an alteration but

those acquainted with the Greek, (perhaps not one reader in twenty,) or with the decisions of good critics.

But there is an *altered* copy of the old version, and that too published "for the Methodist Episcopal Church." We refer to that accompanying John Wesley's Notes. Mr. Wesley has "altered the Scriptures," the old version we mean. In that copy he must have made at least 8000 alterations! The following specimen is a sample and evidence, in which we mark where any thing is left out with an asterisk *—where any thing is put in, with brackets ()—and where a word is altered we put it in *italics*:

MR. WESLEY'S COPY.

EPHESIANS v. 1—4.—Be ye therefore followers of God, as *beloved* children; And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and * given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet-smelling savour. But (let not) fornication, or any uncleanness, or covetousness, * * * be even named among you, as becometh saints: Neither *obscenity*, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient, but rather *thanksgiving*.

EPH. v. 25—27.—Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ * loved the church, and gave (up) himself for it; That he might sanctify * * * it (having cleansed it) by the washing of water *through* the word: That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, * that it should be holy and *unblamable*.

JOHN XIII. 9, 10.—Simon Peter saith to him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands, and my head. Jesus saith to him, he *who hath been bathed*, needeth *only* to wash his feet, and is clean *all over*: and ye are clean; but not all.

Now let the reader compare the above extracts, taken pretty much at random, with the same in the old version, which we mark as the above.

OLD VERSION.

EPH. v 1—4.—Be ye therefore followers of God, as *dear* children; And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and (hath) given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour, But * * fornication, and *all* uncleanness,

or covetousness, (let it not) be *once* named among you, as becometh saints: Neither *filthiness*, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient; but rather *giving of thanks*.

EPH. v. 25—27.—Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ (also) loved the church, and gave * himself for it; That he might sanctify (and cleanse) it *with* the washing of water *by* the word: That he might present to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; (but) that it should be holy and *without blemish*.

JOHN XIII. 9, 10.—Simon Peter saith *unto* him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands, and my head. Jesus saith to him, *He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit:* and ye are clean, but not all.

Mr. Wesley says in his "Preface" to his "Notes;" "I do not say it [the old version] is incapable of being brought, in *several places*, nearer to the *original*. Neither will I affirm, that the *Greek* copies from which this translation [the old] was made, are always the most *correct*. And therefore I shall take the *LIBERTY*, as occasion may require, to make here and there a *small ALTERATION*." And nothing but his veneration for the old version, prevented him from altering it more than he has done. "I am very sensible," continues he, "this will be liable to objections: nay, to objections of quite opposite kinds. Some will probably think, the text is altered too much; and others, that it is altered too little. To the former I would observe, that I never knowingly, so much as in one place, altered it for altering sake: but there, and there only, where first, the sense was made better, stronger, clearer, or more consistent with the context: secondly, where the sense being equally good, the phrase was better or nearer the original. To the latter, who think the alterations too few, and that the translation might have been nearer still, I answer, this is true: I acknowledge it might. But what valuable end would it have answered to multiply such trivial alterations as add neither clearness nor strength to the text? This I could not prevail upon myself to do: so much the less because there is, to my apprehension, I know not what, peculiarly solemn and

venerable in the old language of our translation." Of such a man a *new* version could not be expected. He could only be guilty of, it seems, the *greater sin of altering the old!*

We do not quarrel with Mr. Wesley about "altering the Scriptures." He has made many excellent amendments, of which the reader has a specimen, in the quotations we have made. But a Methodist General Conference paper, as is the Western Christian Advocate, should be the last to say any thing about altering the scriptures, when the only altered copy perhaps in the language, is published under the auspices of the General Conference and "for the Methodist Episcopal Church." If those who are without sin here, have to cast the first stone at *us*, we feel very well assured that the Methodist Church will not do it. We are often reminded of the saying of our divine Lord, that it is necessary to pick the beams out of our eyes, in order to see clearly the motes in the eyes of others. The Methodists should be the last to say any thing to the *Baptists* about an amended version. What a charm there is in a name! Many hard things are said about the new version, but not a word against Mr. Wesley for the "liberty" he has taken! Those who would think their libraries defiled by a copy of the New Version, carefully stow away in it the altered copy of Mr. Wesley! If Alexander Campbell could just be a *Methodist*, how smoothly would his sins in publishing a New Version be passed over!—and perhaps most or all of his other similar sins! "There's *magic* in a name."

EDITOR.

Witness of the Spirit.

We have been informed by those who were present on the occasion that a certain gentleman high in office in his "church," of what "church" we will not say, suffice it, however, to say it is not the "church of Christ," did on a certain occasion above alluded to, say that he heard, he would not say where, a gentleman pray for the witness of the Spirit and after his prayer tell his audience he would have them to understand that that Spirit *was* the word; and we have also been informed that this prayer and expression have been ascribed to *us*.

There is about as much fact and truth in

all this, as in the assertion, made by the same gentleman, that certain people (alluding to the *Baptists*) thought themselves so much better than others, that they would neither commune with them nor suffer them to commune with themselves.—We do not remember ever to have prayed or said what is ascribed to us above. We might have prayed for the Holy Spirit to *continue to bear witness* with ours and might have asserted that the Spirit bore witness *through the word*. And we would ask, how is it possible for *witness* to be borne to any truths or facts whatever *without words or testimony*? Can I, can any body, bear witness with another, to any fact or truth, without the medium of *language*? Common sense must answer, No; and the contrary supposition is as absurd as it is irrational and unscriptural.

The passage of Scripture in which the witness of the Spirit is spoken of, is Rom. viii. 16. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." That this is done by some supposed secret, internal, mystical operation of some sort apart from the word and commands of God, is disproved by the two verses immediately preceding the one just quoted. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again, to fear; [Spirit the Jews had under the Law] but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, *Abby, Father*." Now how can we be led by the Spirit of God without his word which that Spirit inspired? can one man lead the mind of another without words or arguments of some sort? And how can we receive the Spirit of adoption, without having the fact of our adoption communicated to our mind or spirit by the words of God's Spirit? A child in early life has been alienated from his father, and loses the knowledge of him. The father finds his son after this; but how is the son to know this is father without having it communicated to him some how or other by *language*? Without it, would it not be impossible!

"The original term in the Greek for "beareth witness," is *summartureoo*. *Donnegan*, who belongs to no sect that we know of, and therefore would be more impartial here, defines this; "to bear testimony with another: to be a joint witness." *Schrevelius*, perhaps equally as impartial, defines it; "to attest or bear witness together; to prove by testimony; to confirm another's testimony. * * * From *suun* and *martureoo*, to attest, to be a witness to. Them *martur*, a witness."

Mark the expression, that the Spirit of God bears witness with ours that "*we are the children of God*." Now the principle upon which we become children, and the institution of adoption by which we are adopted into the family of God, render the word of God and baptism both necessary, in order for us to have the witness of the Spirit. "*We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus*. For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." "Faith comes by * * * the word of God;" and if faith thus comes and it is on the principle of faith that we become the children of God, as we now see above, how can we become his children without his word? Hence as we must be begotten before we can be born again and become God's children, James says, "of his own will begat he us with the word of truth;" and Paul, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." The "word of God," is "the word of the truth of the gospel." When we believe and are baptized, we have the witness of the Spirit through the word, and no witness before; for, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." EDITOR.

Sherlock and Parkhurst on the Witness of the Spirit.

Upwards of a century has probably elapsed since the following extract from Bishop Sherlock was written. The intelligent Christian reader will, we expect, be surprised to find as correct views on Rom. 8: 16, as those contained in it, so long since and so far back, particularly when considered as coming from an Episcopalian Bishop. The Church of England has not, we expect, on all her roll of "divines," a sounder and more sensible to boast of, than Sherlock;* and perhaps no other "Protestant" establishment. Parkhurst was Sherlock's contemporary in the latter part of his life; and is one of the most eminent and popular Biblical critics and lexicographers. The part of the article from him in brackets is by his editor *Rose*. EDITOR.

* Thomas Sherlock was the Bishop.—He was the son of William Sherlock, deam of St. Paul's, the author of a treatise on Death, on Judgment, and, perhaps one on Divine Providence. Bishop Sherlock was born in 1678, and died in 1761. Parkhurst was born in 1723, and died in 1797.

The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God.—*Rom. 8: 16.*

SHERLOCK.

We must now, in the last place, consider what the result of this evidence is, and with what kind of certainty we may know that we are the children of God.

And first, you must take notice that these two evidences strengthen and support each other, and must both meet to give us the assurance we expect. We must have the evidence of our own Spirit that we do indeed love and approve the law of God; and we must have the evidence of the Spirit of God working in us by obedience; and when we both love and obey the commands of God, we want nothing farther to assure us that we are the children of God; but where either of these is wanting, the evidence of the other avails nothing. If you love and approve the command, but do not obey, you are self-condemned, you are in your sins; lust has dominion over you, and not the Spirit of God. If you obey the law, and conform outwardly to it, but do not love and like it, you are a hypocrite, no Servant of God, but of the world; and your outward compliance is fleshly wisdom, & not the work of the Spirit.

So then you have two ways of judging yourselves, which must both concur; you have inward and outward signs of grace. the inward signs are a pure conscience, a sincere love for God and religion, and whatever tends to the glory and honour of your Maker: the outward signs are acts of obedience conformable to the inward purity and love of your mind. These are fruits by which you may judge yourselves. Our Saviour tells us, 'that we may know men by their fruits:' much rather may we know ourselves by our own fruit especially when we may know the stock too from whence they grow, the motions and workings of our own heart.

Hence it appears that the evidence of the Spirit is not any secret inspiration, or any assurance conveyed to the mind of the faithful; but it is the evidence of works, such as by the Spirit we perform: and there-

fore the only sign of sanctification is holiness; and the only mark of grace is to obey from the heart the word of God; and therefore they err, not knowing the Scriptures, who from this [*Rom. 8: 16.*] or the like passages imagine that the Spirit ever gives, or was ever designed to give, inward assurance or certainty to men on their final State.

Hence, likewise, it is certain that some go too far on the other side, by denying that any man may know himself to be in a state of grace: for all the children of God are in a state of grace; and the evidence of the Spirit of God and our own Spirit may make us certain, where they concur, as they ought to do, that we are the children of God. 'If our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God, which is *St. John's* rule, and comprehends both the evidences in the text; for our heart judges both of our inward and outward obedience: and therefore, where our hearts condemn us not, we have the evidence of both spirits, the end of which is confidence.

But, lastly, this certainty does not extend to our future and final salvation: for to be in a state of grace is to be heir of salvation: but an heir may be defeated, if by any after-act he incapacitates himself to inherit. In a word, a state of grace may be lost; he that is a child of God may cease to be the child of God: and therefore being certain and confident that you are now in a state of grace, cannot make you certain of your salvation; but you must still work out your salvation with fear and trembling.' This we may learn from our Apostle's own arguing here: 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' The consequence of this is, 'if children, then heirs,' verse 17. 'But now are we heirs through hope,' he tells us in another place; and at the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter, 'we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope.' Certainty shuts out hope: and since being children makes us only heirs through hope, it is plain, being certain that we are now the children of God can give us no absolute certainty of

our salvation: and therefore it is great presumption to talk of security. Our certainty reaches to our present condition, which is enough to keep our minds easy and contented. Other certainty than this might make us remiss: this may encourage us to run with patience the race that is before us, and to labour in the Lord, knowing that our labor shall not be in vain.*

PARKHURST AND ROBE.

[The Spirit itself bears witness at the same time (namely, that we cry, *Abba, Father*, ver. 15.) TO our Spirit, that we are the children of God; not by any direct impression, or immediate testimony communicated to the soul, but as the apostle speaks, ver. 14, by leading us in our lives and conversation, and especially by being in us (ver. 15, compare ver. 8, 11.) a spirit of filial love to God; or, as he elsewhere, Rom. 5: 5, expresses himself, by THE LOVE OF GOD shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit given unto us. Compare 2 Cor. 1. 22 1 John 4: 7, 12, 13, 16; but see Macknight on Rom. 8: 16. [Parkhurst's explanation is that of Crellius and Grotius. Bishop Sherlock, in a most admirable sermon on this text, disapproves of this, and says, that *summatureo* [Greek for, "bears witness"] always implies an union of more than one witness. Macknight thinks, that no great difference in sense, however, is produced by this difference of translation. The result of the Bishop's sermon is, that our spirit means our right reason, spoken of by St. Paul (Chap. vii. 25) as the mind approving and serving the law of God, (see also ver. 22) and that the evidence of God's Spirit is not any secret inspiration (as the council of Trent make it) or assurance conveyed to the mind of the faithful, but the evidence of works such as by the Spirit we perform, and that therefore the only sign of Sanctification is holiness. * * *]

Love to God and love one to another.

At this day of the world, when so much is said about loving God and so little regard paid to his commandments, when there

is so much talk about Christians loving one another and so much coldness, malice, envy, ill-will and hatred among those called Christians, it may not be uninteresting and uninformative to inquire in what consist love to God and love one to another. In an age of the world when the animal feelings have been exalted into the supposed operations of the Holy Spirit, it cannot be supposed strange that the multitude, who have too generally been the mistaken party in every age, should put the cart before the horse, and make religion consist in good feeling before good doing, which should always precede it and of which good feeling should be the result, not the cause. Accordingly love is made to consist in merely having good feelings towards its objects, however disobedient those who exercise it may be.

1. LOVE TO GOD. The first and great commandment of the law, and on which, with the second, our Lord said, "hang all the law and the prophets," was, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." But it merely commanded love and did not define in what it consisted. "If ye love me," says our Lord to his disciples, "keep my commandments." This, not burning flows of animal feeling and passion, is the true test of love. It was on this condition, that the promise of the "Spirit of truth," "whom the world cannot receive," was given to his disciples. And again, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." Our Saviour says that he who keeps his commandments, is he who loves him. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." Again, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love." And John in one of his epistles, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." "Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." And again, "This is love, that we walk after his commandments." "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "He that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

2. LOVE ONE TO ANOTHER. The se-

cond commandment of the two, on which—"hang all the law and the prophets," was, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But, who is our *neighbor*? On one occasion during the personal ministry of our Lord on earth, "A lawyer stood up, and said, trying him, Rabbi, what must I do to obtain eternal life? Jesus said to him, What does the law prescribe? What do you read there? He answered, "You shall love the Lord your God, with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and your neighbor as yourself." Jesus replied, You have answered right. Do this and you shall live. But he desirous to appear blameless, said to Jesus, Who is my neighbor? Jesus said, in return, A man of Jerusalem, travelling to Jericho, fell among robbers, who having stripped and wounded him, went away, leaving him half dead. A priest accidentally going that way, and seeing him, passed by on the farther side. Likewise a Levite on the road, when he came near the place and saw him, passed by on the farther side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was, and when he saw him, he had compassion, and went up to him; and having poured wine and oil into his wounds, he bound them up. Then he set him on his own beast, brought him to an inn, and took care of him. On the morrow, when he was going away, he took out two denarii, and giving them to the host, said, Take care of this man, and whatever you spend more, when I return, I will repay you. Now which of these three, think you, was neighbor to him who fell among the robbers? The lawyer answered, He who took pity upon him. Then, said Jesus, Go you, and do in like manner."—*Luke x. 25—37.* NEW VERSION. Let the priest and Levite have had as *good feelings* as they might towards this man, it would have availed them nothing in the great matter of eternal life and contributed nothing to his relief, unless they had done to him as the good Samaritan did. He no doubt, had the approbation of an enlightened conscience, and enjoyed good feelings as the result of his *good doing*. "We know that we have passed from life unto death, when we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death." How do we know when

we love the brethren? "By this we know that we *love the children of God*, when we *love God*, and *KEEP his commandments*. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." The same test of our love to God, is made the test of our love one to another. "If a man say, I love God, and *hateth his brother*,* he is a LIAR: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also." The same apostle observes, "Let us not love in *word*, neither in *tongue*; but in *DEED* and in *TRUTH*;" and as an evidence of this love, "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" This love one to another, must be unfeigned and with a heart which has been purified by an obedience to the truth, and from one who has been born again of the word of God.—"Seeing ye have *PURIFIED your souls in OBEYING the TRUTH* through the Spirit unto *UNFEIGNED LOVE of the BRETHREN*, see that ye *LOVE one another with a PURE HEART fervently: being BORN again*. not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*, which *liveth and abideth forever*."

EDITOR.

* Where the members of a church refuse to speak to, and are continually backbiting, each other, can they love God or one another? Can that be the church of Christ and of the living God?

An erroneous idea removed.

It is frequently said to us by persons who have formed wrong conceptions of our views from others or from misapprehension in hearing and reading and whose minds are disabused, that we have changed, that we do not believe as we once did. But this is all a mistake. It is not we who have changed in our views, but they who have changed in their understandings of them.

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. SEPTEMBER, 1836

[NUMBER 9.]

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER, and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem LUKE XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—MARK XVI. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS
JUDE, 3.

Design of the New Testament writings.

(From the Prefaces to the New Version.)

THESE books were designed to be read and understood by persons of the humblest capacity, as well as by those of the most exalted genius. Readers of the most limited education, as well as those of the most liberal attainments, were equally embraced in the views of the writers. If particular attention was paid to any class of readers, it was doubtless to the poor, who have not the means of a refined education. One of the most striking evidences of the divine mission of the Saviour was, that, to the poor his glad tidings were announced. A revelation not adapted to them, forfeits all claims to a divine original.

In laying down some general principles or rules for reading intelligibly the following narratives, regard must be had to all sorts of readers—the young as well as the old; the illiterate as well as the learned; and also some attention must be paid to the difficulties that lie in the way of a rational and profitable perusal of them.

In the first place, then, there is no opinion or notion which is more prejudicial to an intimate acquaintance with these writings, than that of the Egyptian priests, introduced into the first theological school at Alexandria, and carried throughout christendom—viz. "That the words of scripture have a mystical, spiritual, theological, or some other than a literal meaning; and that the same rules of interpretation are not to be applied to the inspired writings, which are applied to human compositions;" than which no opinion is more absurd and pernicious. If this notion were correct, all efforts to underdate this book must be in vain, until God

sends us an interpreter who can resolve those enigmas and mystic words of theological import, and give us the plain meaning of what the Apostles and Evangelists wrote.

The reader will please to consider that, when God spoke to man, he adopted the language of man. To the fathers of the Jewish nation he spoke in their mother tongue. By his Son, and his Son by the Apostles, spoke to every nation in its own language. When he spoke to any nation he uniformly adopted the words of that nation in expressing his will to it. And that he used their words in the commonly received sense, needs no other proof than this; that if he had not done so, instead of enlightening them in the knowledge of his will, he would have deceived and confounded them: than which no hypothesis is more impious. For example, were God to speak to us in *English*, and select from our vocabulary, the words *death, punishment, perpetual, and wicked*; were he to use the last term as we use it, and annex to the others a signification different from that we affix to them—such as to mean *life* by the term *death*, *happiness* by the term *punishment*, and a *limited time* by the word *perpetual*; and, without apprising us of such a change in their meaning, say, "*Perpetual death shall be the punishment of the wicked*," what a deception would he practice upon us! His words, in our acceptation, would convey a tremendous thought; but, in his reserved sense, would mean no more than, "*A limited life shall be the happiness of the wicked*."

Once more on this topic. As nothing can be said to be revealed or made known by words which are not perfectly intelligible, so we find the sacred writings so conscious of this, that when they used any word which was not familiar to the readers, whom they

addressed, they immediately add, "*Which being interpreted, signifies.*" If, then, those writers were accustomed to explain any word not familiar to their readers, does it not undeniably follow that they supposed every word or allusion not so explained sufficiently plain already? And again, would not the same benevolence and respect to the capacity and understanding of their readers, which induced them to explain some terms of very subordinate importance, such as "corban," "talitha cumi," "Aceldama," "Golgotha," &c. &c. have caused them to explain words of infinite more importance, such as "repentance," "faith," "hope," "love," "justify," "covenant," "baptism," "ambassador," "Son of God," "eternal life," "everlasting punishment," &c. if they had not supposed such terms sufficiently plain in the common usage, and quite intelligible to all their readers. From these plain facts and arguments we deduce the following rule or direction to all those who, under the guidance of Heaven, desire to understand these sacred books:—*You are to understand the words and sentences in these narratives, (and indeed in all the apostolic writings,) by the application of all those rules through which you arrive at the meaning of any other book or writing of the same antiquity.*

Next to a regard to the commonly received sense of the words in these writing, nothing contributes more to the clear and certain understanding of them, than a knowledge of the design of the respective writers of each part of this volume. In one respect they all may be said to have but one design. Taking the ultimate happiness of man as the grand design of all revelation, it must be granted that all the inspired writers had this object in view in all that they wrote. It is, however, capable of the clearest proof; and, indeed, it is universally admitted that every writer who has written different parts of this book, had a specific design in each separate communication. For in the prosecution of one grand design, there are often a thousand items, distinct from each other, to accomplish; each of which may be the design of one particular effort. Now it requires not a moment's reflection to see that Paul had one design in writing to Timothy, another in writing to Philemon, and another in writing to the congregation in Rome.

It is granted by all critics, that when all grammatical rules fail to settle the meaning of any ambiguous word or sentence, a knowledge of the design of the writer or speaker will do it. Even when a writer's terms are badly selected, or improperly used, a knowledge of his design makes his meaning plain. Daily experience must convince us that we

can more easily solve difficulties and correct mistakes in composition, by a knowledge of the design of the writer, than by any other means we possess. Indeed, the more weighty and important criticisms upon verbal inaccuracies, are predicted upon by a knowledge of the design of the writer or speaker. If, then, a suitable regard be paid to the design of any speaker or writer, how ambiguous and incorrect soever his words may be, we shall seldom, if ever, fail in understanding him. For example—little children, when they first begin to speak, have but few terms at command, and necessarily apply them very inaccurately; yet their nurses and attendants find little or no difficulty in understanding them. In regarding what they design to communicate, their language becomes as definite and precise as that of the Grecian or Roman orator.

To those who inquire how we are always to find out the design of a writer, we would just observe, that his design becomes apparent either from an express avowal of it, or from attention to a variety of circumstances connected with his writing, or from both.—But this will in the sequel become sufficiently plain. Indeed, many readers appear to discover the design of a writer much sooner than they do the meaning or propriety of what he says.

But to bring these general hints to bear upon our subject, we must request the attention of our readers to the design of the narratives of Mathew, Mark, Luke, and John. In this way, we think, we can most profitably introduce them to the acquaintance of the youth, who may peruse them.

Had we no means of ascertaining the design of these four historians, other than mere conjecture, predicated on circumstances, we would rationally conclude, that the design in committing to writing their testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth, was the same as induced them to deliver it orally; only with this difference, that in writing they designed to perpetuate, in a more permanent form, what must soon be corrupted and forgotten, if only spoken and not written: and that the conviction of unbelievers, and the confirmation of disciples in the truth of one incomparable fact, was the grand design of their testimony, whether verbal or written. This illustrious fact is, that *Jesus the Nazarene is the Son of God, the Saviour of men.* But we are not, in this instance, dependent on conjecture. We are expressly told by one of the historians that his design in writing was, that through his *written* testimony the reader "might believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that believing this he might have life through his name."

Another of these sacred historians says that his design in writing was, that a certain illustrious personage, a christian disciple, to whom he inscribed his narrative, "might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed." This narrative was directly inscribed to this personage, and through him made public property, and consequently was designed to produce the same effects in all persons in similar circumstances, and therefore was as well designed to produce faith where it was not, as to confirm it where it already existed. But, in brief, whatever was the grand design of one of these historians, was the design of them all; for they all were employed to bear testimony to the same person; and in doing this, they were equally guided by one and the same Spirit.

But whence all the differences and varieties in their narratives? This, too, the design of each goes very far to explain. But was not the design of *one* the design of *all*? True, it was the design of them all to prove one fact; *but it was not to the same identical persons*; and all men are not to be convinced by the same arguments. As this is a point of vast importance, in every way in which it can be viewed, permit me to be more particular in invoking attention to it.

As all nations have their own peculiarities, and all people their own ways of thinking, reasoning, and expressing themselves: these varieties in their circumstances require a corresponding variety in addressing them upon all subjects; though the things spoken be substantially the same, and the design of the speaker precisely the same. Now in writing as well as in speaking, the same persons vary their communications according to the times, places, and circumstances in which they speak or write. For example, though Paul proclaimed the same gospel at all times and in all places, he does not always exhibit it in the same words, nor accompanied with the same evidences, arguments, or reasons. Thus in publishing the same gospel to the Lycaonians, the Athenians, the Antiochans, the Corinthians, he is governed by all the prejudices, views, feelings, and circumstances of his auditors; and adapts the style, the facts, arguments, and evidences, to the capacities, views, and circumstances of his hearers. While he publishes the same glad tidings to them all, he varies in many respects upon all these occasions. This was absolutely necessary to his success, and is a most irrefragable proof of the sincerity and honesty of the man, and greatly adds to the credibility of his testimony. Now for the same reasons that Paul differs from himself, or varies in his way of

speaking the gospel in different places, he would have observed the same varieties in writing to the same people. For he never spoke at random in publishing the glad tidings, and what he *spoke* was as deliberate as what he *wrote*. For the same reasons, therefore, had any one of the writers of these four histories written them all to the different persons, at the different times and in the different places where they were at first published, there is every reason to believe that they would have been as different from each other as they are: and making a reasonable allowance for the peculiarities of each writer, that they would have been the same as they now are. Many reasons could be offered for this opinion, but we shall only submit one proof or argument in favor of it, which is indeed done when one single fact is stated—viz. Luke, in his Acts of the Apostles, *three* times gives an account of Paul's conversion and special call to the apostleship, and these three differ as much from each other as Matthew, Mark, and John differ in their narratives concerning Jesus of Nazareth. But there is just the same reason and necessity for, and the same propriety in, the varieties which are found in these four histories, as there was for Paul to speak the same gospel in a different way, with different arguments, facts, and evidences, in the different places in which he published it. Suppose Matthew Levi to have written a narrative for the Jews in Judea, one for the conviction of the people at Rome, one for the Jews and Greeks in Greece, and one for the Asiatics in general, at different periods within the lapse of from 20 to 30 years; would it not have been as fitting for him to have been as diverse in his statements, as Paul was in his preachings in Damascus, Lycaonia, Athens and Rome?

It was, for example, of indispensable importance that Matthew Levi, when writing for the Jews in Judea, at the time in which he wrote, should trace the lineage of Jesus of Nazareth up to David and Abraham; but of no consequence to the people of Rome for whom John Mark wrote, that he should do it at the time he published his testimony.—This and other differences between Matthew and Mark and the others, is precisely analogous to that between Paul in Damascus and Paul in Athens. In a Jewish synagogue in Damascus the Jewish Prophets must be circumstantially adduced; but before the Areopagus in the city of Athens, Aretas, a Grecian poet, was better evidence than Isaiah or Daniel—better adapted to the audience and to the design of the speaker.

To return to the design of these four testimonies. The *immediate design* of these

writings is to convince men that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; and the *ultimate design* of them is to put men in possession of life! Matthew's design was, in the first instance, to convince the Jews in Judea—Mark's design was to convince the Italians or Romans—Luke's design was to convince the Grecians—and John's design was to convince the Asiatics in general of this fact; and, if you please, through these finally all nations. Now as the Saviour did not exhibit all the evidence of his mission in any one town, village, or city, or to any one people, it was quite compatible with his example, and with all circumstances, that none of his ambassadors should attempt to lay all the evidences before any one people, whether they preached as Paul, in all nations; or wrote, as these writers did, for the conviction of different nations and people.

Now to bring all these remarks to bear upon a rational and profitable *art of reading* these memoirs, we shall, for example, take the testimony of Matthew Levi, and show how a knowledge of his *design* illuminates every page; and contributes to clear and comprehensive views of that religion, in the accomplishment of which he was an active and honored agent. Let the reader suppose that he was possessed of all the facts and documents with which Matthew was furnished, and that he designed to address his countrymen, the Jews, in order to convince them that Jesus of Nazareth, who had, at the time of his writing, finished his earthly career, was that Messiah, the Son of God, which God had long and often promised, and they had expected. That he might write with the most effect, he would take into view the circumstances of the Jews at his time of writing. He would place before him their different sects and prejudices, the popular errors and the popular truths of the time; & being fully acquainted with these, he would select out of the information with which he was furnished such facts and documents as would suit all the circumstances of the case. Being aware that the whole nation expected a prince and deliverer to arise from among them, and from the house of King David, he would conclude, that unless he could satisfactorily prove that this Jesus was legitimately descended from Abraham through David, all further attempts to convince his countrymen would be in vain. For this purpose, then, he would apply to the Register's office for a copy of the roll of the lineage of the house of David, well attested; and from this trace Jesus to David, and thus prove that, in as far as pedigree was concerned, this per-

son had the most legitimate claim upon their faith, as being unquestionably, from the most public and well-attested documents, a descendant of King David. In the next place he would remember, that not only his descendant from David, but many circumstances of his nativity and infancy, had been pointed out by the Prophets of his nation; and that the people of his time expected these to be fulfilled in the Messiah. He would therefore introduce those circumstances which had been foretold—such as the character of his mother, the place of his nativity, the slaughter of the infants in Ramah, his flight into Egypt, his being recalled, his being brought up in Nazareth, and the history of that Elijah that was to come before him. Thus he would adduce the testimonies of Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Malachi, as all concurring in him.

Having, then, introduced him under all these favorable circumstances, and fairly brought him before his readers, accompanied with every attestation which either their own expectations or the sayings of their Prophets had made necessary; his next effort would be to furnish such evidences as their expected Elijah presented in his behalf, and such unexpected attestations as his Father from heaven and the Holy Spirit had given at his first manifestation to Israel. Then he would give a specimen of his own character, deduced from what he said and what he did, that they might judge whether there was any thing in his doctrine or deeds incompatible with his pretensions. In selecting his own declarations he would prefer those of the greatest notoriety, such as his public discourses; and of his miracles he would adduce not only those of the most splendid character, but those which were performed in the presence of the largest and most respectable assemblies.

He would occasionally, as opportunity served, state the success attendant on his labors, mention the names of his principal followers, and introduce as early as possible to the notice of his readers those prominent characters, who afterwards occupied so conspicuous a place in the triumphs of his cause. He would sometimes record such incidents in their history as would unfold their true character, and serve to give them credit with the people. He would always introduce the ancient predictions that bore upon him or them, and thus present a chain of evidence addressed to all that is in man, and to the peculiar temper and feelings of his countrymen. For this purpose pains would be taken to show how he acted in all sorts of company—amongst friends and foes; and

still having regard to the prejudices and errors of the times, such occurrences as would have a tendency to correct these mistakes would be minutely detailed. Combining brevity and great comprehension with simplicity and perspicuity, tracing every prominent incident from his birth to his death, his resurrection and ascension into heaven; he would thus produce such a phalanx of evidence as would leave without excuse every man who had read the ancient oracles, or only heard the comments of the public instructors of the people.

Such, I say, would be the general outlines of the course which reason would suggest to a person, whose design would be to convince a people, circumstanced as the Jews were, at the time Matthew published his testimony in Judea; and such, substantially, is the course that Matthew has adopted and pursued.

Now as the design of a writer is his own guide in the selection and arrangement of his materials, arguments, and evidences; so it is the only infallible guide, when known, to the interpretation of what he has written. A regard to the grand design of the whole, and to the particular design of each item in the narrative, will do more to explain to us the meaning of what is written, than all comments upon the meaning of words, or what is called "the doctrines" of scripture.

Were a person to write at a great distance from Judea, as John did, where the people knew little or nothing of the Jewish Prophets, or of the Jewish customs, he would not think of troubling them with a roll of lineage about his pedigree, nor with many quotations from ancient Prophets, except to let them know that he had been the subject of ancient prophecy, and mention a few instances to show that these prophecies had been most exactly fulfilled in him. He would introduce John the Harbinger merely as "a man sent from God." If he spoke of the people of Canaan, he would simply call them Jews. If he introduced any Hebrew names, such as *Rabbi* or *Messiah*, he would interpret them. If any of the sacred institutions of the Jews' religion, such as the Passover, was introduced, he would call it a *feast of the Jews*. If he referred to any of the usual customs of the Jews, he would explain them, such as the *Jewish manner of purifying*. If he spoke of places in that country, he would give a geographical description of them, such as *Bethany upon the Jordan*. If he alluded to the sectarian feelings of these people, he would describe to what extent they were carried, by informing his readers that *the Jews had no intercourse*

with the Samaritans. Nay, he would adopt the style of the East, as far as compatible with a lucid statement of facts; and as *light* was a favorite topic of the Asiatics, he would, under this similitude, introduce to their consideration Jesus as "*the light of the world*." In affording them the evidences of the mission of this wonderful personage, knowing that they would argue much from the reception which Jesus met with at home in his own country, he would be particular in narrating the miracles wrought in, and near to, the metropolis; and the different arguments and debates to which they gave rise; and as they would be more likely to have heard his fame from the people that visited Jerusalem at the great annual festivals and convocations, he would more minutely detail what happened on those occasions. Such would be some of his peculiarities in addressing a people so great strangers to the Jewish history.

With similar varieties both Luke and Mark are distinguished, but for the same reasons, and subordinate to the same ends; and are just as easily understood as those of Matthew and John, when all the preceding considerations are attended to.

The Christian, who sincerely desires to understand these narratives, will not only most unfeignedly present his supplications and prayers to him who gives his Holy Spirit to them that ask him; but he will exercise those faculties of understanding which God has given him, and to which he has adapted all his communications, since man became a transgressor. He will apply the same rules of interpretation to these compositions, which he would apply to any other writings of the same antiquity. He will consider the terms, not otherwise explained by the writers, as conveying the same ideas which they are wont to convey in common acceptation. He will always keep the design of the writer before his mind; and for this purpose he will attend to all circumstances requisite to ascertaining his design—such as the character of the writer himself, the circumstances of the people whom he addressed, or amongst whom he published his writings, their peculiar prejudices, views, and feelings at the time of his writing to or for them; his own most explicit avowals with regard to his motives and intentions in making any communications to them. All these things will be attended to, and the writings examined in the natural order in which they are presented; noting every allusion and incident with the greatest circumspection, whether it regard time, place, or character. But above all, the most prominent object which the writer has

in view, will be the most prominent in the consideration of a rational reader of his writings. And when difficulties occur, not to be satisfactorily solved by the mere import of the words, that meaning which best accords with the design of the whole writing, or with the particular passage, will be preferred.

But, as yet, we have not called the attention of the reader to the ultimate design of these narratives. We have, indeed, noticed that their *immediate* design is to convince the reader that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, "the Son of God"—and that this object is subordinate to another design, viz. that **THE READER MIGHT, THROUGH THIS CONVICTION, ENJOY EVERLASTING LIFE.**

Reader! This is the glorious end of these sacred histories. On the following pages is inscribed the most astonishing narrative ever read; the sublimest and the simplest story ever told. But this is not all. It is designed to accomplish an object superlatively grand, transcending—in degrees inexpressible—the most magnificent scheme that created intelligence ever conceived. To convert a race of polluted, miserable, and dying mortals, into pure, happy, and glorious immortals; to convert the gates of death into the gates of immortality; to make the pathway to rottenness and corruption, a high road to deathless vigor and incorruptible glory; to make the grave the vestibule, the antechamber, to a "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" to make the dying groans of sin-worn nature a prelude to ecstasies unalloyed. Yes, this is the benevolent and glorious design of these Testimonies. Books, written with such a design, with a design to purify, elevate, and glorify the debased and degraded children of men; to prepare, furnish, and adorn them for the society of principalities and powers, for the society of their God and King, in a world of perfect bliss, most assuredly come with a divine character to man. Their claims on the attention and examination of those to whom they are presented, most certainly are paramount to all others. And the bare hypothesis, to say nothing of the moral certainty, that they came from God, with such a design, is quite enough, methinks, to woo our whole rational nature, to constrain all our moral powers, to test their high pretensions to a character so philanthropic and divine.

On such a theme, who would not wish to be eloquent! But how can we equal in style a subject which, when but faintly and in prospective viewed, exhausted the sublimest strains of heaven-taught prophets, and of poets fired with God's own inspiration—

whose hallowed lips tasted not the fabled springs of Pagan muses, but the fountain of living waters, springing from eternal love! Yet even these failed to lisp its praise. Nay, the brightest seraph that burns in heavenly light, fails in his best effort, and, in profound thought, pores upon the marvellous theme. The compassion of the eternal God, the benevolence and philanthropy of the Father of the whole family in heaven and in earth towards us, the fallen children of his love, has transcended the loftiest grasp of the highest intelligence, and has made to falter the most expressive tongue in all the ranks of heavenly powers. In all the rapturous flights of these morning stars of creation, in all the ecstatic acclamations of these elder Sons of God, the theme has not been reached; and though they have tuned their harps a thousand times, and swelled their voices in full chorus in countless efforts, yet the theme is still unequalled, and, as it were, untouched. Vain, then would be the attempt, and fruitless every effort, to express, in corresponding terms, a subject so divine. Indeed, we have no language, we have not been taught an alphabet adapted to such a theme.

"Come, then, expressive silence, muse its praise."

Public Prayer.

As you intend, I perceive, to devote much of your work to criticism, I will mention to you a subject which I have often thought worthy of correction amongst our brethren who pray in public. It is the strange (to me) use they make of "the name" of God: You hear them express themselves thus. "We implore thy holy name; we bless the name of," &c.; "invoke thy name;" &c. &c. I have not such an opinion of myself, as to suppose myself incapable of being mistaken, but I cannot think the expressions correct. There are some other things which I think worthy an attempt at correction—Very many make up one third of their prayers of appellations of Deity. Indeed, the best prayers are those which breath the pure language of scripture.

W. A. E.

The above remarks on public prayers are excellent and worthy of attention.—We have frequently had occasion to notice the faults alluded to. No sentiments and expressions but those which are strictly *scriptural*, should be used in prayer. We should be particularly careful to avoid what our saviour censures in praying. "When ye pray use not *vain repetitions*, as the heathen do; for they think that they shall

"be heard for their *much speaking*." *Long* prayers should also be avoided. Our Lord censures them in speaking of the conduct of the hypocritical Scribes and Pharises. "Ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make *long prayers*." Besides, he says to his disciples; "Your Father *knoweth* what things ye have need of, *before* ye ask him." This, then, being so, that God knows what we want before we ask him, what use is there of repetitions and long prayers? Some of us spin our prayers out to a most unnecessary and tiresome length! Some preachers preach in their praying and pray in their preaching. We should do neither. And if we would, prayers before discourses would frequently be much shorter than they are. We should separate between what is proper to be said in a prayer and spoken in a discourse; and the best way to do this is to omit in our prayer what can be properly used in a discourse. All the prayers recorded in the Bible are *short*; and we should imitate their length. We are not commanded to pray long, but *often*. "Pray always." "Men ought always to pray and not to faint." "Pray without ceasing." "*Always in every* prayer."

There are three things necessary to all prayer to render it acceptable to God: that we keep God's *commandments*; that we ask according to his *will*; and that we ask in *faith*. 1. That we keep his commandments. "Whatsoever we *ask* we receive of him, *because* we *KEEP* his *commandments*, and do *those things* which are *pleasing* in his sight." 2. That we ask according to his will. "If we *ask* any thing *according* to his *will* he *heareth* us: and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we *have* the *petitions* whatsoever we desired of him." 3. That we ask in faith. "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. But let him *ask in faith*, nothing wavering." "The *prayer of faith* shall save the sick." EDITOR.

Confirmation and reception of the Word.

NO. III.

In our second and last essay on this subject, we alluded to the three theories of

the operation of the Holy Spirit in preparing the heart for the production of its fruits, contended for in the religious systems of the day: the preparation of the heart for the reception of the word by some mysterious or indescribable physical or metaphysical operation of the Holy Spirit; the special influence of the Spirit attending the word and impressing it upon the heart and causing it to sink into it; and the preparation of the heart by this mysterious, indescribable without any agency of testimony or of the word whatever: and we illustrated and exposed the unreasonableness and absurdity of all these theories. We then came to the question, how is the heart to be prepared for a profitable reception of the word? It is to this that we design now attending.

We showed in our first essay, how in the commencement of the Christian dispensation, the word or revelation of God was confirmed or rendered credible to those to whom it was announced: by the performance of miracles by those who proclaimed this word and made known this revelation to the world. It was in this way that the Apostles and first preachers of Christianity, prepared the hearts or minds of those to whom they were sent, to credit their mission as the Messengers of God and to receive the communications which they addressed to them. But the days of miracles have passed away, with the Apostles, and the completion and perfection of the Christian system and the first establishment of Christianity, for which they were given; and how have the hearts of people since been, and how are they now, prepared for the reception of the word? What the miracles recorder in the New Testament were designed by their performance to effect, and which they did effect, the *record* of those miracles is now intended to accomplish. This is declared by John, who wrote his testimony or gospel, as did Matthew, Mark and Luke, to prove the grandest and most sublime proposition in the Universe, that Jesus Christ is the Messiah and Son of God. "Many other *signs* [miracles]," says he, "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." The argument from miracles is the grand argument for, and the sustaining argument of, the divine origin of the Christian religion, and of its being a revelation from God. Take that away, and its claims to divine originality and to being a *revelation*, rest on no better grounds than those of any other system of religion not referring us to miracles in attestation of its claims.—Although all Scripture, in consequence of its being of divine inspiration, is called the word of God, we should make a distinction between what is properly so called, comprehending the communications concerning his will made through the Apostles, and the *testimony* of these same Apostles concerning the *facts* of which they were the *witnesses*. The former concerns what Jesus and the Apostles said in their discourses and conversations,—the latter, the miraculous works performed by them. Peter's discourse on Pentecost was the word received, particularly his answer to the inquiry of the penitent Jews, which it is said they *gladly* received; while the miracles which were seen and heard, wrought in attestation of the divine mission of the apostles and in confirmation of their word, we have recorded by Luke. So with his discourse at the house of Cornelius, and so with what was seen and heard there. It may be worth while here to remark, that the Apostles generally wrought some miracle, or some miracle was wrought for them, before they either proclaimed who they were, or called for the faith and obedience of the people. This was the case on the day of Pentecost; when the cripple was healed at the gate of the Temple, called Beautiful; and at Philippi, in the case of the Jailor, and his family; and seems to have been generally done to call and excite the attention of the people and prepare their minds for the reception of the word of the Lord which was spoken unto them. The Apostles in their discourses as recorded in the New Testament, generally called attention to the miracles performed by Jesus, before they stated his divine mission and character, propounded the terms of pardon, and called for faith and obedience to him. In illustration of this, see the discourse of Peter on Pentecost, at the Beautiful gate of the Temple, and at the

house of Cornelius, and other discourses recorded in the Living Oracles.—The three theories, to which we have adverted, destroy the plan of heaven for the conversion of mankind to Christianity, and make the gospel a partial and exclusive system. This is in fact the case with every system of religion which recognises mystical or special spiritual operations. They confine all present and future blessings of the gospel to those mystically and specially operated upon! But the *faith* of the gospel being the principle, and obedience to it the condition, upon which justification, salvation, adoption, &c. flow through it, all can enjoy its privileges and blessings where the word and testimony of God go, who have capacity to believe and capability to obey.

The case of Paul is mostly relied on to prove supernatural and miraculous conversions, and that of Lydia, to prove mystical, abstract and supernatural operations. The advocates of such conversions and operations, are very fond of *spiritualizing* the Scriptures, of giving to them a hidden, spiritual, or some other than their real meaning. For example, the conversion of Paul is made to consist in his having been miraculously made blind by the intense light which he saw while on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus, and afterwards receiving his sight by the laying on him of the hands of Ananias. His real and physical blindness is spiritualized into spiritual blindness, and the real falling of something like scales from his natural eyes, is spiritualized into the falling of the scales of sin from the eyes of his mind! Such *spiritualizers* do not consider that Paul was really blind, and pay no attention to what the Book says. "And Saul arose from the earth; [after having fallen to the earth] and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him to Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." It will be rather difficult to show how Paul *opened* his spiritual eyes and saw no man, and how he was spiritually led by the hand, and how he neither spiritually eat nor drank! Besides, if his blindness was spiritual blindness, then he must have had his spiritual sight before, and been in as good a spiritual condition

as he was before, and the Lord, not Satan, must have made him spiritually blind! And if Paul's conversion, as thus contended for, be an example for the conversion of all Christians, then they must first spiritually see, be made spiritually blind, be *three days* without spiritual sight, and the spiritual scales of sin must spiritually fall from their spiritual eyes! As to his receiving his sight, we are informed that this was as real and as physical as blindness. "And Annanias went his way, and entered into his house; and putting hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." If these were the scales of sin which fell from Paul's spiritual eyes, then must Annanias have put his spiritual hands upon him and he must have spiritually arose, and have been spiritually baptized! In fact, this *spiritualizing* rule of interpretation would make Paul and Annanias both spiritual beings, and exclude *matter* entirely!

Although the conversion of Paul was consequent upon these miracles which he witnessed and which were performed upon him, yet it was not for the purpose of converting him, that the Lord appeared unto him. It was for something else that Paul was made the subject of these miraculous displays, and we are told what it was for. "I have *appeared* unto thee for *this purpose*, to make thee a MINISTER, and a WITNESS both of these things which thou hast *seen*, and of those things in the which I will *appear* unto thee; delivering the from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee; to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." In the conversion of Paul, we have an example of the "confirmation and reception of the word," as we have in the other conversions recorded in the New Testament. "As he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a

light from heaven, and he fell to the earth and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." What does Paul say? Convinced by this supernatural light, appearance, and voice, that it was Christ who addressed him, he immediately and eagerly inquires what he must do. "And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He is told. "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." These words of the Lord being thus confirmed by these miracles, he receives them, and goes without hesitation as directed. Annanias is sent to him. He puts his hands upon him, made blind by the vivid and intense light which he had seen, and he immediately receives his sight. He addresses him still reclining; "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Convinced by this miracle performed upon him, in opening his eyes, that Annanias is a messenger from the Lord, he receives his words thus confirmed without hesitation, and forthwith obeys. "Immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." Would it not have been very easy for the Lord to have told Paul what to do, instead of sending him to Annanias? Could not the Lord have forgiven his sins there by his immediate word, as he did those of others during his personal ministry on earth; and would not this have been more consistent with the modern theories of conversion?—more consistent too with what many imagine to have been Paul's conversion? The actual circumstances of this case, nullify these theories and destroy these suppositions. Why was Paul sent to Annanias? A new order of things had previously commenced with the Reign of Heaven on Pentecost, and the Lord will not depart from this order, and make an interruption calculated to break in upon and destroy it. In that order, baptism was the *converting* act, the act of turning from the world to God, for this is the meaning of the term *convert*, a turning away from and to, a turning about. Paul, although made an apostle, before he can

become a Christian or enter upon his ministry, must come under the reign of heaven, as all others did after the establishment of that order.—On Pentecost it was, “*Repent ye therefore, 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;*” at the Beautiful gate of the Temple it was, “*Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;*” and to Paul it was, “*Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord.*” Although previously convinced of sin, it was not until Paul was baptized, that he was converted.

The case of Lydia is the next which claims our attention. We will give it as narrated by Luke in Acts. “*And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made: and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.*” The important query here is, how did the Lord open Lydia’s heart? Was it by some immediate, abstract, mystical operation of the Holy Spirit, apart or separate from signs, testimony or words of any sort? The Holy Spirit, the reader will see, is not once mentioned in passages quoted, nor any such operations as those alluded to. From the case of Paul, those noticed in our first essay, as well as the uniform procedure of God under the ministry of the Apostles, we are bound to infer that Paul must either have performed some miracle before Lydia, or have exhibited evidences of having performed them or of being able to do so, or have adduced testimony strong enough to gain her credence, before she could believe or obey. This same Apostle himself, speaking of these demonstrations of the Spirit, says, “*that no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by*

the Holy Spirit.” It must then have been by miracles of testimony that “the Lord opened” or prepared “Lydia’s heart.” “*With the heart man believeth unto righteousness*” or justification; and we have amply demonstrated in the essay alluded to above, that no one can believe without testimony, and there can be no testimony without facts. The words of Paul being confirmed in this way, or his testimony exhibited, Lydia received them and obeyed, or “she attended unto the things spoken” by him;—and “she was baptized, and her household.” Lydia’s heart must have been in some state of preparation before she heard Paul, received the word, or attended to things spoken by him. Luke is particular in saying that she “*worshipped God,*” before he mentions the opening of her heart. She must have heard Paul too before, for Luke says that she “*heard us,*” before he says her heart was opened by the Lord. But we have a miracle recorded here, which Lydia might have witnessed before her conversion. Luke immediately after saying that they went to the river side where prayer was wont to be made, and relating Lydia’s conversion, says in recording this miracle, “*And it came to pass as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination, met us,*” &c. We will now bring up the strongest argument against the supposition, that Lydia’s heart was opened by some mystical and abstract operation. Our Saviour, when he told Paul that he appeared to him to make him a minister, tells him that he would send him to the Gentiles, “*to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified, by faith that is in me.*” Now how was Paul to do this, but by miracles and testimony? And would it not have been counteracting these means, for the Lord to have opened Lydia’s heart with other means, or without means? If Paul was to open the eyes of the people to whom he was sent, it must have been by some means which the Lord enabled him to use; but if the Lord opened them without these means, then Paul’s mission was useless and he accomplished nothing by it. These arguments are conclusive against mystical and

abstract operations in the case of Lydia.

The case of the Phillippian Jailor is the last to be considered. When the foundations of his prison were shaken by the great earthquake, and its doors thrown open and his prisoners' fetters unloosed by a miracle, he was convinced of the interposition of a supernatural power. Trembling, he falls before Paul and Silas, brings them out of the prison, and inquires; "Sirs! What must I do to be saved?" They reply to him, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." But do they stop here? "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." He credits their mission as teachers and messengers from the Lord, and believes, or receives and obeys "the word," confirmed by the miraculous attestations which he had witnessed. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

EDITOR.

Additional Remarks by A. K.

The following, from the pen of a talented young brother and one of the ablest and most efficient proclaimers in this reformation, at least for his age, will form some additional remarks to the preceding essay. The reader will look over any inaccuracies in style, arrangement or composition, as he is inexperienced as a *writer*, and has more regard for the *matter* than for the *manner* of expressing it. It was written at our request.

EDITOR C. R.

From the present condition of things in the religious world, I imagine a sophisticated mystic turnig to the "parable of the Sower," and casting a dark shade upon the character of the Lord, as he proceeds to inform me, that though "the word of God is the seed," and though the word will bring forth the manifold fruit wanted, the *immediate, abstract or special* workings of the Spirit must first prepare the ground or heart before the seed can produce fruit.

Let us suppose a youth of *fifteen*, whose heart the Lord has prepared by these immediate, abstract or special energies of the Spirit, so that the Gospel produces much

fruit, and suppose a man of *fifty-five*, who has laboured his 7 or 12 years to "get through," as the popular phrase is, but who, from not having this *immediate* influence to prepare the ground, has been unable to bring forth any fruit.

The young man is extremely anxious that his father be converted; but he is told to wait God's good time; that when God sees fit he will send the Spirit to open his heart and "bring him through." Does not this seem to argue that God wanted the young man converted at 15, therefore he prepared his heart, but he did not want his father to turn to him until in his old age, therefore he would not prepare his heart sooner?—And if the father die without hope, is not the young man lead to suppose the cause of his father's damnation to be in the neglect of God to prepare the ground or heart?

Under the most common application of the "parable of the Sower," we are unavoidably led to trace the cause of all the infidelity and irreligion in every land where the Bible is read, to the *neglect* of God in *preparing the ground*. Let me be indulged to beg every reader of this humble request, who may have parents, relations or neighbors, to reflect *why* the word does not bring forth fruit, some 30, some 60, &c. among them? Are you not unavoidably led to conclude that God does not want them converted, and therefore he has left them with the stony ground, by the way side or among thorns? And if the seed never do any good with them, will it not be because God *has not prepared* that part of his ground well? Is it not a little strange that God prepares some part of his ground (men's hearts) well, sows his seed, and then blesses it because it yields much fruit; and at the same time leaves some entirely unprepared, sows his seed, (the word) on rocks and where he knows nothing but thorns can grow; and there curses and eternally condemns it because it yields no fruit? Will a prudent farmer sow his wheat in the woods on rocks where he knows it cannot grow to any perfection; and especially if he has thought about wasting "pearl before swine?" All this seems calculated, in its deleterious influence, to destroy confidence in God, by exciting suspicions of his character. For, on the supposition before us, God exhibits *two* characters *diametrically opposed*. To the young man, whose heart was well prepared, he is a gracious Father of immediate mercy and goodness, not willing that *all* should perish, but that a *few* should come to repentance; but to the father, he is a God destitute of all goodness, a malignant and

cruel tyrant, sinking him into eternal wo without giving him any chance, punishing him for not bringing forth fruit when the ground was never prepared!

Whether God, in preparing his ground by the Spirit, done some of his work well and left some half-done, is a question with which our gracious Master was never insulted during his own personal ministry and that of his Apostles; nor in fact until the revelation of the "Man of Sin"—papal influence and superstition.

Though such a question was not then agitated, we are certainly at liberty to notice the means by which all the ground or hearts may be well prepared; and as Lydia's heart was opened or prepared in the same manner that others were, as all will admit; and as her case seems to present the same difficulty; we will proceed to notice the appointment under which Paul was sent to Lydia and all to whom he preached; in which we think it very evident that God opened her heart by what Paul *said and did*; remarking by the way that this is the most difficult case in the Bible on the subject on which we are writing. If, therefore, we can see that God opened Lydia's heart by arguments, miracles or testimony, we will surely be able to see the justice of God in condemning the stony ground or hearted hearer; considering that the same preparatory means were offered to all, and all had the same opportunity to count up the cost, examine daily, to see whether the things declared were so, and thus have their minds fully prepared to receive whatsoever the sower or Apostles might deliver. Jesus says (unto Paul, (Acts xxvi. 16—18), "I have appeared unto thee for *this purpose*, to make thee a *minister* and a *witness*, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I SEND thee; to OPEN their eyes, and to TURN them from DARKNESS to LIGHT, and from the POWER of SATAN to GOD; that they may RECEIVE FORGIVENESS of sins, and INHERITANCE among them that are sanctified, by FAITH that is in ME." Why did Jesus make Paul a witness of this wonderful appearance and many miraculous signs? Was it not to enable him to "turn others from darkness to light? And who will say that it was in any other way than by his ministry and evidence, that he was able to open the hearts and "turn from darkness to light" all who would examine his credentials? Does it not appear plain, that God opened Lydia's heart by Paul as a minister, or by the miracles or evi-

dence laid before her or addressed to her senses by him? But suppose God turned her from darkness to light by the *immediate* agency of the Spirit, so strenuously contended for by many, will it not immediately appear that he counteracted his own means?—that after having sent Paul on that business, or for that purpose, he had found it to be a bad plan, and had concluded to open the hearts of the people by *other* means, or *without* means? And would not Paul have been utterly confounded, as one sent on important business, of the utmost moment, and yet not permitted to perform it? The question may yet remain in the breast of the anxious inquirer; how could Paul open Lydia's heart, that she attended to the things spoken? What was necessary to prepare Lydia to attend, obey or submit to what Paul taught? Simply and assuredly that Paul should prove to her that what he was saying, was by the authority of almighty God.

That we may better see the necessity of preparing the hearts of the people for the reception of the Gospel, we will notice what Paul calls the Gospel, (1 Cor. xv. Chap.) "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." Now suppose Paul to have delivered this gospel to all with whom he met, without ever proving his authority by miracles, or preparing their hearts by testimony, can we imagine one of all the thousands to whom Paul preached, who would have received it? They would have treated it as the whim of some fanatic, or pretext of some vile impostor. Jesus neither instructed nor permitted his Apostles to preach to any congregation, until they were empowered to work miracles and endowed with miraculous gifts. Though Peter had the keys of the kingdom of Heaven and though the Lord promised to bind in heaven that which he bound on earth, he never preached Jesus and him crucified until the day of Pentecost, when the prophecy of Joel was fulfilled so wonderfully and when he was able miraculously to speak in all the dialects known. Did not the "sword of the Spirit which is the word of God," pierce the pentecostian hearers to the heart? And did not the wonders wrought on that occasion open their hearts or minds to attend to what was spoken by Peter? After this we hear of Peter's preaching to five thousand, (Acts iii. chap.) but he prepared his hearers by first healing or making whole the lame man who had never before stood on his feet; whom the people saw leaping and praising

God, and which caused them to run together in a concourse. We consider this miracle Peter's credentials, which proved that he was an ambassador from God, and therefore the people felt themselves bound to hear him. Paul would not have been justifiable in attending to what Annanias told him, had not Annanias proved his authority by performing a miracle. We learn, (Acts ix & xxii chaps.) that Annanias laid his hands on Saul and restored his sight, then taught him how he could have his sins forgiven, and he arose straightway and was baptized, as was Lydia. Let me here recite Psalms xix. 7. "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple," proceed on. Notwithstanding the Apostles adduced testimony, wrought miracles, &c. to open the understandings and prepare the hearts for the reception of "the seed which is the word of God," all this preparation is of God. God said "let us make man in our own image," and then "created all things by and for his Son." He instructed and warned the Jews by prophets, made our glorious Master the mediator of the New Covenant, sent his Spirit to convince the world of sin, &c. through the Apostles seated on twelve thrones to judge the twelve tribes of Israel; and as we have seen, by Paul he "opened their eyes and turned them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." In a word, God has seen fit to work by means; and if we do not make use of the means we are culpable, cannot expect the effects of them, and may be found among the "stony ground"; hearers. In Matt. xiii. 19, Jesus says "when any one hears the word of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh that wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which receiveth seed by the way side." All will agree that the word will bring forth no fruit unless believed; but the difficulty is in finding the cause of his not understanding. I will say he refused to use the means as many do now. I will not deny, that God had determined to make the Jews who rejected him, vessels of wrath, having endured them with much long-suffering; and that he therefore spoke to them in parables,* &c.

* Perhaps our brother is mistaken here. We have the reason from the mouth of the Lord himself why he spoke to the Jews in parables. On being asked by his disciples, "why speakest thou unto them in parables?" he replied, "because it is given unto you [disciples] to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given."

But for us to plead ignorance of our duty is to plead indolence. Paul says, (Eph. iii. 4.) "whereby when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ," and (verses 8, 9,) it was given to him to make all men see the fellowship of the mystery which had been hid from the beginning of the world. Not to multiply quotations permit me to ask; has our heavenly Father pretended to give us a REVELATION which does not REVEAL his WILL and our DUTY? Can we call an incomprehensible MYSTERY a revelation with any regard to truth? Has the all gracious Lord of the Universe condescended to speak to man in letters dyed in sacred blood,* and dare I say he knew we could not understand it? Why preach it to sinners? Why send it to the heathens?—if it does not contain the words of eternal life to be understood? Indolence, the parent of ignorance, which lies at the root of our miseries and woes, may tell me I am excused on account of ignorance; but who can rise in judgment with his sins, and say to my gracious Master, "you never told me intelligibly what to do for the remission of sins!" Pray read the iv & v chapters of Leviticus; lay aside the theological divinity of the schools; study in the college of Heaven under Paul, Peter and John; cease to discourage Bible readers by telling them they cannot understand it; exhort the people to search the scriptures which are able to make wise unto salvation; and parents will not find so many of their sons and daughters "by the way-side hearers." If those by the way-side had acted the part of the noble Bereans, searched to see and striven to know they no doubt would have received the seed into understanding hearts.

Those on the rock (Luke viii. 13.) are such as believe for a while, but in time of temptation fall away. I will exhort the Christian reader to "give diligence to make his calling and election sure," "for if ye do these things (2 Pet. i. 10,) ye shall never fall." Persons who carelessly and merely assent to the Gospel, without counting up the cost, who believe the gospel because others receive it as true, without considering the necessity of making the best use of the means proposed, are apt to be easily shaken and moved by a Voltaire or a Paine, or driven to blasphemy by an Inquisition. Many have thus failed to endure hardness as good soldiers of our blessed Lord.

As to the thorny ground, none will dare

* "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."—Matt. xxvi. 28.

say that God caused that professor to seek riches, place his affections on things below, and thus "pierce himself through with many sorrows," Paul warned the brethren by Timothy, of the "deceitfulness of riches," and that they who will be rich fall into many temptations and snares, "and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition." A. K.

Note to the preceding Essay.

The following extracts are from Dr. James Fishback's "Philosophy of the Human Mind in respect to Religion," from which we made an extract in one of our preceding nos. on "Religious Enthusiasm," and which is replete with valuable truths and to which we feel ourselves indebted for valuable information. Let the reader bear in mind, that Dr. F. is, as we stated, a Baptist.

EDITOR C. R.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

Saul had been a very bloody persecutor of the christians. As he went towards Damascus, suddenly there *shone round about him a light* from heaven, and he fell to the earth, and *heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? and he said, who art thou Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; and he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.* And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. Ananias, a disciple, who was at Damascus, the Lord *said unto in a vision, arise, and go to Saul of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him that he might receive his sight; and Ananias with great hesitation, through fear of Saul, on account of his former character, went his way, and entered into the house, and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest) hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost; and immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received his sight forthwith; and arose, and was baptized. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues that he is the Son of God—at which all Paul's former acquaintances were amazed; but Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews who dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the very Christ.—*

Let any person of common sense, and candor examine this instance of conversion, and say whether the miraculous appearance, and the words explanatory, did not convince Saul that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; and whether the bestowment of the Spirit was not subsequent, and imparted by the laying on of Ananias' hands? one of the operations of our day, form any part of this distinguished conversion. Paul is convinced of sin, by the miraculous things which he *saw and heard*, because he had not believed in Jesus Christ; and *after* believing he received the Holy Ghost, agreeable to Christ's promise; and afterwards preached the Gospel by working of miracles in the name of Jesus Christ, pursuing the same plan to prove that he was the Son of God, which had been employed upon him at his conversion. That the above contains all that entered into the essential character, and nature of the divine agencies in Saul's conversion is manifest from Paul on two different occasions, detailing the same facts, without any hint at the operations of our day. In the 22d chapter of the Acts, Paul in his defence before the Jews, said unto them, "as I made my journey, and was come nigh to Damascus, about noon, suddenly there *shone from heaven a great light round about me, and I fell to the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul Saul why persecutest thou me? And I answered who art thou Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest. The Lord said unto me, arise, and go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.* Ananias was sent, and said unto him, Brother Saul receive thy sight, and *he said the God of our Fathers hath chosen thee that thou shouldst know his will, and see that just one, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth.— For thou shalt be his witness unto all men, of what thou hast seen, and heard.* In the 26th chapter of Acts, Paul, in his defence before Agrippa, rehearses nearly the same facts; and observes that the "Lord said unto me arise, (when on the ground) and stand upon thy feet, for I have *appeared unto thee for this purpose to make thee a minister, and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles unto whom now I send thee; to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.*" He told Agrippa

that he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision, and having obtained help of God (by the gifts of the Holy Ghost,) said he, I continue unto this day *witnessing* both to small, and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets, and Moses did say should come; that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shed light unto the people, and unto the Gentiles.—Never was there a more clear, and intelligible narrative than is here exhibited—by the signs, and wonders, and voices explanatory, is Saul converted to the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; and thus convinced by this ample, and clear testimony, it was indeed hard for him to kick against the pricks of conscience, consisting in the clearest convictions from these overwhelming proofs; he, therefore, was not disobedient to the heavenly vision—but addressed himself to the work whereunto he was called, (*viz.*) in bearing witness unto all men of what he had *seen*, and *heard*; and particularly unto the Gentiles, to whom he was sent to open their eyes, and to turn them (by preaching the gospel, and working miracles in the name of Jesus Christ, in confirmation of its truth) from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; that *they may receive* forgiveness of sins, and inheritance amongst them which are sanctified by faith that is in Jesus Christ; urging the Gentiles that they *should repent*, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance. There is not a single hint in these narratives of the operations which are contended for in our day, the external evidences prove the propositions taught, and the evidences are the signs, and wonders, and words explaining them;—all of which are of the Holy Ghost; for the miracles were wrought by him, and the words by which they were explained were given to the Apostles by the Spirit that they might know and teach the things of God. They were recorded by the direction of the Spirit under the literal fulfilment of the promise of Christ, and he (the Spirit) shall take the things of mine, and shew them unto you, and bring all things to your remembrance; by which they not only wrote what Christ told them, but also what was shewn to them after his resurrection.

LYDIA'S CONVERSION.

I will bestow some attention upon the case of Lydia, recorded in the 16th. chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

This case is relied on more to prove the opinions relative the *immediate* operations of the Spirit in conversion, than any other

which is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles; and on no other account than because it is said that *the Lord opened Lydia's heart* that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. It is never asked whether any means were employed in opening her heart, and, if any, what they were? Such an inquiry might produce a conclusion against the doctrine of immediate agencies. With me there is no doubt; nor can there be any, according to the principles established, and the proofs adduced, that the Lord opened Lydia's heart to attend unto the things spoken of Paul. I think I have abundantly proven, in the preceding chapter that no means merely natural or human could possibly have done it. The impossibility of this, is in perfect unison with the plan employed by Christ before, and, through the Apostles, by the Holy Ghost, since his ascension; nothing merely human or natural were employed. The only question is, whether her heart was opened to attend unto Paul, by *instrumentalities of a spiritual, and divine character*. To this question I answer in the affirmative; and think, that the regular, and established plan of divine administrations amongst mankind, as intelligent, and moral beings; after the Gospel first began to be preached at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, (as exhibited in the examination of the manner, the means, and the effects of teaching, and preaching in the foregoing pages of this chapter, until the case of Lydia occurred,) establishes it.—The case of Lydia furnishes testimony itself to the same purpose.

Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, says, "A vision appeared to Paul in the night; there stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." They accordingly went "to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony: And we (says Luke) were in that city, abiding certain days. And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us; whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." &c. There is a very striking resemblance between the case of Cornelius, and Lydia. It seems that they were both worshippers of God before the Gospel was preached to them by the Apostles. Peter, by an angel, was sent to Cornelius, several years after the gospel was first preached at Jerusalem, and Paul was

sent into Macedonia by a man whom he saw in a vision, where he met with Lydia. This was, as computed by chronologers, about twenty two years after the Gospel began to be preached at Jerusalem. That Paul imparted spiritual gifts, as he was accustomed to do, by the imposition of his hands to the members of the church at Philippi, is evident from the 3d. verse of the second chapter of his Epistle to the Philippians, in which he cautions them against strife, and vain glory, in the exercise of their spiritual gifts; as was too much the case in the church at Corinth (Corinth. 14.) Lydia, probably, at the time Paul instructed her, was in a state of acceptance with God, a Rahab was; whose faith (produced by hearing how the Lord dried up the water of the red sea for the Israelites to pass through, when they came out of Egypt.) was counted to her for righteousness:—having secretly received, and concealed the spies who were sent by Joshua to Jerico, and sent them away by a different road from that which she knew their pursuers would go. Josh. 2. 3—11. Heb. 11. 31. James 2. 25. Rahab believed from what she heard, that the Lord, the God of Israel, he is God in Heaven above and on earth beneath. This faith was produced by the Spirit, and power of God, in the miracles which were wrought. God declared that he designed by the miracles, the signs and the wonders which he wrought in Egypt, and in favor of the children of Israel, to make known and establish his name upon the earth.

Lydia, after she believed, may have received the Holy Ghost as did Cornelius; and Paul may have wrought miracles before her eyes in the name of Jesus Christ, by which her heart was opened to attend unto what he said; or, he might have told her, (which he most probably did,) that he was sent by the Holy Ghost to instruct her; having gathered, as Luke observes, that the Lord had called them to preach the Gospel unto them in Macedonia. The Lord opened the hearts of the three thousand, and of the five thousand, to attend unto what Peter said, and by which they were converted—he did this by the signs, and wonders on the day of Pentecost; and the miracles, in healing the lame man, which *they saw, and heard.*

CONVERSION OF THE JAILOR.

The conversion of the jailor, and Louse, was affected by miracles; for, says the historian, "At midnight, Paul, and Silas (having their feet made fast in the stocks, in the inner prison,) prayed, and sung praises to God; and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so

that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison, awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, (he probably slept in a part of the prison,) he drew out his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, do thyself no harm, for we are all here. Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul, and Silas, and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (the answer is a plain one.) "And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. *And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.*"

The great earthquake, together with the penalty which seems to have been annexed to the keepers of prisoners letting them go, were probably the cause of the jailor trembling. Peter, when confined in jail, was rescued by an angel; and Herod commanded that the keepers of the jail should be put to death. Acts 12. 1—19. The jailor saw and felt that there was safety no where but in the faith of Paul, and Silas; and in their God. Hence the inquiry, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" To which the answer was plain, and the ground of safety easy, with the evidence before him, "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*"

God reconciled to Sinners.

"The design of the atonement was twofold: first, to reconcile God to the world; secondly to reconcile the world to God. In support of the first position, take the expression, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Not that thou hast aught against him, or that he has injured thee, but though hast injured him; go, therefore, and conciliate him. In support of the second, take the following passage: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself, by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation."

This is another fragment from Mr. Hanner's "Sermon." A mutual reconciliation as expressed above, must imply that there

are faults with each of the parties to be reconciled. If this be not the case, if there exists faults or causes of enmity or variance with one party only, then one party only can be reconciled. Now this is the case in regard to God and sinners. If God be reconciled to sinners, then they cannot be reconciled to Him, and *vice versa*. Reconciliation implies a previous state of separation. What has produced the separation between God and sinners, and with which party does the separation take place? Isaiah prophesying against the Jews tells them: "But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you that he will not hear." And again: "For our transgressions are multiplied before thee, and our sins testify against us: for our transgressions are with us; and as for our iniquities we know them. In transgressing and lying against the Lord, and departing away from our God." Mr. Noyes has rendered these passages very beautifully and correctly as follows:

"But your iniquities have separated you from your God,

And your sins have hidden his face from you that he doth not hear.

* * * * *

For our transgressions are multiplied before thee

And our sins testify against us,

And our iniquities we know.

We have rebelled and proved false to Jehovah,

We have departed from our God."

Here the reconciliation had to take place on the part of the Jews; as it was their sins which had separated them from the Lord. And with this accords all the scriptures. It cannot be proven either from position, assertion (except that of men) or deduced from inference, in all the Bible, that a reconciliation to the sinner has to take place with God. It has not the colour of an argument to support it; and is a mere figment of the brain! The sinner is always represented every where as having to be reconciled to God. The very text which Mr. H. has adduced to support his position, is so far from containing any proof for it, that it goes against him. The brother on bringing his gift to the altar, and

remembering that his brother had aught against him, (in consequence of *his own*, not his brother's, offence,) was to leave his gift there, and go and be reconciled to his brother, (not his brother to him,) before his offering could be acceptable.* The last quotation which Mr. H. has made is very pertinent, and completely overturns his first position. But where, it may be asked, did Mr. H. get this doctrine, as it is nowhere in the Bible? I will tell you reader. From the *Methodist Discipline*, where it reads;—"one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us," &c. And where did the Discipline get it?—Not out of the *Bible!*

EDITOR.

* Since writing the above, we heard a very intelligent sectarian preacher cite this very same passage to prove that sinners were to be reconciled to God, and not God to sinners. How "divines" do differ!

The Boston Investigator.

It seems that the editor of this paper, notwithstanding the contemptuous notice which he took of mine, has found it of sufficient importance to devote a whole column to our remarks on his first notice of us. In his paper of Augst. 12th. which he has sent us, we found an editorial article headed "CHRISTIAN REFORMER," which on reading a few lines, we could hardly think was by Abner Kneeland, it was so weak, flat and insipid, and the editor spoke of "Mr. Kneeland." When we came to the answer to our "Seven Questions to Deists," we found that it was not Mr. Kneeland, but some young tyro editor in his absence. However as he has been thought important enough to be entrusted with the editorial department of the "Investigator,"* we will devote a little time and space to a notice of him.—He commences as follows:

"CHRISTIAN REFORMER."—Some months since we noticed this work, it being sent us for "exchange;" but not thinking it of much stamina, we returned it to the Editor, as he

* This *Boston Investigator* must be a misnomer, as it does not seem to confine its investigations to Boston.

requested, if we did not wish to exchange. He sent us no more till lately; when we received No. 5, an article in the index being marked as follows:  Abner Kneeland and the Boston Investigator.  On turning to the article, we find that he has published Mr. Kneeland's remark about his "concern," and appended a long string of remarks, winding up with "Seven Questions to Deists." There is also another article on "Infidelity," one on the "Concessions of Deists," and one headed "The Triumphs [Triumphs] of Scepticism." The poor man seems to have blown his blast; but we are verily afraid his Christian brethren will rap his knuckles for his ignorance. Hear him:

"Wishing to hear and know what was going on in the city of 'Mental Independence,' we very freely and politely tendered our paper in exchange for this ORGAN of DEISM."!!!

Organ of DEISM! Well done, Mr. Howard!! You have discovered the philosopher's store! Never call Solomon the *wisest* man after this!"

As Mr. Kneeland returned our *second* no. (not our first) to us without even having read it, as appeared from the leaves not being cut, in order to draw his attention to the article in question, noticed above, we made with our pen a couple of hands pointing it, and did not have them printed, as a person from reading the above might suppose. His thus referring to this, and the notice he has taken of a trifling and unimportant typographical mistake which he has corrected in brackets, exhibit the weakness of this tyro editor's intellect. But what more can we expect from one who with a table of *contents* before his eyes should call it an *index!* Such an one has good reason to exclaim, "My eyes!!!"

Your eyes, young Mr. Infidel! Certainly you must have had them shut when you penned the latter part of the above extract from you! Do you not know that Deism is the name appropriated to your system; and that the term organ is frequently, very commonly, used in reference to a paper which expresses and defends the views of a party? If you do not, and it would seem so from the above, your ignorance is really to be pitied! What more common than to

say of a political paper, that it is the organ of Jacksonism, of Van Burenism; and of a religious paper, that it is the organ of Methodism, Presbyterianism, &c.? It is from the use so commonly made of such expressions, that we caught the one of which we have been guilty. So this gentleman's wonderment is all, at last, at nothing, and springs from his ignorance and stupidity! The following comes next:

"He [Mr. Kneeland] has asked us, what is Christianity 'a divine and perfect system' of!—and what in our opinion constitutes Christianity? We would, consistently with the merits of such an inquiry, inform Mr. Kneeland that Christianity is a divine and perfect system of *religion*, and that the *Christian religion* in our opinion constitutes *Christianity*."!!!

"A second Daniel! My eyes!! He also says that Mr. Kneeland never knew much about the Christian religion; and says if Universalism was all he everknew about it, he must be very ignorant of it. Pray, Mr. Howard, what do you know about it? What does any one know about it? Nothing, except that it is, and has been, the cause of more misery and crime, plunder and bloodshed, than any thing else. But what can we expect from a man who calls the Investigator the "*Organ of Deism?*"

Concerning the expression above made use of by us, we made a correction in the number of our paper before the last, in which we stated that we meant and should have said, "consistently with such an inquiry, *as coming from him*," Mr. Kneeland. We further observed, that such an inquiry coming from one ignorant of those things, honest of heart and really desirous to know, merited a different answer; but from an infidel like Mr. K. who doubtless pretends to know all about it, such an inquiry was appropriate enough. So his wonderment here is at nothing at last. His remarks are very trifling, flat and dull! However, to sharpen his obtusity a little, and to relieve him of some of his stupidity, we would inform *him*, that Christianity is that system of religion of which Jesus Christ is the Author and Founder. He asks us, what do we or any one know about it? We reply, that we know what the Bible teaches us, and that he seems to

know but very little, if any. The charge, that Christianity is and has been the cause of more misery, crime, plunder and bloodshed, than any thing else, is, as it relates to pure and uncorrupted Christianity, as false and unfounded as it can be. Its corruptions and perversions may and have been causes of these, but it cannot be shown that this religion *itself* has ever been a cause. What! a religion the cause of that which it every where opposes and condemns! The charge is as absurd as it is unfounded. We invite, we challenge investigation, upon this subject. Show us, we demand, where the Lord Jesus Christ permits or connives at any of these things. Ignorant indeed must be this tyro editor, of the New Testament!—He then goes on:

“His “seven questions” are as follows, which the writer, although young and in the absence of the Editor, would answer thus:

“Question 1. How did the idea of a God, or the existence of a God, ever originate, if not imparted to man by revelation from God?”

Answer. How did the idea of sin, or infidelity, ever originate, if not imparted to man by revelation from God? And if God did not originate sin, and reveal it to man, how came the idea of it to exist?”

So this seemingly bold, fearless, courageous editor has to plead his *youth!* And well may he, when his answers to our questions come to be examined! He has not pretended to answer our first question, as the reader will see. He attempts to answer it, or rather to evade it, by asking another! This way of answering a question by asking another, does pretty well, where the questions stand related, which is not at all the case here. What relation, we would ask, is there between the question concerning the existence of the Deity and that of the origination of evil? But this is an easy way of getting around a question where it cannot be answered! The question, how did *infidelity* originate unless imparted to man by revelation from God, is absurd to the last degree! God revealing *unbelief* to man!! This caps the climax of absurdity! But what shall we say to the blasphemous imputation, which here attempts to make God the au-

thor of sin by originating it!—How would this gentleman, or any body else, know what sin is, or any thing about it, were it not for revelation? Sin is an appropriated term, and means the transgression of a divine law, or law of God; and how would we know what God's laws are or any thing about them, if he had not revealed them unto us? “Sin is the transgression of the law,” says an Apostle, and “where there is no law there can be no transgression;” and thus sin has become an appropriated term, meaning the transgression of a revealed law of God.

“*Quest. 2d.* Without revelation how can man know any thing about the character and designs of God?”

Ans. Sure enough! But how do we know that he has revealed any thing? Did God reveal the fifteenth chapter of Leviticus, and the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, —12th, 13th, and 14th verses? and many other similar holy passages?”

The first part of this answer admits what is asked. The remainder is another evasion. What connexion, we would ask, is there between these questions here and ours?—between the question, how can man know any thing about the character and designs of God without revelation? and, how do we know that God has revealed any thing? and did he reveal such and such passages of the Bible?—But this will do very well, and is a very easy way of getting round our question! The passages alluded to, are as revelations not unworthy of the Supreme Being, when the state of those to whom these revelations were made is considered, the design of making them, and the disease the contagion of which it is intended to prevent. If the Septuagint is consulted, it will be found that a most loathsome disease is intended to be prevented.

“*Ques. 3d.* If the character of Jesus Christ was fictitious, where has the model ever existed upon which it was formed, or from which it was invented?”

Ans. The good parts were taken from Confucius, and all other good men; but the bad ones from—priests, I think!”

He has ventured to answer this question, and weak enough is the answer! He may

well say, "I think," for it is nothing but a think so. A heavy *onus probandi*, burden of proof, will lie upon this gentleman, to show that the good parts of our Saviour's character were taken from the Chinese philosopher Confucius and other good men. It is nothing but mere conjecture and supposition! There cannot be a particle of proof adduced from all the records of ancient history. If he admits the existence of Confucius, he must also admit that of Jesus Christ; for the proofs for the latter are far more abundant, stronger and certain. But will this young gentleman inform who is the author of this character which he seems to view as fictitious—as never having any real existence? As to the blasphemous assertion, that the Messiah's character had some *bad parts*, it is without a particle of foundation whatever! It is nothing but bare, groundless supposition! All that infidels and others know of his character, is in the New Testament and contemporaneous historians. The former presents not a single bad trait in it, casts not a single dark shade upon it, while the latter agree with this divine volume. The character of Jesus Christ was pure, spotless and perfect, and worthy of the Son of God. It was the character of God himself, for he was "an effulgence of his glory and an *exact representation* of his character."

"*Ques. 4th.* How did the idea of miracles ever enter into the word, if no such thing as a *real* miracle was ever performed, seeing that miracles are opposed to the constitution and course of nature; as there can be nothing *false* without the previous existence of that which is *real*?"

Ans. How did the idea that the Boston Investigator was the "Organ of Deism," ever enter the brain of J. R. Howard? Or how did the idea of a journey to the moon originate? How did the idea of hell originate?"

The reader will see that this answer is on a par with the previous ones which we have quoted, and furnishes another evidence of the weakness of this tyro's intellect. What connexion, we would ask, has it with our question? It is another miserable *evasion*! But a bad or irrelevant answer is better than no answer. Any body

can give some sort of an answer to any question, however foreign to the question the answer may be! We will, however, answer his questions, simple as they are—"Deism" is the name appropriated to the infidel system, as we have shown, and "Organ" a term used in reference to a paper which advocates a doctrine or system. The Boston Investigator being the advocate of the infidel system in the United States, the idea that it is the "Organ of Deism," entered our brain.—People when they wish to visit any place, must take a journey to it, in order to visit it. Somebody wished that they could visit the moon. Thus originated the idea of a journey to the moon.—(This editor exhibits great ignorance of mental philosophy!) As to the idea of hell—ah, how did that originate! This is like the idea of sin, in the answer to our first question. As the idea of sin would never have been known, if God had never revealed laws, the transgression of which constitutes sin, so the idea of hell, or a place or state of future punishment for sin would never have been known had it never been revealed. Let any infidel get over this, if he can. Let him show, if he be able, how man could ever have originated the idea of future punishment, or a future state of existence?

"*Ques. 5th.* Without revelation how can man know any thing about his origin?"

Ans. By the study of Geology, Physiology, and other sciences, and by examining things naturally, he will know all that can be known, and *more* than will do him any good."

This is the first, and only one, of our questions which he has attempted to answer directly. And foolish and absurd enough, is the answer too! How man can find out any thing about his *origin*, or *how* he came into existence, by studying Geology, Physiology, &c., will, we think, puzzle the brains of this young Editor to tell. Such a supposition is as absurd as it is unreasonable. And these are the people who boast of *reason*! How, we would ask, were those who existed *before* Geology, Physiology, and the other sciences were known, to find out any thing about *their* origin?!—We can examine *natural* things, but how are we to examine things *natural*—

ly? If we can thus examine things, there must be two sorts of examination, *natural* and *artificial*. Now will this Editor inform us, how we can examine a *natural* thing, *artificially*, or an *artificial* thing, *naturally*?!!—But he says that in this way and by these studies man will know all that can be known of his origin. This is reducing it to an impossibility at once! But the proofs of design in the constitution of man, and the succession of generations of the human race, show that our race is not eternal, but has had an origin. To know that God created man, is more than Geology, &c. can teach; and that he was created, none but the blindest Atheist can deny.—As to man's learning from these sciences more about his origin than will do him any good, it is true in regard to the *false knowledge* which infidels possess!

“*Ques. 6th.* Where did the doctrine that man was created in the image or likeness of God, come from, if never revealed to him by his creator?”

Ans. The most foolish question ever asked.—Did God make man in his likeness, or *vice versa*? Christians say, as well as the Bible, that he is like nothing either in heaven or on earth; that his presence fills immensity, &c. Is man any thing like this?”

Another answer in keeping with previous answers, or rather no answer at all, but a similar evasion. That there is such a doctrine, as that man was created in the likeness or image of God, the Bible teaches. Whether it is a foolish question to ask, where it came from if it was not revealed to him by that God whom the Bible claims for its Author, I will leave to the sensible to decide; for if it came not from God it must have had an *origin* from some other source. From part of the answer here given, the reader of this Editor would be led to suppose I meant that man was created corporeally in the likeness or image of God! That God, whose presence fills all space, has a body like man, is an idea too absurd to have ever entered the head of any one of common sense!—I meant the moral and intellectual image of God; and the question remains to be answered yet, where this doctrine came from, if not revealed to man by God himself?

“*Quest. 7th.* Where did the idea of a

future state of existence derive its origin, if not communicated to man by revelation, seeing that it is opposed to the course and constitution of nature? and without revelation how can man know any thing of his destiny?”

Ans. A mere repetition of former questions.—The answer to the fourth question would do for this, but I will say a few words more about a future state. Why was not the existence of a future state revealed to the Old Testament worthies? Why was it left in darkness about 4000 years? If the priests and Bible makers had no way to frighten their dupes by a threatened punishment, they never would have gained the ascendancy as they have done. If they had punished, or threatened to punish the people for their sins in this world, the trick would have been seen through. But by keeping the people in ignorance, they work upon their fears by telling them of a dreadful punishment in a future state of existence, and thus obtain all they wish for.—You say that God's Kingdom is not of this world; but it takes an “awful smart” of this world's *money* to build it up, or even keep it in repair.”

I would ask the reader what former questions is this a repetition of? This Editor seems to insinuate that it is the fourth, as he says the same answer will do for both. How the question of, “Where did the idea of a future state of existence derive its origin, if not communicated to man by revelation?” can be a *repetition* of the question, “How did the idea of miracles enter into the world, if no such thing as a real miracle was ever performed?” remained for this tyro to find out! And wonderful is the discovery indeed! He can see something where there is nothing!—what the wisest man has never yet been able to see. Well may he exclaim, “My eyes.” But this will do to get around a question when some sort of an answer is better than no answer.—In answer to his assertions we reply, that a future state of existence was revealed from almost the creation of the world; and by asserting in the face of the Bible which contains these revelations of it, he exhibits his ignorance of this book which he is *blindly* assailing. Besides the knowledge which Adam, Job, David, had of it, and

that "cloud of witnesses" who "confessing themselves *strangers* and *pilgrims* on earth" "all died in faith, not having received the promises," but "having beheld them afar off embraced them,"—besides this, the translation of Enoch and Elijah to heaven, who never saw death, is plainly recorded. This Editor then goes on to say, that if the "priests and Bible makers," as he calls them, had punished or threatened to punish the people for their sins in *this world*, the *trick* would have been seen through. Now this was actually done, during the period of the whole Jewish economy or government, and the "trick" was never seen through!—which would have been the case, had that government not have had its origin from God.—And as for the insinuation about "*money*," we can say, that as far as known to us, no preacher or writer in this Reformation, makes it an object. That is not for what *they* labour. And as to ourself, we can say, that so far from having received any remuneration for our labors, we have expended considerably for our means. The charge may justly be made against the hireling clergy of the age. But *we* have no clergy, and do not profess to belong to their order. The "clergy are not known in the New Testament. The infidels are much mistaken, if in contending against *us*, they imagine they are contending against "the clergy." Let them understand their men. This Editor concludes by saying:

"The remaining articles are about as sensible as the rest part [rest part!] of the work, and that is not saying much in their favour; but not having time to say as much as we wish, we shall lay them aside till the Editor returns."

Not having time!—a good excuse to get off from them.—We have thus republished all the remarks about us in the "Investigator; and now let Mr. Kneeland act the gentleman and the man of honor, and do the same for us, and send us the papers containing them, and all his remarks.

EDITOR.

Two Arguments of Scepticism and Deism Refuted.

Among the arguments adduced by Sceptics and Deists against the divine origin of the Christian Religion, are *two*, which,

from their unjustness and inapplicability, deserve particular notice or attention. In the first place, it is asserted, if we are not mistaken, that Christianity has been the occasion of more *war* and *bloodshed*, since its establishment, than perhaps all other causes operating together, where it has been introduced and disseminated. This is argued and inferred from the fact, and that, alone, of the existence of this religion where the greatest and most numerous wars, among nations claiming the appellation of "civilized," have been waged, and where the largest quantity of blood has been spilled. The argument rests upon the ground of tracing effects to *wrong* causes, or those which have not produced them. They are charged upon Christianity, which is as innocent of them, as the new born babe. As far as its alleged agency is concerned, they are to be charged upon the *corruptions* and *perversions* of this Religion, and not upon itself. *Pure* and *uncorrupted* Christianity, such as it is, breathing in all its freshness from the Living Oracles, is as far from engendering or permitting a spirit of warfare, hostility, enmity and revenge, as light is from darkness, heat from cold, or our holy Creator from being the author of evil. Christianity is no more accountable for its perversions, corruptions, & the crimes that have been perpetrated in its name, than the beings of another orb for the actions of those who inhabit this globe, whom they have never seen and of whom they have never heard. The Spirit of the Christian Religion, is emphatically that of PEACE. "*On earth peace, good will to words men* was the song of praise to God, chanted by the choir composing the multitude of the heavenly host, to the Shepherds watching their flocks in the fields, And He whose birth the angel announced, is emphatically styled the PRINCE OF PEACE. The "good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people," that this same angel announced, was, that a SAVIOUR for them was born, not a *destroyer*. And the glorious consummation of the Religion of which He is the divine Author, is, that war shall cease and its implements shall be converted into the implements of peace:—"they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword

against nation, neither shall they learn war any more;" a consummation most devoutly wished for *by every real* Christian.—But is the assertion true, that there has been more warfare and bloodshed under Christianity, than under the Pagan religions of ancient and modern times? Compare their horrid massacres, their cold blooded and merciless butcheries, and the multitudes whose lives have been sacrificed, even in polished Greece and Rome, and the spirit of barbarity, the concomitant of all this, and what is the result? Consult History, and she will tell.

The other argument is directed against the *moral* tendency of Christianity, and involves the first which we have examined. It may seem more specious and plausible, but is far more fertile and absurd. It is alleged and objected against this Religion, if we are not mistaken, that it is the source and cause of great moral evil, and of much of the vice, crime and misery of mankind, where it has been introduced. This argument is also placed upon as wrong and false ground as the other; & it is equally as unjust as far as the *perversions* of this religion are concerned. It every where breathes a spirit of *holiness* and *purity*, as much as it does of peace and good will. It is not because it has originated *evil*, but because it has shown what *evil is*, its real character and shape, that this objection and allegation have been made; and are, as if we should blame and censure the *light of day*, because it revealed to our eyes *loathsome* objects which were hid from our observation by the *darkness of night!* Christianity, like its Author, is "THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD," the Sun of the Moral Universe, beaming in all the splendors and effulgence of day upon a benighted and dying world. "By the Law is the *knowledge of sin*," says Paul; and the Christian revelation aids in discovering its symptoms, as well as in furnishing remedy to heal this moral disease. Were it not for REVELATION, Sceptics and Infidels would be unable to define the character of that sin and evil, of which they so much complain, and which they charge upon our holy Religion, the very light which reveals it to their view. They boast of the light in which they walk, and attempt to extinguish and put out the "SUN OF RIGHTEOUS-

NESS," to whose beams they are indebted for it; and vainly imagine that they are walking in the light of *human* philosophy. They steal this sacred light and kindle torches with it, and then deny the Source from which it emanated! The boasted *intelligence* and *wisdom*, which form one of the great distinction of modern times from the ancient, are all connected, in their origin and progress, in some way or other, with the light which revelation has shed, and the effects which Christianity has produced in the condition of the world.—The night of Paganism will be found, we expect, to cover and hide in its darkness as much moral evil and crime, if not far more, than the day of Christianity has opened up and revealed to our view. We appeal to authentic History again, and challenge an investigation of the result.—We will close this article with an excellent appropriate extract from a sectarian author.

"The light which superficial Sceptics vaunt, as that of *nature* or philosophy, is, in a great degree, derived from the Scriptures. The arguments which they level against Christianity, have been suggested by the *light of Christianity itself.*"

EDITOR.

Divine Originality of the Gospel.

There are some people in the world who deny the Gospel's being of divine originality; and therefore make Reason and the Laws of Nature the great revealers of things, past, present, and to come. But as the New Testament is in the world, they must allow it to be the product of some cause; for it is a maxim with these philosophers, that there can be no effect without a cause.—And when they endeavour to assign a cause for the production of the New Testament, they either attribute it to the men whose names it bears, or the ingenious production of some other imagination. In short, they say that the whole work owes its origin to the inventive genius of man only.—Let us try this upon the principles of philosophy.—There can be no effect without a cause; and the effect cannot be greater than the cause that produced it. Now if the N. Testament is the product of human wisdom alone, then it has no higher source for its origin than the wisdom of man; and as it is purely human, it cannot be sustained by any higher power than human power. Now

with these premises before us, let us take up the history of the Book, and what a scene is presented! We find it opposed by the combined wisdom of Jews and Pagans. Philosophers, Kings and Senators combined stretch every imagination of their minds, and all the force of reason. They could not check—they could not stop the force of reason and good sense of the Book. Here was an effect acting above the cause! Here was human wisdom triumphing over human wisdom! Here was uncombined wisdom triumphing over the strongest combination of wisdom!—men unlearned organizing a system which throws into the shades all the wisdom and learning of the schools, and eclipses the bright scintillations of all their philosophy!—If human power gave birth to the Book, human power must sustain it. But we find it opposed by all the combined powers on earth:—Kings with their train of mighty men, arming them with instruments of destruction, gibbets and halters, sword and flame, to hunt it and its admirers from the earth. Still it lived—it triumphed! Here again was the effect greater than the cause! Here was “human” power throwing into insignificance the strongest combination of human power,—the weaker power triumphing over the stronger power! We must deny the plain principles of philosophy and reason; or admit the Book was produced and sustained by power super-human; as human wisdom and power combined could not stop its operations or effects.

JAMES C. ANDERSON.

Philosophy and Christianity.

PHILOSOPHY confines its views to this world principally. It endeavours to satisfy man with the grovelling joys of earth, till he returns to that earth from which he was taken. Christianity takes a nobler flight. Her course is directed towards immortality. Thither she conducts her votary, and never forsakes him till, having introduced him into the society of angels she fixes his residence among the spirits of the just. Philosophy can only heave a sigh after immortality. Eternity is to her an unknown vast, in which she soars on conjecture's trembling wing. Above—beneath—round—is an unfathomable void: and doubt, uncertainty, and despair, are the result of all her inquiries. Christianity, on the other hand, having furnished all necessary information concerning life, with firm and undaunted step, crosses death's narrow isthmus, and boldly launches forth into that dreadful futurity which borders on it. Her path is marked with glory.

The once dark and dreary region lightens as she approaches it and benignly smiles as she passes over it. Faith follows where she advances, till reaching the summit of the everlasting hills, an unknown scene of endless varieties, of loveliness and beauty presents itself, over which the ravishing eye wanders without a cloud to dim, or limit to obstruct its sight. In the midst of this scene, rendered luminous by the glory which covers it, the citadel—the palace, the THRONE OF GOD appears. Trees of life wave their ambrosial tops around it; rivers of salvation issue from beneath it; before it angels touch their harps of living melody, and saints breathe forth to the listening Heavens, their grateful songs. The breezes of paradise waft the symphony, and the pendent sky directs it to the earth. The redeemed of the Lord catch the distant sound. 'Tis the voice of departed friendship—friendship, the loss of which they mourned upon earth, but which they are now assured will be restored in the Heavens, from whence a voice is heard to say—“fear not; death cannot injure you; the grave cannot conquer you—through its chill mansion, grace will conduct you up to glory.”—*Dr. Eliphalett Nott.*

Progress of Christianity.

The Camp Meeting advertised on the cover of our paper to commence Friday preceding the 2nd. Lord's day in September, took place agreeably to previous appointment and arrangements. Father Wm. Hooten of Perry Co., bros. Allen and Carroll Kendrick of Madison, together with other proclaiming brethren and ourself, were present on the occasion and labored in the word. The congregations were unusually large and attentive. Much interest was manifested, and the brethren exhibited much zeal and warmth. It was indeed a season of refreshing to us;—of Christian union and the outpouring of Christian affection! *Fifteen* obeyed the Gospel in being “immersed for the remission of sins,” and *three* more who had offered themselves for baptism, were to be immersed afterwards,—making *eighteen* in all.

On the Lord's day before, (1st. in Sept.) bro A. Kendrick immersed *two* intelligent gentlemen at Paris, for the remission of sins.—A wide field is open in this country for able and intelligent proclaimers; and there is a prospect of doing much, great

good. "The harvest is ripe but the labourers are few," few indeed. Nearly all the sects are stationary and declining; and the people are in many places becoming tired of counterfeit gospels, convinced of their inefficiency, and prepared to receive the true and apostolic gospel, while in others, the people are in a state to have their minds excited on the subject of religion, and will fall into sectarianism, if an exhibition of the real gospel is not made to them. May the truth as it is in Jesus prevail every where over infidelity and antichristian error; may speculations upon the theory of religion cease and the attention of all aroused to its practice; and may that glorious period rapidly roll around when shall take place the consummation of "glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men," when "all shall see eye to eye, and hear ear to ear," when "righteousness shall cover the land as waters do the deep,"

"Till like a sea of glory
It spreads from pole to pole."

The accounts of the progress of christianity, as presented in our different papers, are cheering from every quarter. We present our readers with some of them.

EDITOR.

(From the Christian Preacher for July.)

At the protracted meeting in Dayton (Ohio) 4th. Sunday in April, eleven persons obeyed the Lord.

The Bracken meeting was numerously attended, and the disciples appeared revived. On the way to the meeting, the Editor stopped at Maysville, and introduced five previous disciples into the kingdom of the Lord Jesus. One person obeyed at Bracken.

Brother writes that he was at Lexington the second Lord's day in May, and two Baptist ladies united with the disciples. He also states that the Bethel meeting at Clermont O., which occurred fourth Lord's day in May, issued in the conversion of five persons. There were several preachers there.

At the time of the last named meeting, I visited WARSAW, Ky., the vicinity, and Ghent: was gone four or five days, and immersed twenty-two persons, who united with the congregation at Warsaw, which now amounts, perhaps, to more than one hundred and thirty members. A new church has been organized at Ghent, (eight or nine miles below,) of twenty converts. Of these brother Roberts recently immersed six or eight. The prospects are yet good for a

general harvest, where two months since, we counted not a member. What hath God wrought! On Lord's day at Warsaw, I had rather an amusing public interview with a Methodist circuit rider, which, however, issued profitably, as several immediately obeyed the Lord.

Two or three weeks since, Mr. Henry Muggerrige, for many years a minister in the regular Baptist community, and well known here for his piety, presented himself to our church in this city, after hearing an exposition of our Lord's prayer for the unity of Christians, as subservient to the conversion of the world. Monday, and Tuesday, May 30 and 31, I immersed a gentleman each day.

We are receiving encouraging accounts by every mail. EDITOR.

(From the August No. of the same.)

Brother Jacob Coons of Calloway Co. Mo., writes that "on the 4th. Lord's day in April we constituted a church on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the bottom corner stone. We have since made choice of Elders and Deacons and put them forward to their work, by imposition of hands according to the scriptures. When constituted, we numbered twenty-five, and have since increased to twenty-nine; our prospects are favorable for further increase; we expect to break bread every Lord's day."

Brother M. Cole of Ia., writes, June 28th — "On Thursday, 14th. inst. Bro. Brown and myself went to New Washington, (near Madison,) and there joined Bro. Mavity. The meeting continued that evening, next day and night; twelve confessed the Lord, who, added to four who obeyed eight or ten days before, makes 16 joyful disciples.

June 23d I left the city for 7 days, during which time I visited WARSAW, Ky. twice and MADISON, Ia. and delivered thirteen discourses. At Madison there has recently been organized, to whom five were added while I was there. They need but zeal and prudence to succeed in that flourishing town. Let these graces shine and their light cannot be hid. The Lord bless them for his name's sake. At Warsaw some eighteen or nineteen obeyed the Lord, including two of the physicians, a third having led the way three months since. May these brethren lay their abilities and influence at the feet of Jesus, as consecrated to his service. Bro. Johnson, ever active, had spent a week already in the country, and had dismembered two or three of Satan's Kingdom, and as many Sectarians at New Liberty, and was

at Warsaw to co-operate. Six buried at one of his meetings in the vicinity, and some at Ghent. Up to the time I left, thirty four had submitted in that county, making about 190 during three months—praise to the Highest! Bro. J. intends spending several days at New Liberty with brother Benj. Tiller, whom we immersed some time since in Warsaw. They hope to reap a plentiful harvest. Brother Tiller last week, left the Methodists for good, and he and bro. Almerin Stilman were ordained Elders of the Warsaw church by prayer and imposition of hands.

EDITOR.

Since writing the above the following come to hand:—

DEAR BROTHER BURNETT,—

Oh that you had been with me at New Liberty! Bro. Tiller was with me on Lord's day, and spoke finely. Many of the Warsaw brethren were there, among those Bro. Stilman, who participated in prayer in his usual sweet way. They left me alone, I had 16 to unite on my return. You know I got five on my way down. * *

J. T. JOHNSON.

I have just returned from a meeting of three days at Dayton. Bro. O'Kane and myself co-operated with the church and its officers—Bro. Jameson, Gosney, &c. Ten persons obeyed. July 27th. EDITOR.

(From the August and September Nos. of the Millennial Harbinger).

SPRINGFIELD, Green Co. Mo. May 21, 1836.

Some five weeks ago I removed from Howard county in this State, and became a resident of this little village, with my family. The day before I left Howard I taught in the meeting house near brother J. Prewitt's, when two were immersed for the remission of sins by brother Prewitt, and three more made the confession required by the gospel, and were to be immersed Lord's day following.

Last evening a gentleman rode up into our little village and inquired for me; and when he found me he informed me that he wished to have a night's chat with me. I found him an intelligent disciple, who had moved from Tennessee, near forty miles south-west of this; but not a public teacher, though he had taught his family and friends to rely upon the Bible for directions how to serve God acceptably. The consequences resulting therefrom were, that his wife and two daughters, & several neighbours, had become firm believers and reformed their lives, and he was desirous that I should go down and baptize them. JOEL E. HADEN.

CHARLESTON, Ia. May 27, 1836.

The good cause is progressing in this section of country. Brother Littell has immersed seven or eight in the neighborhood of this place. Brother Brown and myself visited New Washington last Tuesday and Wednesday. We immersed four, and two more confessed who were not immersed.

M. COLE.

ESSEX COUNTY, Va. June 2, 1836.

I have been on a tour of 17 days in Matthews, York, and James' City counties. In all I preached 12 discourses, and 10 confessed the Lord in the "good old way." I was happy in the company at York, and co-operation of Brother Dangerfield, and Father T. M. Henley. We had well attended and very happy meetings. JAS. HENSHALL.

CHITTENDEN, Grant Co. Ky. June 2, 1836.

Brother Roberts has just informed me that on his last week's tour to Gallatin and Owen counties, he immersed 24 persons, organized a church of 20 members in Ghent, Gallatin county, and set it in order; and also put out a subscription for building a meeting house, which was liberally subscribed to.

FELIX WEBB.

WEST LIBERTY, Morgan Co. Ky. May 23,

In this obscure section of our State the sceptre of King Immanuel has been held out to the people, and hundreds are bowing thereto. About four years ago brother Archibald Steward, from the county of Montgomery or Estill, I think, come to an association held in this county in 1832 or '33; and on the Lord's day, or on Monday, through much difficulty and reluctance by the Clergy, he obtained leave to speak to the people.

With no learning but that of the Scriptures—with no earthly distinction, save that of a true, legal, and faithful disciple of Jesus—amidst the murmurings, the whisperings of disapprobation, and restlessness of the called ones and their little Satellites, he succeeded in destroying the confidence of seven or eight of the Babylonish captives. They formed themselves into a congregation and commenced their march for the land of the King, guided by his banner and governed by his law.

The beauty, the order and simplicity of their movement, attracted the observation of all classes, and at the same time drew down upon them the united opposition of the different sects around them. The Demetrian cry was raised; the craft was in danger; and, as strange as it may seem, the different

craftsmen, who on other occasions could scarcely live in the same neighborhood, were seen fighting in the same ranks, endeavoring to exterminate this little band, who would not should the plaudits of their Diana—their darling creed. But fearless of consequences, with their King at their head, they moved forward, gaining recruits and confidence, until at the present time they count in this county, *four congregations* and about *three hundred* members.

DANL. P. MOSELEY.

SHELBY Co. Ky. May 30, 1836.

We number upwards of *fifty*, and occasionally have additions by confession and immersion. We have immersed *seven* in the last seven weeks.

SAMUEL ERWIN.

HANCOCK COUNTY O. May 27, 1836.

I rejoice to inform you that our little church has increased since January *nine* in number, making the whole at present *twenty five*; but the greatest consolation to myself and all who are the followers of Christ, is, that we all appear to stand firm in the faith of the gospel, and willing to contend for the same.

* * * * *

I am informed by a brother, living about 12 miles east of me in this county, that there is a congregation of disciples of Jesus Christ at Kenton, Hardin county, about 20 miles south of this place, of about 15 or 16 members, mostly new converts.

H. L. DALLY.

DUBUQUE. M. T. June 16, 1836.

Last Lord's day I immersed *two* into the name of Jesus Christ—next Lord's day I expect to immerse *two* more; we shall then have *twenty five* living stones in the building, cemented, I believe, with the charity of the gospel. * * *

J. BAUGH.

PATRIOT, Ia. July 4, 1836.

The glorious work is going on in this part of the country. Within the last two months *one hundred and seventy* have made the good confession and were immersed for the remission of sins.

EDWIN H. WILSON.

(From the Christian Messenger for August & September.)

In Tazwell Co. Ill. at Walnut Grove at a protracted meeting of 5 days, commencing Friday before the 2nd. Lord's day of July, 49 were baptized, and 10 or 12 more united with the church there, principally of the Baptist church. Since then, on the 3rd.

Lord's day, 5 more were immersed at little Mackinaw in the same bounds. The good work is still progressing. The Christians are all alive. On 3rd Lord's day were baptized in Sangamon Co. Cantrell's Creek, 3 more.

Eld. D. Warford of Vincennes writes July 21, "The good cause is progressing steadily with us. We are refreshed at seeing our neighbors occasionally confess and obey the Lord. We number about 60, the majority of whom have been immersed within two years."

In Jackson co. Missouri, I was informed that at some recent meetings, br. Maxey of Ky. and br. Duke Young of Mo. had baptized some scores of believers, and the work was progressing.

—
Extract of a letter from brother Daniel Travis.

LIBERTY, TAZEWELL CO. ILL. Aug. 23, 1836.

Dear Brother—You will learn from this letter that we held a four days meeting on Panther Creek, having commenced on the Saturday before the first Lord's day of this month. *Thirt, five* were added to the church, 20 by immersion and 15 by letter. On the Lord's day following we met brother Reynolds at Little Mackinaw—*eight* were immersed there. At the same time brothers H. D. Palmer, Js. Robertson and Abner Peeler held a four days meeting in Peeler's neighborhood. *Eight* were immersed, and a church constituted of *thirty* members.—On Mo. day evening brother Robertson, on his way home, immersed 7 more at brother Willis's on Panther Creek. There is truly a great work going on in this section. Yesterday at this place, brothers Lindsay, Robertson, and McCordle, were with us. A church of 9 members was established, and two were immersed.

—
RIGGSVILLE, August 13, 1836.

Father Stone—Business having called me into Fulton county, I was favored with the opportunity of spending last Lord's day in July with a congregation of our brethren about nine miles from Lewistown; *two* of our fellow travellers on life's weary journey made the good confession and were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus. On the following Lord's day, the first in August, I met the same congregation in company with brethren Scott and Charles Rigdon, when *nine* obeyed the Lord's command, and on the next day *five* more followed the good example, making in all *sixteen*. The Lord grant that they may prove faithful unto death,

that so they may receive a crown of life.—
* * *

J. RIGDON.

The above extracts are from only a few of our periodicals, and contain but little from some of these. We could have filled part of every no. of our paper with such accounts as these, but our own letters, want of room, of time to compile them, and other considerations, prevented us. What we have here given is but a mere sample of what we might present the reader with.

In speaking of the meeting on Roane's Creek, we omitted to mention, that we there had the pleasure of meeting with an old father in the Lord, Stephen Roach, from near Carrollville in Wayne Co. Tenn., who informed that he, with about twelve others in his neighborhood, had recently come out from among the Methodists, among whom he was a licensed exhorter. A considerable congregation has been built up in his neighborhood during the last 18 months. The gospel continues to be obeyed there; and the prospect for future additions are flattering.

At the meeting above referred to we had the pleasure of finding five young brethren, who have commenced and intend proclaiming the Gospel of Christ. Most of these are promising, and one of them possesses talents of the first order. This is really encouraging, and augurs well for the glorious cause in which we are engaged, and in which we are exhausting our energies. Oh, that the young talented brethren would add to their faith, *courage, knowledge*, &c. and boldly advocate the cause of the Lord! There is a host of such in the Reformation, who have first rate talents, but keep them *hid* and unemployed.

We here also give extracts from the following letters to us: ED. C. R.

ELLIOTT'S CROSS ROADS, Ky. Aug. 18, 1836.

I can do but little for you this year; but I am of opinion that next year, I shall be able to obtain 100 readers for you. The symptoms of an investigating spirit, are developing themselves in this part of Ky.—The sects are becoming *outrageous*. They do every thing to prevent their *vassals*, or *dupes*, from hearing for themselves, and acting as free men ought to act, and as free men will act. These things make me think I can do something for you next year. Besides, I intend to make a greater exertion

next year than this. I have this year been confined to my school room. I shall teach part of next year; the other part I shall teach *Christianity*. I would like to give you a history of the reformation in this country, but I cannot at this time. However I will at some future time. We have had a harder task here than most of the brethren have had in other places, though we are doing as well as we can. We stick near the BIBLE.

Bro:—I think the editors are not correctly informed with regard to the restoration of primitive worship and primitive order in the congregations. I believe the primitive Gospel is restored—but I very much doubt the prosperity of saying "*the primitive worship is restored*". I know that it is said that many congregations are meeting on the first day of every week. I ask if these same congregations* are not in the practice of disappointing their meetings for the accommodation of the sects, even so often as three times in a month, and sometimes for more than a month? If they are not in the habit of doing this, I am most egregiously mistaken—Understand, I am not saying they lie in this matter. No! I say not that thing. But I say they mistake primitive order and primitive worship.

ISAAC T. RENEAU.

NASHVILLE, Sept. 27th. 1836.

We have had a meeting of 3 or 4 days. * * * Bro. Fanning has returned, and bro. Giles has been with us. We have received five since the meeting commenced, and prospects are encouraging. Our congregations were large and attentive three times on Lord's day. Also, last night, when 4 confessed. We meet to night again, and to morrow night, May the Lord be praised; and his word be glorified in the salvation of our friends. J. W. DAVIS.

* This may be true in regard to several congregations; but there are numbers who will not disappoint their own meetings for any others. ED. C. R.

Sophistry of the Boston Investigator.

This infidel paper of which Abner Kneeland is the Editor, who will not, it seems, *deign* to exchange with us, abounds with sophistry, to the poor and mean resort of using which the infidels appear to be driven, in order to get along in their opposition to Christianity. We notice the following: "Let all the Christians in the United

States on a day to be appointed, go to work and *pray* for the conversion of the Infidels; and you have the word of Jesus Christ for it, that if there is *one*, single *believer*, who does so, the prayer will be answered.—John xiv. 13, 14.”

This assertion is entirely *false*; for we have not the word of our Saviour for any such thing. The scripture referred to, was addressed by Jesus to his *twelve* disciples; and to make a *general*, is to make a *misapplication* of it. It reads as follows: “And whatsoever ye [the twelve] shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye [the twelve] shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.” This promise was performed to the letter. We nowhere read of any thing which they asked after this promise, that Jesus did not perform for them. It was the age of miracles; and in this discourse from which the above extracts are taken, the miraculous aids of the Holy Spirit are promised to them.

“The Bible writers knew no more about a future state of existence than we do; and if they did, the wisest of those writers had declared that “man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they all go to one place.””

This assertion is as false as the one previously quoted. The numbers who *saw* Jesus Christ after his resurrection, and saw him ascend to heaven, *knew* that there is a future state of existence. And that he existed, died, arose, and ascended to heaven, no infidel has ever yet succeeded in disproving. The quotation made above from Solomon, has no reference whatever to the doctrine, that there is no future state of *existence*. Solomon merely asserted what every body knows, that in regard to mortality or death, man had no pre-eminence above a beast; “for *as* the one *dieth*, so *dieth* the *other*.” And as to their animal existence, “all go to one place;” to the dust from which they came. And had Mr. Kneeland suffered Solomon to have spoken on, he would have said, “*all* are of the *dust*, and *all* turn to *dust* again.” The infidels are as unfair in quoting and as unjust in applying scriptures as are the scrap and text preachers. And another quotation from Solomon immediately after the

last one just made, would have showed that he looked upon man as being something more than a mere beast, which the system of Infidelity attempts to make him out. “Who knoweth the *spirit* of man that *goeth upward*, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?”

We give these as a specimen of the sophistry of the Boston Investigator, and of the general strain of reasoning which characterises that paper. EDITOR.

CONVERTING THE HEATHEN.

James town O. 11th Aug. 1836.

BRO. HOWARD;

In running over the contents of the “Missionary Herald” of July, 1836, I could not help drawing a comparison between what was practiced in the days of the Apostles, and what is now practiced in converting the Heathens.

But to set forth the comparison in a clear light, we must place these United States in the place of Judea, and suppose that salvation is of these states, instead of the Jews. Then read thus, “It behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, that repentance and remission of sins might be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Washington City.” And then place the Missionaries, in the room of the Apostles, and read thus, “you shall be witnesses in Washington, and in all the States, and in Canada, and in the uttermost parts of the Earth.”

You will see from the above arrangement, that our first business would be to Evangelize these United States. This done, then go on till we reached the end of the world. But there appears to be more solicitude now, for the conversion of the heathen than for those among us.

But this difference is but trifling to what the next I shall notice is. I cannot tell how much money is raised annually in these States for the conversion of the heathen; but thousands and tens of thousands will not enumerate it. Whereas exactly the reverse of this took place in the days of the Apostles. Instead of collecting money in Judea for the conversion of the Gentiles, money was collected of the Gentiles and

sent to Judea. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we should reap your carnal things?" said the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, who were Gentiles. And again, "Now concerning the collection for the Saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come. And when I come whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send with you liberality unto Jerusalem, &c."

The heathen must be much poorer now, than they were then, else they would be able to support the Ministers who go among them; and if they were really christianized by them would send money back to these United States to refund every cent that has been expended for their benefit. They would be careful to owe no man any thing but love.

But from the display of collections and accounts of money exhibited in the aforesaid "Missionary Herald," one would be led to suppose that all the disciples made in those heathen countries, had to be bought with money; and that they were exceedingly poor and entirely destitute of gratitude. If I were among the disciples in those countries, I would say to the *Burmese* and *others*, You have been much benefitted by the ministration of scriptural things among you, and other churches. *Especially those of the United States have been robbed.* Therefore you ought to lay by carnal things according to your wealth, and send them back to America to be distributed among the saints;—and thereby give proof of your gratitude for the favors conferred upon you. Write letters by some of your most prominent men, and send your liberality by them to the "Missionary Society," requesting them to distribute your gifts among the saints. And if needs be I will accompany them, and assist them in explaining the object of their mission.

Would not this be a strong proof that the spirit which said "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you," had got into these heathen brethren?—or rather brethren from among the heathens?

As ever, yours,

M. WINANS.

The Character of an Evangelist examined.

"And he gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers," &c. &c.

The design for which these official characters were given, is manifestly declared in the following words;—"For the perfecting of the saints,—for the work of the ministry;—for the edifying of the body of Christ:—till we all come into the unity of the faith, unto the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man," &c.

Whenever any legate or officer is commissioned to accomplish a certain work, he is placed in a subordinate relation; and cannot, therefore, act in this capacity, after he promptly fills the requisitions of his commission. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, &c. &c. were all superior official characters, appointed in the congregation of the Lord, in order to bring about that consummate harmony, which alone could give character and success to the cause of truth. The appointment of these characters was doubtless an accomplishment of what our Saviour said, (Mark 16: 17, 18.) "And 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."

That the apostles, evangelists, &c. had power to perform such miracles as the foregoing, is a fact too well established to admit of the least lingering doubt.

Now I ask, that inasmuch as those highly-gifted individuals were constituted for the accomplishment of a certain end, viz. the consummate union of the body of Christ—which was effected at an early age indeed—how can such characters exist now a days? How can an Evangelist any more exist at this time, than an apostle, or a prophet? They were to be contemporaneous in their operations. The office of an evangelist embraces more than *teaching alone*. Philip the Evangelist, wrought '*special miracles*' among the Samaritans. Hence to "do the work of an evangelist," certainly implies more than simply instructing the people, by public discourses on the subject of Christianity.

If there should, in the estimation of any person, exist an error in the foregoing, that person will confer a special favour by making it manifest.

J. H. JOHNSON.

The arguments in the preceding communication derive countenance from the following definition of the original (Greek) *euangelistees*: "*An Evangelist*. These were ministers in the primitive church, who seem to have been assistants to the Apostles in propagating the gospel, and whom accordingly they sent from place to place, to execute such particular commissions as they thought proper to entrust them with. *occ. Acts xxi. 8. Eph. iv. 11. 2 Tim. iv. 5. comp. Acts xix. 22.*"—PARKHURST. With this agrees Schleusner and Donnegan. We have found Parkhurst to be generally correct in his primary definitions. Donnegan is now, we believe, the standard Greek Lexicon in our highest seminaries of learning. Like the writer of the foregoing, if there be error in it we would like to see it exposed.

Ed. C. R.

Biblical Criticisms.

No.

(From the (Cincinnati) Journal & Luminary.)
MINOR CRITICISMS.—Coll. iii. 16.

Brother Brainard.—Some time since, I noticed a short article in your paper, illustrating the importance of a correct punctuation in those who write for the press. The following will show how a wrong punctuation obscures the sense, and mars the beauty of a passage, from one of the sacred writers.

As commonly printed in our English Bibles, the verse reads thus: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."

According to this method of punctuating the verse, the idea conveyed to the reader is, that we are to teach, and admonish each other, not in plain prose, *wisely*, and *prudently*, as the apostle in reality intended; but, in the true spirit of those, who advocate the singing of all kinds of historical narration, doctrinal disquisitions etc. in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; while the singing "with grace in our hearts," is represented as a

totally different exercise from the singing of psalms and hymns. A little change of the pauses will render conspicuous, forcible, and beautiful too, the author's meaning — "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly: with all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another; in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Now we have three specific duties enjoined.

1. That we should be thoroughly instructed in the doctrine of Christ. A very important matter, truly.

2. That when we attempt to teach, and especially when we give admonition, it should be done "with all wisdom." Some of us have, I fear, erred in this particular. We have done, what at first sight may seem a small matter, put the *colon*, in the wrong place; so that though we have frequently given admonition, we have not done it *wisely*. Our admonitions have not been sufficiently imbued with that "wisdom which is from above."

3. That singing should *always* be an exercise of the *heart* as well as of the voice — Whatever we sing, should ever be sung in the true spirit of true devotion. K. A.

Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

The persons to whom the Apostle addressed this epistle are said to have been elected "*(en)* in sanctification (*pneumatos*) of spirit (*eis*) unto obedience (*kai*) and sprinkling the blood of Jesus Christ. God elects people *in*, not *out of*, sanctification of spirit. But it must be such a sanctification of spirit as results in obedience. You know that (*pneumatos*) spirit, in the Greek text, is without an article. There is not "*the*" there. It is of the spirit of man that the Apostle here speaks, and not the spirit of God. You are also aware that the word "sanctification" is not now used in the sense in which it is used in the Scriptures. There are many persons now who understand it to mean the transmission of a religious gas through the human system. Hence we hear them tell of feeling it to the very ends of their fingers and toes. Others understand by it the purification of our moral nature. No such ideas are found in that word as used in the Sacred Writings. *Hagios* signifies consecrated; and *hagiazō*, to consecrate. So the phrase, (*en hagiasmo*) used by Peter, means, in consecration (*pneumatos*) of spirit, and that too, with respect to the obedience of the truth.— The spirit of the persons addressed in this

letter was consecrated to obedience.—The plain import of the passage is. 'You are elected, not in religious apathy, not in a spirit bent on an irreligious course of life; but in a spirit consecrated to the observance of the commandments of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.' Their election, and consecration of spirit hath had reference to that blood which cleanses from all sin.—*Primitive Christian.*

Legitimate fruits of Two-seedism.

As all seeds produce fruits according to their nature, so the doctrine of "The Two Seeds," as usually termed, seems to have recently brought forth some *fruit* perfectly agreeing with its nature! Being lately in the neighborhood of a place, where the "Two Seed Baptists" had not long before held an Association, we were informed that a preacher at said Association did actually proclaim to his congregation, that one of the eternally and unconditionally elected (the *good seed*) might get drunk, bet, and lose his life in this situation, and he would be eternally saved! The expression was this: Two of them might visit a distillery, and on leaving it might bet, run a horse race, and the horse of one dash his brains out, and he would go "straight home to heaven!"—that God would not be cheated out of his rights for half a pint of ardent spirit!!!—This claps the climax of *profane* preaching! The gambler and the drunkard may both go to heaven without holiness, provided they are of the "good seed!"—but it will not be the Christian's heaven; for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," and "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," "neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abuses of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." Such doctrine and preaching as the above, give license to the most abominable sinning; and such preachers are "called and sent" not of God, but of the Devil, and are his ministers!

These are the people who talk so much about the operation of the Spirit, and the enmity of the carnal mind to God! It cannot be the *Holy Spirit* that operates upon such; but unfortunately it is too often the

operation of "*ardent spirits!*" And *carnal* too must be the minds of such. This doctrine and that of eternal election from which it sprung, permit the indulgence of vice, and "are very pleasing to the flesh." And yet these people profess to look upon the poor "Campbellites" with the utmost contempt!

EDITOR.

Anecdote.

A certain "Doctor of Divinity" who once taught a "Theological School" at Franklin, Tenn was while engaged in it, offered \$1000 per annum to preach at Franklin and \$1500, at Louisville, Ky. The latter was accepted, as might be expected in the case of most D. D.'s and preachers of the Doctor's caste. While teaching under this circumstance, he one day proposed a question to one of his students; What was a *common* and what a *special* call to the ministry? The student soon returned with an answer that, A *common* call was \$1000 at Franklin, and a *special* call, \$1500 at Louisville. The Doctor felt the reply, and said nothing more to the student. This same Doctor is the one who boasted some years ago, that he did, in a sermon pronounced at Frankfort, Ky. "*sweep from the arena,*" the sentiments and views expressed by Alexander Campbell in an address delivered in the chamber of the Representatives of Ky. in Novr. 1824; and that too in his presence, while A. C. was at Lexington when the Dr. spoke!

Ed. C. R.

Faith of the Gospel.

The faith of the Gospel is of the operation of God, but not in the way generally believed in our day, or in the way which seems to have been supposed for many centuries past. The operations which are contended for as pre-requisite to faith in this day, are unauthorised by Christ, and the Apostles, and have no place in the Gospel plan. The operations of the Spirit, which produced faith in the Apostolic day, were addressed to the external senses and the mind through them, and explained by words—they were supernatural, and miraculous.—*Dr. Fishback* (a Baptist.)

Immortality.

The light of life, and immortality, by its superior effulgence, casts a deep shade around the most luminous displays in nature. The bond of union which connects a worm of the dust to the throne of God, and redeems him from a state of sin, and death, to a state of purity, and immortality is one of the most glorious works of the Almighty.—18.

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME 1.]

PARIS, TENN. OCTOBER, 1836

[NUMBER 10.]

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark xvi. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS
Jude, 3.

Design of the New Testament Writings.

(From the Prefaces to the New Version.)

HINTS TO READERS.

It has been often noticed, that the grand laws of the natural world, the fundamental principles of the philosophy of nature, are few and simple; that all sciences predicated upon God's works are reducible to a few leading or general principles. The same may be said of the grandest of all systems, of the noblest of all sciences—God's own system of virtue, and his own science of happiness.

All the law and all the prophets were founded upon two general principles, according to the reasoning of the Author of the Christian religion. In the estimation of the same person, the whole Christian religion is based upon one fact. But this fact is of such an astonishing nature that it affects both heaven and earth. Its meaning is every thing that regulates, or, it is the very principle upon which is founded the moral government of the world. It affects the government of God over all men, and the cheerful and acceptable allegiance of any part of them. It is, to the moral system and to the moral empire, every thing that the Sun is to the solar system and to the globe which we inhabit. It is the centre around which all pure and gracious affections in human hearts revolve; and it is the source of light and life to a benighted and dying world. It attracts to itself every happy eye in the universe, and draws to itself every pious emotion in every human breast. The eyes of all saints, in all lands, are gladdened by its light; and the hearts of all are cheered and warmed by its vivifying power. That

the Christian religion should be based upon such a fact is every way worthy of its Author, and exhibits it, to the rational mind, as altogether glorious and divine.

When one question of fact is answered in the affirmative, the way to happiness is laid open, and all doubts on the nature of true piety and humanity are dissipated. The question is one, which the following histories alone can answer. The fact is a historic one, and this question is of the same nature. It is this—*Was Jesus the Nazarene, the Son and Apostle of God?* This question is capable of being converted into various forms such as—Are the subsequent narratives true? Did Jesus actually and literally rise from the dead after being crucified and interred? Did he ascend into heaven in the presence of his disciples? Is he constituted the Judge of the living and the dead? Or, Was he an impostor and a deceiver of men? It may be proposed in many a form; but it is still a unit, and amounts to this—*Is Jesus the Nazarene, the Son of God, the Apostle of the Father, the Saviour of men?* When this question is answered in the affirmative, our duty, our salvation, and our happiness are ascertained and determined.

Although the subsequent writings of the Apostles add an immense weight of evidence to that afforded by these histories, still the fact on which the whole system is built, is exhibited and attested in the following narratives; and from these primarily, if not exclusively, its truth and certainty must be decided.

Any hints, therefore, which may arrest the attention of the youthful reader, and direct his inquiries in a fair and impartial examination of these witnesses, appear to us of primary importance. For if these histo-

ries are not understood and believed, there is no enjoyment of the glad tidings which they announce—Philanthropy cannot exhibit itself to so much advantage on the theatre of this life, as in calling the attention, and in directing the pursuits of the young and the thoughtless, in the acquisition of what may be emphatically called *the true knowledge*.

In addition to the remarks on this subject, found in our preface to the four following narratives, we will subjoin a few important hints, derived from various sources which we cannot, at this time, enumerate. These are designed to aid the youth who are desirous of understanding the following testimonies in their minute and diligent researches into these mines of salvation.

I. *Not one of these four historians wrote with any design of improving upon the others, of detailing the things omitted by them, or of supplying any defects which he observed in their statements.*

From this it would follow, that none of these writers had any concern or thought, when writing, how his testimony would correspond with any other, or how it might be viewed as an improvement upon it. We know that this is not generally noticed, and that many "Harmonies" and "Sketches of the Life of Jesus," taken from these narratives, are founded upon the supposition that each subsequent history was written with some design to supply the defects of the preceding. But amongst the arguments which support the above position, one is chief; and, in our judgment, alone sufficient to make it manifest to all. For example—Let it be supposed that Luke or John wrote with a design to supply certain omissions in Matthew, to make some improvement upon his testimony; how will such a supposition affect the character of Matthew as an Apostle, or the Spirit by which he wrote? The *Evangelists*, Mark and Luke, on this hypothesis, appear as correctors or improvers upon an *Apostle*!! But John avows his own design in writing, and this settles the point with regard to him. Nor can it be inferred from Luke's own preface, that he had ever seen the writings of Matthew or Mark. He speaks of many attempts that had been made to write these memoirs, but there is not the least ground to imagine that he ever alludes to any of those that we now have.

The above hint is of much importance on many accounts; but we must leave it, unaccompanied with any illustration or application, to the use and appropriation of the reader.

II. *Not one of these historians relates all that he knew of Jesus, nor do they all relate*

as much as any one of them could have related concerning him. In proof of this, see John, chapter xxi. This was not their object. They do, indeed, give a fair specimen of his doctrine, and of the evidence and authority which accompanied it.

In order to explain some facts which are partially related by one more fully by another, differently by another, and not at all by some of them; it will be necessary to remember that they all omit some things to which some of them refer, and that allusions are found in one, to facts which he omits to record, but which are recorded in another. (As before said, it cannot be proved that any one of them had seen the testimony of any other at the time he wrote his own.) An instance or two must suffice. Three of the historians mention that Chorazin is addressed by the Saviour as having been the theatre on which many and stupendous miracles were wrought; such as would have converted Tyre and Sidon; and yet not one of the four witnesses so much as says that Jesus was ever there, much less exhibits one of these miracles. Again, we find allusions to a form of prayer which John taught his disciples; yet none of these writers record it. None of them tells us that John the Immerser's father was struck *deaf* as well as *dumb*; and yet the fact is alluded to and gathered from these words—"They made signs to Zacharias how he would have his son named."

In other parts of the New Testament, certain facts and occurrences in the life of Jesus are related and alluded to, which are not found in any of these narratives. Such as his being seen of five hundred brethren at one time, assembled after his resurrection: his discourses concerning his reign previous to his ascension; and even one saying of his quoted by Paul, which, with the circumstances that gave rise to it, is omitted by them all, viz. "*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*"

But some things are alluded to by one, which happen to be recorded by another. For example—John tells us that the disciple, that was known to the High Priest's family, went into the palace with Jesus, but he never tells us that Jesus was carried to Caiaphas. This the others record. Luke tells us that the women, who first visited the empty sepulchre, "*found the stone rolled away*;" but never tells us that the stone was sealed, or fixed at the entrance of the sepulchre.

This fact not only teaches us that the writers willingly omitted to record many things which they knew, as well as those which they have narrated, because unneces-

sary to the completion of their design; but that apparent incongruities in their narratives might be easily reconciled, by a knowledge of those things which either some, or all of them, found no occasion to record. This second fact exhibits the weakness of those puny critics, who reject the testimony of these witnesses because they did not record every thing which they knew, or in a way that suits their peculiar notions of what is fitting; and it also shows us how little sense there is in all that talk about "contradictions and incongruities," and the attempts made to "reconcile" them, which we so often hear.

III. *These historians do not always aim at giving the precise words of those they quote, not even of the Saviour himself, but only the full and precise sense of what was uttered or written.* This applies to their quotations of the Jewish prophets, the words of angels, and even of the Father himself.

It is true, that where they aim at giving the words of the Saviour, they do, in some respects, vary from one another. In this way, however, we may account for it; the Saviour's mother tongue was the Syro-Chaldaic, then spoken in Judea: in translating his words into Greek they sometimes differ from each other, as other translators differ, in selecting words which equally convey the same sense. And in writing to different people, they would naturally select such words as would most correctly communicate to their understanding the sense of his expressions. But as was said, they do not always aim at giving the precise words. For example; the testimony which the Father gave to Jesus at his immersion, is differently given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke:—"This is my beloved Son in whom I delight." "Thou art my beloved Son in whom I delight." "Thou art my Son, in thee I delight." In words these attestations differ; but as respects the testimony in favor of Jesus, or as respects the sense, they are the same. But these writers do not, in this instance, differ more from one another, than one of them might differ from himself. The heavenly messenger says to Cornelius—"Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." Yet Peter, in quoting these words, says—"Thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God." Many such instances may be found in these narratives, which, instead of detracting from, greatly add to, the credibility of the whole. But the use and application of these hints are beyond our limits, and left to the judicious reader.

IV. *The Saviour often delivered the*

same maxims, parables, and discourses, during his public labors, and many of his miracles were accompanied with many of the same circumstances, though exhibited in times and places far remote.

A very superficial observer must see this. In the commission which Jesus gave both to the twelve, and the seventy whom he employed during his lifetime, he authorizes and commands them to announce the same truths, to publish the same facts in every village and city, and to perform the same cures for a confirmation of the truths they declared. Indeed, it would be difficult to conceive how any public teacher, daily employed in communicating instructions on a few glorious topics, could avoid delivering the same discourses, answering the same questions, and exhibiting the same evidences, in unfolding the same kingdom; and in enforcing the same reformation on all persons, as did the Saviour, and yet avoid repeating many of the same things. This remark will solve some difficulties, which have appeared to some persons respecting fragments of the "Sermon on the Mount," & other discourses found in different narratives, and in different places of the same narrative, as well as some other imaginary difficulties of another kind.

V. A fifth hint of some consequence, is—*That the order of narration in these histories is similar to the Jewish and other ancient histories, and is not conducted according to the modern plan of historic writings; consequently not so lucid to us, who are accustomed to a greater degree of precision in affixing dates to events and transactions, as also in describing the theatres on which they happen, as histories conducted on our plan.*

We are liable to err in supposing that events following each other in close succession in the thread of narration, as immediately followed each other in time and place, in actual occurrence. But other events which appear to be immediately connected in the narrative, happened at times and places considerably remote. One would think on reading the close of Luke's testimony, that Jesus ascended to heaven the evening of the same day on which he arose from the grave, but the same historian tells us elsewhere, that he did not ascend till nearly six weeks afterwards. We shall leave these hints with the reader, and conclude with a few remarks on the whole plan of these historians.

Their plan, and its execution, are alike simple, beautiful, and supernatural. Viewing their narratives as a whole, and taking them together, they furnish a combination of evidence, sublime and majestic as the

heavens, and as irrefragable as that which assigns to the Almighty the mechanism of the universe. The shafts of the conceited, sceptic, aimed at these impregnable bulwarks of our faith, fall at his own feet, harmless as the school-boy's arrows aimed at the extinction of the sun.

With what skill, simplicity, and beauty, is the nativity of this long-expected child introduced. His birth appears, for a time, to engross the undivided attention of all the pure and high intelligences in heaven and earth. God's heavenly messengers are ever on the wing with some important errand, relative to the care, safety and management of this well-beloved Son. The eastern magi and the shepherds of Bethlehem, alike admonished from the skies, are found hastening to the cottage; alike importunate in their inquiries and equally devout in presenting their acknowledgements at the feet of this wonderful stranger. Both Herod and his nobles are troubled at the tidings of his birth, and alike apprehensive of a revolution in Judea, fatal to their ambitious expectations. The wakeful thoughts and the night visions of those honored females, the relatives and acquaintances of the favorite virgin, are all engrossed in scenes in which this high-born infant is exhibited as full of grace and truth. The prophets and prophetesses in Jerusalem and Judea, in all their interviews, think and speak of nothing else. Some oracle concerning him, or some expression from his infant lips, are the only subjects that fill their hearts, to the exclusion of all and every thing besides.

Thus they introduce him. Through all the meanderings of the seed of Abraham for forty-two generations, they trace his ancestry, to the exact accomplishment of every syllable announced to the father of the faithful, or repeated to any of his illustrious descendants. Next they present the last of Israel's prophets, who came to consummate the Jewish line, as so much engrossed in preparing his way as to neglect ordinary attention to food and raiment, the chief concern of almost all the human race. They open the heaven of all the ancient Prophets, and pour upon his head a continued stream of prophetic light illuminating, by its reflection, every step of his journey from the cradle to the cross; from the manger to the sepulchre of a rich nobleman, a senator of the commonwealth of Israel.

But here they do not stop. They narrate other attestations given of him still more illustrious. While John the Immerser, the favor of God to Israel, is loudly proclaiming, to the inhabitants of Judea and Jerusalem,

Jesus, as the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world, and putting an end to sin-offerings;—soon as Jesus emerges from the Jordan, soon as he is born of water, the voice of his Father is heard. He bows the heavens. He declares aloud from the excellent glory, "*This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight;*" and to identify the person of whom he thus spoke, the Spirit of God, as a dove cowers down, descends upon his head, and there abides until it disappears in him.

Having thus introduced him with these high recommendations, with these credentials from earth and heaven, his own deeds are permitted to speak for him. All nature then feels and owns him universal Lord. His hand is never stretched out, but its benign and benificent power is displayed and felt. His lips are ever teeming with grace and truth. Not only does the race of living men, amongst whom he is reckoned, feel and attest his omnipotence; not only do the air, the earth, and the sea lay their respective tributes at his feet; but even the dead, and the spirits of the dead, of times past and present, both good and evil, come and own him as the Lord of all. Strange assemblage of evidence! Unparalleled concurrence of things human and divine of things animate and inanimate, of things above and things beneath, of all ranks and orders of intelligences, both good and evil, of the whole universe, in confirmation of his pretensions!! Nothing like this was ever seen or thought of before. The only occurrence the least analogous to it, and that will not bear a comparison with it, which the annals of the world exhibit, was the universal assemblage of the inhabitants of the earth and air to Noah when entering the ark. Moved by Heaven, they forgot all their antipathies and their discords, and all concurred in avouching Noah as their saviour, and the founder of a new world. This is but a feeble type; yet it is the only one all history affords of this universal suffrage in acknowledging Jesus of Nazareth as God's own Son, and our only Saviour.

These sacred historians, then, had no model which they could imitate; no lesson, nor instructions in their plan from all that had gone before them. Moses himself failed to instruct them. No age, no history, no people set them an example. Their success in this cannot be attributed to any other cause, than to the supernatural qualifications which they possessed, than to the all-creating energies of that Spirit which brought all things to their remembrance, and to that unparalleled character which is the subject of their memoirs.

Touching their own character, too, it may be observed, that they exhibit themselves to be the most artless, the least accomplished, and the most faithful historians that ever wrote. They are the least indebted to human accomplishments of all writers whose works survived one century; and yet they have excelled all others in the essential attributes of a historian. Their honesty and fidelity constitute the most prominent trait which arrests the reader's attention, whether he thinks of them as men or as biographers. They seem always so completely absent to themselves and each other; so regardless of their own reputation; so entirely absorbed in their Master's praise, that they tell their own faults, and expose each other's weaknesses, without ever seeming to think, or to care what opinion the reader would form of them, or of any thing they record. They seem to have no feelings in common with other writers. They are so full of facts; so enamoured with the words and deeds of their Master, that to record these was all they aimed at, was all they deemed necessary. To conclude, in the words of Doctor Macknight: "Through the whole of their histories, they have not pronounced one encomium upon Jesus or upon any of his friends; nor thrown out one reflection upon any of his enemies; although much of both kinds might have been, and no doubt would have been done by them, had they been governed either by a spirit of imposture or enthusiasm. Christ's life is not praised by them, his death is not lamented, his friends are not commended, his enemies are not reproached; but every thing is told naked and unadorned, just as it happened, and all who read are left to judge and reflections for themselves.—So deeply are they impressed with the dignity and importance of their subject."

INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTS OF APOSTLES.

THIS book has been sometimes titled "*The Gospel of the Holy Spirit*;" because it is the only book which gives us an account of his descent and splendid operations in the confirmation of the mission of the Apostles. It has also been styled "*The Gospel of the Gentiles*;" because it is the only source of information on their calling, and fellowship with the Jews, in the blessings of the reign of Messiah the Great King. In most of the Greek copies of the New Testament it is called "*The Acts or Transactions of the Apostles*;" because it exhibits their labors in planting Christianity in the world. This

name, however, does not fully comport with the contents of the book. It is not *the Acts of the Apostles*, but *Acts of Apostles*; because only a few transactions of a few Apostles are mentioned in it. By Chrysostom, one of the Greek Fathers, it is named, "*The Book, the Demonstration of the Resurrection.*"

It does not appear that Luke designed to write what might be called an ecclesiastical history of his own times, nor an account of the labors of all the Apostles, nor even of all the labors of any one of them, during the time embraced in his narrative. If he had designed such a thing, he fell far short of it: for of the Apostles, except Peter and Paul, he says but little; and even of the last mentioned, though more minute in his history, he narrates, comparatively, but a few great transactions. Though somewhat particular in detailing his journeys by land, and voyages by sea, yet he omits several of his voyages, and is altogether silent on the incidents of his journey into Arabia. Nor does he appear to have designed to write a history of the foundation of the Christian communities in the different countries of the world in which he labored, during the thirty years embraced in his history: for he says nothing of the foundation of the first Christian community in the city of Rome, in Babylon, in Egypt, and in many other places of note alluded to in the Epistles. Nor can it be gathered from his narrative that he intended merely to relate such things as he was an eye-witness of, or a party concerned in; for he is not full in recording even these, and tells of many other things of which he was not an eye-witness. What, then, was his design?

There are two things on which he fixes the attention of his reader with more than ordinary care. The *first* of these is the opening of the Reign of Heaven amongst the Jews on Pentecost, and the wonderful displays of heavenly influences attendant on that glorious event. He narrates no more of the history of the first congregation in Jerusalem than is necessary to give a correct view of the commencement of Messiah's reign over the literal descendants of Abraham. This occupies about one-fourth of his whole narrative.

While he follows the order of the commission, beginning at Jerusalem, proceeding to Samaria, and thence to the uttermost parts of the earth, in giving a brief account of the establishment of Christianity; the *second* object, which seems pre-eminently to engross his attention, is the commencement of the reign of Messiah over the Gentiles. Hence we find the calling of the Gentiles, and all

the events connected with it more fully and circumstantially related than any thing else. Of the occurrences in Jerusalem, at the time of the meeting of the Apostles, and of the labors of Paul in all his journeys, those things are particularly told which concerned this event. These considerations suggest to us that, while Luke designed to give a brief account how the Apostles executed their commission in general in Judea and Samaria, his grand design in writing was to establish in the minds of all christians of that age, with a reference also to future times the just claims and inalienable rights of the Gentiles to be considered and treated as God's people; to become members of the Christian communities, on the same footing with the Jews. Doubtless this was his grand or chief design in writing this history. The plan he pursued was not to settle the controversy by argument, as Paul does in some of his epistles, but by recording what God had done for this people, by simply showing that he done every thing for them which he had done for the Jews, and had made no difference between Jews and Gentile under the Reign of his Son.

Admitting this to have been his chief design in writing his narrative, how suitable does it account for his minuteness in describing the conversion of Saul, and his call to preach to the Gentiles; the story of Cornelius and Peter; the debates at Jerusalem; the separating Paul and Barnabas to their mission; the decrees of the Apostles and elders; together with his frequent accounts of Paul's speeches to and interviews with the Gentiles; and of the success attendant on the labors of Paul and Barnabas among them. This view of his in writing this book also accounts for his having omitted to inform us of the travels and labors of the other Apostles, and of the congregations which they planted in different places, with many other things which could not be accounted for, upon the supposition of his intending to write a history of the acts of the Apostles, during the period from the ascension of the Messiah till Paul arrives a prisoner at Rome.

It is nevertheless true, that in accomplishing his design he is obliged to give us a very general and comprehensive view of the introduction of christianity throughout the whole world. So that still his history is, in a certain sense, an ecclesiastic one, the oldest and most authentic in the world. As the four preceding histories constitute rather memoirs than biography, so this is rather a mere sketch of what happened during the labors of the Apostles, than a history of the transactions of any one of them.

Of the New Testament historians Luke is

the most eminent. He gives us one continued history from the commencement of the Christian era down to A. D. 63 or 64. He records in his testimony concerning Jesus, and in his Acts of Apostles, all the grand and important events and transactions connected with the establishment of the Christian religion in Asia, Africa and Europe.— This book is the grand link which connects the previous histories with the apostolic epistles, and constitutes a key to the right interpretation of them, without which they would have been, in a great measure, unintelligible. An accurate acquaintance with the history of the people which composed most of the congregations to which the Apostles addressed letters, with the time and circumstances of their conversion, and with their customs and questions found in this book, greatly facilitates our proficiency in the knowledge of those letters, which explain the meaning and bearings of that one glorious fact, on which the Christian superstructure is reared.

From it alone we learn by what means that great moral and religious revolution was accomplished, which eventuated in the destruction of polytheism and idolatry in the best portions of the world; which desolated so many Pagan temples and caused millions of altars to moulder down to dust, notwithstanding the wisdom and learning of philosophers, the sword of the civil magistrate, and the superstition of the common people, were allied in maintaining them, and in suppressing this "wicked and odious heresy," as the Romans called it.

From it we also learn what true Christianity is, and how far the modern exhibitions of it have degenerated from the ancient and apostolic order of things; we discover what was the spirit and temper of the first Christians, and the character and design of their religious meetings. In a word, as Dr. Adam Clark observes, "in the book of Acts we see how the church of Christ was formed and settled. The Apostles simply proclaim the truth of God relative to the passion, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ; and God accompanies their testimony with the demonstration of the Spirit. What was the consequence? Thousands acknowledge the truth, embrace christianity, and openly profess it at the most imminent risk of their lives. The change is not a change of merely one religious sentiment or mode of worship for another, but a change of tempers, passions, prospects, and moral conduct. All before was earthly, or animal, or devilish, or all these together: but now all is holy, spiritual, and divine—the heavenly influence be-

comes extended, and nations are born unto God. And how was all this brought about? Not by might nor power; not by the sword, nor by secular authority; not through worldly motives and prospects; nor by pious frauds or cunning craftiness; not by the force of persuasive eloquence; in a word, by nothing but the sole influence of truth itself, attested to the heart by the power of the Holy Spirit. Wherever religious frauds and secular influence have been used to found or support a church, professing itself to be *Christian*, there, we may rest assured, is the fullest evidence that that church is wholly *antichristian*: and where such a church, possessing *secular* power, has endeavored to support itself by *persecution*, and persecution unto privation of *goods*, of *liberty*, and of *life*, it not only shows itself to be *antichristian*, but also *diabolic*. The religion of Christ stands in no need either of human cunning or power. It is the religion of God, and is to be propagated by *his* power: this the book of the Acts fully shows; and in it we find the true model, after which every church should be builded. As far as any church can show that it has followed this model, so far it is holy and apostolic. And when *all* churches or congregations of people, professing christianity, shall be founded and regulated according to the *doctrine* and *discipline* laid down in the book of the Acts of Apostles, then the *aggregate body* may be justly called "*The Holy, Apostolic, and Catholic Church*."

"You different sects, who all declare,
Lo! CHRIST is here, and CHRIST is there,
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the Christians live."

Charge of denying the operation of the Holy Spirit refuted.

The false charges brought against the advocates of this Reformation are perhaps as numerous and as groundless as those which were brought against the Saviour and his apostles and disciples by the Priests, Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees of ancient Judea. Jesus and his apostles condemned them for their false, traditionary, and unauthorised doctrines and worship and their impure and unholy lives; and the guilty in turn condemned the innocent. So it is now, and so fares those who condemn our modern Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, with the testimony of Jesus and the Holy Twelve.

No charge brought against us is perhaps more common and more untrue than that of denying the operation of the Holy Spirit. If those who thus accuse us would say that it is *their views* of the operation of the Holy Spirit which we deny, they might come nearer the truth. They have formed certain views or opinions about the manner in which the Spirit operates which they have exalted into his supposed operations; and to deny these is with them to deny his operation, let us be as scriptural, consistent and rational as we may be!

No point of doctrine is perhaps more plainly taught in the New Testament than the influence or operation of the Holy Spirit, and that too upon the *heart* of man. It is necessary to every alien or sinner in becoming a christian, and to every christian in living as such. Our Lord told Nicodemus that except a man "be born again," "be born of water and the Spirit," he could not enter into his kingdom here. It is impossible for a man to be "born of the Spirit," without having been under the influence or operation of the Spirit. Paul told the Romans that Christians "have the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us," and the Galatians, "because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father," and the Romans, "the Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are born of God;" all of which would have been impossible without the operation or influence of the Holy Spirit. The same Apostle tells the Galatian christians; "The works of the FLESH are manifest; which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, DRUNKENNESS, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which *do such things* shall NOT inherit the kingdom of God." These he has introduced and enumerated in order to contrast them with the fruits of the Spirit, for he immediately adds; "but the FRUIT of the SPIRIT is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, TEMPERANCE: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have CRUCIFIED the FLESH with the affec-

tions and lusts" He adds a few verses further on, which, with the preceding, deserve the attention of all "professing Christians" who are so fondly indulging in the vain but groundless confidence of having secured their eternal salvation, and indulging in sloth are dreaming of a heaven which is promised to only those who "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling,"—he adds; "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: *whatsoever* a man *soweth*, **THAT** shall he **REAP**. For he that soweth to his *flesh*, shall of the flesh reap **CORRUPTION**: but he that soweth to the *Spirit*, shall of the Spirit reap **LIFE EVERLASTING**. And let us not be weary in **WELL-DOING**: for in due season we *shall* **REAP**, *if we faint not*."

We see how very important it is for us to know whether we have been or are operated upon by the Holy Spirit or not. As we are charged to "be not deceived," we *may be deceived*; and a mistake here may involve our eternal destiny! Can we not know? There must be some infallible criterion. Are *feelings* that criterion, and the evidence by which we are to judge ourselves? But we may be deceived by them, as every one's experience can testify; and they therefore are a fallible criterion, and will not do. Besides, this would not be having *one*, but many criterions, as many as there would be individuals, as each one's feelings would be his own standard; and would destroy any common or general criterion which could be applied to all. We fear, we awfully fear, that hundreds of thousands have been and are now deceived; and imagine themselves to be under the influence of the Holy Spirit when it is nothing but imagination or feeling!—There is a sure, unerring, infallible criterion, and that is—"THE WORD OF GOD." We cannot be deceived in the operation or influence which accords with this, while we may with regard to any other.

All who admit the divine authenticity of the holy scriptures, are compelled to admit that the men who wrote them were, in writing them, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and that they are, therefore, the voice of the Spirit, the words of inspiration. This being the case then, it follows as a matter of course and which can no more be denied than the fact itself of their being written

under the influence of inspiration, that the operation of the word of God is the operation of the Holy Spirit;—and that when and where that word operates, then and there the Holy Spirit operates. And with this do the scriptures every where agree. "The sword of the Spirit," says Paul, "is the word of God;" and as such it can effect every thing which the Spirit abstractedly or without it, can do. "The word of God," says the same Apostle, "is quick [living] and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Could the Spirit *abstractedly* do more than this? It is said of Peter and the other Apostles on Pentecost; "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, *as the Spirit gave them utterance*." Peter thus under the influence of the Holy Spirit, delivers a discourse to the assembled Jews. It is said of that discourse; "now when they *heard* this, they were *pricked* in [*cut to*] their heart." Can it be denied that they were cut to the heart by the Holy Spirit? And did he not do it by the words which were spoken by Peter? There was no word operating without the Spirit, nor Spirit without the word here. It was the operation of the Holy Spirit by the word. They were *cut to the heart*.—We have just seen from a quotation from Paul that the word of God "*discerns* the thoughts and intents of the heart." But the Holy Spirit is said to *speak*, which he must have done by words. "The Holy Spirit *saieth*, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Thus *saieth* the Holy Spirit," says Agabus to Paul, "So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle," &c. "Now the Spirit *speaketh expressly*," says Paul to Timothy, "that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils," &c.—Here then is a sure and infallible criterion. When we are operated upon by the word of God, we know whether we are operated upon by the Holy Spirit or not, which we are ignorant of on any other hypothesis.

To deny then the operation of the Holy Spirit by the word, to deny that when the

word operates the Spirit operates, is to deny the operation of the Spirit. We have shown from incontrovertible and conclusive evidence, that the Holy Spirit operates by the word of God; and it cannot be proven from any part of the Scriptures that he operates abstractedly or without. And if it is sinning against the Holy Spirit to deny that he performed the miracles wrought by him, is it not sinning against him as much to deny his operation by the word of God? We hear sectarian preachers sometimes praying for the Spirit to accompany the word and impress it upon the hearts of their hearers, as though the word was an abstract thing from the Spirit and not always attended by it! Now all must admit that the Spirit of God is *omnipresent*, always and every where present. This being the case, there cannot be any such thing as abstract word; for let the word go or be where it may, there the Spirit is with it. There cannot be any such thing as the operation of abstract Spirit or abstract word. God has made his word indivisible and inseparable from his Spirit; and "what God has joined together let not man put asunder." To pray as above is not only unauthorised by apostolic precept or precedent, but is virtually denying the sufficiency of the word and the operation of the Holy Spirit! No really enlightened christian ever prayed, or ever can pray, such a prayer.

God always uses *means* in his creations and operations. "The Spirit moved upon the face of the waters," and all the beauties and varieties of creation came to view. But it was not done by his Spirit alone or abstractedly. "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water." "The worlds were framed by the word of God." As they were created by that word, so are they upheld and sustained. He who created them "upholds all things by the word of his power;" and "the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgement and perdition of ungodly men. As it is in the old or material creation, so it is in the new or spiritual. It is by the word of God that this creation is effected, and by his word upheld and sustained. "If any man have not the Spirit

of Christ, [the Holy Spirit,] he is none of his;" and "Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." Christ must dwell in us by his Spirit, and how does he do it? Paul prays for the Ephesians, that God would grant them "to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;" "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith;" and as he says that faith comes by the word, he very consistently tells the Colossians, "let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." In accordance with all this, we hear our Saviour telling his Apostles, "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you." And John says in his epistle, "ye are strong, the word of God abides in you." It is as impossible for the human heart to produce the fruits of the Spirit, which we referred to above, without having previously received the word into it, as it is for the best soil to produce wheat before the grain has been deposited in it. Our Saviour has sufficiently illustrated this by the parable of the sower. And in accordance with the Saviour, Paul represents the word as producing fruit. "We give thanks unto God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," says he in his epistle to the Colossian Christians, "praying always for you, since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints; for the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel: which [word] is come unto you as it is unto all the world; and bringeth forth fruit as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth." And in perfect accordance with all this, Peter says that we are "born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever." Thus the word of God received into the heart produces the fruit of the Holy Spirit; and thus we are born of the Holy Spirit by the word of God.

EDITOR.

The Church of Christ is no Sect.

This is the title of a discourse delivered in Boston, Mass. on 17th July, by bro. Tolbert Fanning of Nashville, Tenn. The

Biblical learning and research exhibited in this production are really creditable to the talents of the young and highly promising author. He has not only shown the real import of the term *sect*, and what it takes to constitute a sect, but he has ably met and refuted the charge brought against us of being a *sect*, and, as the intelligent reader will see, entirely cleared us of it. The remainder of the discourse, containing the remedy for sects and only foundation of Christian union, we design presenting the reader with in our next. EDITOR C. R.

No community that builds upon original principles can be a *sect*. That is, no people, while they take the first and highest authority, can be partizans. The Mohame-dans, on the Alcoran, are not a sect, but when they separate on different opinions, making their peculiarities the basis of their distinction; then, and not till then, are they sectarian, and consequently, so far, opposed to the original constitution. The Jews were no sect, so long as they adhered strictly to the law of Moses. It is thought, by the learned, that sects were not known among them, till the time of the Ptolemies. So long as the ancients obeyed the law, they were honorably styled, "the people of God;" but when, upon their *opinions* and *traditions*, they made void the law of God, they were called *sects*, and not before. So the analogy might be kept up with regard to the Bible and Christianity.

The very name of the Pharisees, from the Hebrew *Pharosh*, separated, signifies nearly the same as *haireisis* in Greek, or sect in English. Mark, they were not Pharisees, by the law of Moses; but a departure from it and an open violation of it were indispensable to constitute them Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Scribes, Lawyers, Samaritans, Herodians, Gallileans, Zealots, and the Sicarii.

But that the Church of Christ is one and indivisible, requires not more proof, and as terms *rent* and *division* are intimately connected with sect, they also demand some attention.

The terms schism, (*schisma*.) rent, division, and dissension, all convey pretty nearly the same idea, but none of them denote a body independent of itself. These all differ from sect or heresy, only in this particular; rent, schism, &c. denote the act of breaking off; but heresy or sect, is used to designate the state of the separated. But whether the separation be great or small, ill it is a schism that merges, at once, in-

to a heresy. So when one of these is proved wrong, all must be so.

The apostle says, (1 Cor. i. 10,) "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." Again he asserts. (xii. 25,) "There should be no schism in the body," but that the members should "have the same care one for another."

Nothing is more obvious, from these passages, than that divisions or schisms are derogatory to Christianity.

But let those who obstinately contend for divisions among Christians, look at the language of inspiration, where they are stamped with the blackest catalogue. (Rom. xvi. 16, 17,) "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who cause divisions," (*dichostacius*) or parties, "contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and avoid them." First, he says, "mark them." Why? Because they corrupt men, and dishonor God. Secondly, "it is opposed to the teaching of Christ, and therefore should be avoided as the most flagrant infidelity. Thirdly, those who cause divisions are also to be "avoided," as ungodly men, turning the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ into lasciviousness, and serving the creature more than the Creator."

Hymenius and Philetus were party makers: the consequence was, they "overthrew the faith of some," and for this were given over to Satan. Cerinthus was the "great heresiarch," because he made a great party, and this was his and their destruction.

Not only the makers of divisions are wicked men, but also the misguided made, are among the "carnal" of the earth, (1 Cor. iii. 3.) "For whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are you not carnal, and walk as men?"

But the word *dichostacias* is used again, (Gal. v. 20,) and called *seditions*. Then if sedition is contrary to Christianity, so must division be, for they denote precisely the same thing.

Jesus, knowing well the aptitude of our race to follow each other, and admire themselves, forewarned the disciples of the great danger of taking men for their leaders. "Be not called Rabbi," said our Teacher; "for one is your Master, even Christ, and all you are brethren," (Matt. xxiii. 8.) Again, he says, (ver. 10.) "Be not called leaders, (*kath'egetai*) for one only is your leader—the Christ."

But this, unfortunately for us, is an age in which men glory in being called *leaders*, and the majority glory in being led; though anciently it was a most criminal practice. But to pursue the investigation of terms a

little further. In scripture, schism is once metonymically used, to signify the rankest heresy. It is said, (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19,) "For, first of all, when you come together in the church, I hear that there are schisms (*chisma*) among you; and I (though reluctantly) partly believe it. For there must be also heresies." (*haireisis*) or sects, "among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you." Thus it is proof irreversible, that schisms, divisions, and heresies, are used in about the same, but no good sense.

That schisms and heresies are contrary to revelation requires no argument. The whole Christian world look upon these as digressions from Christianity. But if *heresy* be repugnant to the word of God, so must *sect* or *party* be, for in every instance they mean the same thing.

In the Greek Testament, there is but one word for *heresy* and *sect*, that is, the noun *haireisis*, which means, a choosing. This is from the verb *haireo*, to choose. How admirably is the meaning of the word suited to the parties of the age! There is a peculiar fondness for choosing our own course, and acting as we please, in all matters, in religion; though, in other governments and pursuits of life, strict regard must be had to law and the prescribed rules of action. It is thought charitable to say, if you are not pleased with one religion, select another—there are a plenty to suit the tastes of all the world. But if there are not enough, *modify, change, and make a system* to suit the emergencies of the times, is the motto of the day. Though sects all contradict each other, and act as opposite as the poles, yet all are going to heaven, and, go any way you please, on this plan you can scarcely miss heaven. But, it is asked, are we not permitted to select any religion we please? This is the meaning of heresy, or sect & of course we must bow to the shrine of this goddess, while we are determined to conform to the prejudices of the age; but, in view of revelation, the reverse is true—for there is but one straight and narrow path to immortality.

But is it urged still, that Christianity is so liberal a system, that we can take any sentiments, so we do not wound our own conscience, and contradict what we think is the *spirit* of the gospel? Men should act conscientiously, but a misguided conscience has been the destruction of millions; and now it is an intrenchment against examination and obedience, and a deep ditch, for a large portion of the iniquities of the times.

Moreover, there is no spirit of the law con-

trary to what is written, and in this Christ is too absolute to permit mankind to follow their vile passions with impunity. The words are, emphatically, "believe, obey, and be saved, or disbelieve, and be damned."

When we act according to our choosing and inclination, and not the exact oracles of God, we are neglecting to yield to divine authority, and, so far, are heretical. But in the party, orthodox, and popular religions of this generation, *ab ovo usque ad mala*, every thing a man chooses to be right, has the sanction of the multitude; and as this is the precise idea of heresy, ours should be recorded, in the history of time, as the *heretical age*.

The Romanist idea of heresy is expressed in the asseveration, that all who dissent from them are heretics, and the Protestant world generally harmonize in the same definition, but apply it to each party; yet the scriptural idea is, every party, according to our own caprices, and, of course, not agreeable to the word of God.

But to show our translators, and all biblical critics, understood heresy and sect to mean the same, and nothing good, reference must be made to the places where it occurs in the original.

In scripture we have an account of the sect (*haireisis*) of the Sadducees, (Acts v. 17,) also, the sect (*haireisis*) of the Pharisees, (Acts xv. 5,) which was 'the orthodox party in the days of the Savior. Of this strictest sect (*haireisis*) was Paul a member, (Acts xxvi. 5.)

It is asked, if these heresies were ever right in the eyes of Heaven? Heresy was never right. It has before been proved these sects were no part of the Jews' religion when first established, and that they were only modern inventions in the time of the Savior. But says Jehovah, "my people are guilty of two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewn out to themselves broken cisterns which can hold no water." So declared the Messiah to these heretics.

"In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Yes, full well you reject the commandments of God, and make yourselves sects, by keeping your own traditions. This clinging to the commandments of men, instead of the institutions of God, made them heresies. The same makes sects now, and nothing short of rebellion can make a partisan. I am well aware, that, with most persons, sectarian has nothing in it opprobrious, but a heretic is a being detested by all. But with such, the meaning of the words is not known to

be the same, in spite of criticism. A factionist, probably, is more detestable than either, but in a scriptural and classical acceptance it is no arduous matter to prove they designate the same person.

Inspiration says, (Titus iii. 10, 11,) "A man that is a heretic, (*hæreticon*.) after the first and second admonition, reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." This is the only time the word occurs, and it cannot refer to erroneous opinions, but to leaders of parties, or factionists. Then a factionist, partisan, heretic, and sectarist, all pointing out the identical subversion, should be rejected by the whole Christian world.

But, so far, the term sect has been examined in connection with others of the same family. Now, the mind being prepared for a further advance, we will resolve the whole argument into one single proposition, viz: Is the term sect ever used, appropriately, to denote any but rebels? True, the ancient Christians, by the bitterest reproach, were called a sect, or heresy, but never, since the world began, did any one inspired, or who believed in the inspiration of the New Testament, denominate, properly, the disciples of Christ, *partisans*, *heretics*, or *sectarists*, in any sense.

Tertullus, an impertinent, though eloquent infidel, said to Felix the governor, (Acts xxiv. 5.) "We have found this man a mover of sedition among the Jews, and a ring-leader of the sect (*haireseos*) of the Nazarenes."

Doubtless, the good-natured of this and former ages would have submitted to the intolerable accusation, without a murmur; and many others that see better would have said, as they do now, viz: "Partyism is wrong, but the world will call us something; therefore let us confess ourselves a *sect*, and crowd along (to ruin) with the multitude." But the Jewish senate requested Paul's mind on the subject, (Acts xxviii. 22,) by saying, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, (*hairesis*.) we know that every where it is spoken against." See this venerable and magnanimous man, at the motion of Felix, step forward to answer the charge. Oh, how many would have equivocated at so important a crisis! But Paul resolved, live or die, to declare the truth, and with scorn and a manly and Christian dignity, throw the charge of lying upon his reckless adversaries. Therefore, after expressing his gratitude for being honored with a reply, he said calmly, though positively, "he had moved none to seditious practices;" but now he comes to

the point upon which he would hang his existence, by asserting, (verse 13, 14,) "Neither can they prove the things whereof they accuse me." Of what had they accused him? They had maliciously slandered him with belonging to a "sect of Nazarenes." "But," said Paul, "this I confess unto thee, that after the way they call a sect; (*hairesis*.) so worship I the God of my fathers." This was the heresy of believing God, and hoping for immortality through his Son.

This seems to be enough to conclude the argument; but if ever there was the fairest opportunity for a disciple of Christ to confess himself a member or leader of a sect, this was evidently the time. But Paul denied it, when he knew not but he would lose his life for the declaration.

It would appear enough to prove heresy and sect are from the same original word, and their application to be an unchristian one, for all to conclude we must abandon sects; but fearing some are hard of belief, I will pursue it through every place in the New Testament.

In the long and dark catalogue of crimes, styled the works of the flesh, (Gal. v. 20,) sects or heresies are put at the very bottom of the sediment of sinful practices. If, then, "witchcraft," "seditions," "variance," "envy," "strife," "drunkenness," or "murder" be a crime, so is "sectarianism."

But read the last place where the word is found in the Christian scriptures, (2 Pet. ii. 1.) "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable—*heresis*—or sects, "even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Oh! who could read such a warning, and still be willing to remain a partisan? Can these monsters be innocents of the greatest utility, when inspiration denounces them damnable? Surely not. As before premised, heresy or sectarianism consists not in opinions, however erroneous, but in segments and parties. A man may, for aught I know, have many erroneous views of religion, and still belong to the church of Christ. Heretics are men that make factions, and such are to be invariably rejected after the first and second admonitions. Now, as far as criticisms on the terms are necessary, we are through the subject, but as to the pernicious influence of parties, either in the primitive or modern age, we have not said a word.—This is a topic of exhaustless and sorrowful resources. But one objection answered, and one more argument offered, and the matter of sects being opposed to Christianity, must be beyond controversy in all time to come.

It is frequently supposed to be triumphantly asked, if there were not sects in the days of the apostles? Ergo, there should be parties now. This position is true, but the sorollary is far from truth. But there were many other crimes then in the world, and even thousands of years before that time; but, thanks to Heaven, venerable antiquity cannot convert enormous vices into useful virtues.

There were, at that time, not only many other evils in the world, but also some of the greatest extravagances among Christians, such as theft, drunkenness, lying, &c. But the unchangeable government of the King has not let hoary time change these into Christian graces. Then proving parties were among the primitive Christians, as curses, is no argument they should now exist. In that early age, some were for Paul, Appollos, and Peter, and, also, some who saw better, were for Christ as the only leader. But the apostle presents the triumphant and all-conquering argument first, by asking "If Christ were divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized into the name of Paul?" Every intelligent Christian knew then that Christ was not split up into branches and factions, as we would want to have him now. Therefore, it was an *argumentum ad judicium*, simple, it is true, but struck them as dumb as the grave. If Christ or his church had ever been divided, so might his people have been then, and so might they be now.

If Paul had been crucified for them, or they had been baptized into the name of Paul, then, and not till then, could they, legally, have acknowledged Paul as leader. But this God-fearing man had the offer once before to assume to be a leader, but this honor he always awarded to his Master, "because he had respect to the recompense of reward." It is also urged as an argument, that those for Christ alone were equally culpable with those who were for Paul, Peter, &c. This cannot be; and the idea certainly originates in a non-acquaintance with the word of God. For it is through the name of Christ we obtain salvation, and overcome the world. Neither does the apostle say they are all guilty, nor can it be inferred from the language. In the first chapter he says, "some are for Paul, Cephas and Christ," yet calls none of them carnal; but, in the third chapter, he asks, emphatically, "While some of you saith, I am for Paul, and another, I am for Appollos, (but none for Christ.) are you not carnal, and walk as men?" Those who were for Paul and Appollos were carnal, but those only for Christ were the true servants

of the living God. But the apostle puts the matter beyond the shade of a doubt or dispute, by exhorting the saints to "let no man glory in men," such as Paul and Appollos, "but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." We honor God by rejecting in him, that is, in being Christians, but dishonor him by being any thing besides — Strangely wicked must the world be, when there is no difference in glorying in being a member of Christ's church, or a follower of some man. To be a Christian is the highest style of man, but to be a partisan is dishonoring to God and man. But can it be contended, farther, that those who plead for the Bible and Church of Christ alone are as much sectarian as those who belong to a party? If it were shown that those who now plead for the Bible alone were a sect, still the question is not touched, for it is already demonstrated that the ancient Christians were no party. But there is no sect now in existence, that pleads for and is governed by the *Scriptures alone*. I challenge investigation on this point. Christians should not shrink from duty, for fear of being sectarian; for the apostle has said "it is good to be zealously affected in a good thing." Christianity is the best cause in the universe, and it is the noblest conduct of man to be scrupulously engaged in the advocacy of its heavenly principles.

There is not a stronger evidence on earth of the degraded condition of the moral world, than to make no difference between the pleadings for pure Christianity and original measures, and the advocacy of sects and modern principles. Now heresy is not apt, yes, more so, to be appended to persons who worship God in the ancient manner, than to the vilest faction in the land. This cannot always be.

Christianity is the religion of the Bible. Heresy is the religion of a corrupt heart, that is made by "the doctrines and commandments of men."

Christians are made by submission to God, as directed in the Bible,—sectarian's, of every grade, are made by creeds, and an open violation of the word of God.

Who are sects?—now is the great inquiry. I accuse no party. They all stand forth in the light of open day. If the interrogatory were reversed, where can we not find sects?—it would be much more applicable to the times. All parties, from the Romanists down to the youngest and most feeble daughter of "abominations," not only confess themselves sects and parties, but these are the chief glory of all their votaries. It is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, for a partisan to say, I belong to a

sect that originated with Luther, Calvin, Wesley, or some other more modern leader, & in it I wish to live and die. This is the inviolable conduct where ignorance predominates, and the word of God is trampled under foot. It is obvious there are thousands who glory in a party which differs *totò cælo* from the ancient church, where there is one rejoices in being a Christian. A disciple of Christ is now far from orthodoxy; and to live by the Bible alone, pleading it as the only correct course, is the quintessence of uncharitableness. These things ought not to be.

Creation is now thickly spread over with parties assuming to be related to Christ,—so much so, as to be admitted “branches of his Church,” not considering that the branches of the “true vine” are not *sects*, but *persons*, as Jesus himself declared, (John xv. 1.) and all those wild and noxious plants sown by an enemy, are too exotic to grow in the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts.

The Pope of Rome stands at the head of factions and sects in religion. The church of Rome is certainly the mistress of parties, and the fostering mother from whom sprang the most, if not all, the sects, of this age.

“The man of sin” is universal lord of parties, sitting in the temple of Jehovah, and feigning himself a god, by legislating for the people of the Most High. He has changed laws and customs, and, by his sole authority, changes strange and unnatural, are going on annually, among the ecclesiastical establishments of modern times.

But him and all his accomplices “will the Lord consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming.” The merchants of sectarian confusion will weep over their miseries, when it will be forever too late.

But the stage of the argument and lamentable situation of the world require us to take a bird’s eye view of society in our own times. In doing this, sorrow must fill our hearts, while looking upon our age, and misguided countrymen. Notwithstanding the superabundant scientific advancements, with religious knowledge and privileges, that raise us above our ancestors, till we can stand as if on a lofty mountain, and with microscopic eyes, at one glance, look back to the birth of Christianity, and mark the thousands of derelictions from truth; yet, in many respects, our lines have not fallen to us in pleasant places. We have been born far in the city of confusion, and nurtured on the bosom of the parties that rule the world. Therefore, to see the darkness of our own times, in a day, seems to me impossible.—We look back with terror on the thick clouds

that hung over former ages, but in centuries yet unborn, ours may be pointed to as the most remarkable era, for eccentricities and aberrations from truth, in the annals of time. It may be, the next generation, in pointing to the most distinguished enormity of this age, will direct universal attention to the prevailing maxim, throughout the whole sectarian ranks, which are antipodes to each other, and to Christianity, viz. *“all parties, though as opposite as the zenith and nadir, are right, and in the straight and narrow path to immortality.”* The like was never known before, and, it is earnestly hoped, will never be witnessed again. But to see society as it is, we must endeavor to disconnect ourselves from the age, and, as discriminating spectators on some distant planet, look with a steady and unflinching eye to the main-spring and all the inward workings of the mighty system that has brought us forth, and borne us down the stream to the present hour.

The inhabitants of these times are not so culpable for what they are, as, in all probability, for what posterity will be. We have been made, to a great extent, by the circumstances that surround us. “The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” Before we are able to tell our right hand from our left, some sectarian mantle is thrown over our eyes, through which but few ever see. The world cannot be accused of dishonesty in this matter. No, I look upon all as sincere in religion. Yes, Jews, Pagans, Mohammedans, Romanists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists would suffer, and, no doubt, die, for their cause. But suffering, and even martyrdom, prove neither correctness of sentiment, or practice, or approbation in the eyes of Heaven. Men have been, and are now, as sincere believers in error as truth. Moreover, no one can dispute the piety of some, in all parties. But this does not prove that the modern and corrupt systems of religion are the ancient and true one established by the Messiah, no more than it proves monarchy a correct system, because one of liberal views happens to be brought up under it.

There may be monarchists under republican governments, as well as republicans under monarchical systems; but these are only exceptions, that prove not correctness in either system. I would not hesitate to say, there are many sincere and devoted persons under sectarian governments, as well as some evil and ungodly sectarists, that profess to take the Bible alone in religion; but these are exceptions, as the former, which prove nothing that is not couch-

ed in the proposition. But this will not excuse a good man for remaining in a party, while the warning voice of inspiration is, "come out of her, my people." In our excursions after truth, let us brace our nerves, and endeavor to look minutely at the situation of our own country. Matters of fact are all we dare touch on this delicate string. We are surrounded with sects of great respectability and influence, such as Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, &c. &c. about which I would not utter a reproachful word.

But these all must own to have sprung from the hot-beds of Catholicism; and I ask if the branches can be good where the tree is so corrupt?

The fact of these, and many others spring from this aged mother, is obvious to all the intelligent, and, more still, the place, time and circumstances of their origin, are all matters of record. They have taken their articles of faith, and the bulk of their government, from the Romanists. The Athanasian creed is the foundation of every Protestant one in Christendom, and they all bear its exact image. But is the Roman church the one that was founded at Jerusalem, on Pentecost, & governed by the oracles of God? I positively assert it is not. Can, then, the broken off branches of that church be the components of Christ's spiritual body? I leave it to the wise to Judge.

But what have these examples of orthodoxy done in less than two hundred years, and what are they doing for us now? In that time there have sprung from the prolific soil of Presbyterianism some eight or ten conflicting sects, and every factionists that is born among them, and has influence sufficient, takes off a branch and raises a new party, hostile to all others.—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 the Baptists, who not only took their articles of faith from the Presbyterians, but also owe their origin mainly, to that party? In less time than the former, the Baptist sect has split and divided in some twelve or fifteen parties, that neither commune with, or have any sympathy for each other.

The methodists, though, have done more than either. In less than a hundred years they have succeeded in manufacturing and turning out upon the world, according to the best computation, nine distinct sects.

These are some of the inglorious triumphs of faction in our world. But seeing what has been done for us in so short a time, imagination's utmost stretch must fail in

counting the number into which these fruitful parties will multiply, in a hundred years to come, unless this tide of desperate events is stayed, or turned from its onward course immediately. But partyism is doing more than turning brother against brother, and man against his fellow. It is the master argument in converting the world to infidelity. I do not say, that sectarianism is infidelity, by any means, but I do assert, in the fear of Almighty God, and in face of all the world, that I believe it is a source of making more infidels than every other cause in the land. The prayer of Jesus was, that "all who should believe on him through the apostles' word might be one, that the world should believe the Father had sent the Son." Those who profess to believe are not one, neither can they be, while there are different sects. The consequence is, the world is not converted, neither indeed can be under this state of affairs. Our own youth are stumbling over parties into the yawning vortex of scepticism. I am sorry to say it, but it is *examine*, I give utterance to my feelings, in declaring the rising generation in the United States seem to be sick of the Christianity of sects, and many of them are strongly predisposed to prefer to this Babel open infidelity. How can we read the reports of our missionaries without weeping almost tears of blood, at the complaint of heathens, in reproaching us to our face, and as with scorn turning the torrent of sectarianism back upon us, by telling us to be united among ourselves, before we deluge their country with partyism and blood?

These are some of the sad records of our own times. I ask, then, the pious of every party, if all can be right? But what is most astonishing to me is, the learned, intelligent, and good of all parties profess to see, with pitying eye, these evils, yet live in the bosom of confusion and corruption. I could form an excuse for the ignorant, who know no better; but when I hear this confessed by so many of the enlightened, who still persist in schisms and making factions, I cannot hope for their happiness, or much better times.

I have adduced some of the most respectable names for illustration, but the same could be said of all sects in the country.—But let us turn with horror from this picture, and see if we cannot find a remedy, that all the world must acknowledge, and rejoice in the great delivery.

The Church of Scotland.

A member of this "church" in a letter

to the Editor of the Cumberland Presbyterian, published at Nashville, observes; "I have always entertained a very high opinion of the church of Scotland, esteeming it one of the best institutions which the wisdom of man ever devised." Of this we have no doubt; that the "church of SCOTLAND" was "derised" by the "wisdom of MAN." But we will hear this writer a little further. "It has been a chief instrument in the hand of providence for promoting civil and religious liberty, not only in Scotland, but throughout the civilized world." This church then, not "of CHRIST," but "of SCOTLAND," devised by the wisdom of man, has been the "chief instrument" in God's hand for promoting "civil and religious liberty" in the world!! The "church of CHRIST" was devised by the "wisdom of God," the "church of SCOTLAND," by the "wisdom of MAN!" The "wisdom of man" is the "wisdom of this world." "The world by wisdom knew not God." "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of THIS WORLD?" "The wisdom of this WORLD is foolishness with God." "We," says Paul, "speak the wisdom of God;" and, "my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of MAN'S wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your FAITH should not stand in the wisdom of MEN, but in the power of God." The "wisdom of man" according to the above writer, has been the "chief instrument of promoting civil and religious liberty!" This is placing the wisdom of man above that of God, and a mark of Antichrist, "that man of sin, * * the son of perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

This writer gives us some information in regard to the "present state of the church of Scotland," and the attempted separation of "church and State," which is interesting, as it goes to show that the Clergy, at least there, are more zealous for, and watchful over, their "salaries" than their "religion." "You may be aware," says he, "that about two or three years ago, a movement was made by some of the Dissenters, calling for a separation of church and State—meaning thereby to sequester the

TIPENDS of the established CLERGY, and bring them to the exchequer. * * * Another section of the clergy here, began to take alarm for their stipends, and sounded the trumpet against Voluntaries, Papists and Infidels, whom they very charitably class together. The higher class of Tories adroitly taking advantage of this state of things have industriously fomented the question, professing great alarm for the spread of Popery and Infidelity—and the CLERGY instead of merely defending their stipends, have made a great and unfounded cry about the destitute state of the land for the means of religious instruction, and loudly demanded new churches and ENDOWMENTS out of the public TREASURY. * * * * In the midst of this turmoil the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, a week or two ago, resolved to form "Protestant Associations" in every Parish—a thing wholly uncalled for, if the real object was against popery, or with a religious view. However the lure will, to a certain extent, take effect with well meaning, but weak minded people, and do great damage in the mean time to the interests of Reform. But my own opinion is, that in the end the conduct exhibited by the majority of the clergy, will bring down upon them the very catastrophe which they think themselves laboring to prevent."

The conduct of these privileged sons of the "church of Scotland" is no more than what we might expect from such offspring of such a mother. She is the "harlot daughter" of the great "mother of harlots," whom John saw in a vision on the isle of Patmos, with a name written upon her forehead, "mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of Harlots." "The kings of the earth have committed fornication with her; and the offspring of this illicit alliance of 'church and state,' or church and world, has been these "harlots."

EDITOR.

Converting power in the Word of God.

Many sincere, honest and well meaning "professors of religion," seem to be fearful of ascribing any or too much agency to the word of God in the conversion of sinners, least it should detract from the glory and

honor of God; and must have the word always accompanied or attended by the Spirit in a special manner, or the sinner previously operated upon or illuminated by the Spirit in order to understand or receive it. Now when we ascribe the conversion of sinners to the instrumentality of the word of God, we are so far from detracting any thing from his glory and honor, that we add to, instead of taking from, them. If the word of God was the word of *man* instead of the word of God, then might we contend for an operation of God's Spirit with it in specially applying it, or before it in preparing for it. But it is not the word of man. "Thank we God without ceasing," says Paul to the Thessalonians, "because, when ye received the *word of God* which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the *word of men*, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which *effectually worketh* also in you that *believe*." Whatever is done by God's word is done by him, or, whatever God's word does he does. And as much glory and honor belong to him when he does any thing by his word, or any means he has appointed, as if he had done it without either; and he is as much the author in one case as in the other. God created all things by his Son when he pre-existed as the Word. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. * * * All things were made by *him*; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Again, it is said of Christ, "Who being the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the *word* of his power." And Peter says in one of his epistles, "by the *word* of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but 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." If such was and is the power of the word of God, that by it he created all things and upholds and sustains them, has it so much less or so little power now, that it is not sufficient for the new creation in Christ Jesus? Had God to use means in the first creation, and does he Ξ make use of none in

the far more important second? Are means (his word) necessary to the first creation of a human soul, and none to the second? And cannot God as easily and with as much glory and honor to himself, begin and carry on the second creation with his *word*, as the first?

"The *law* of the Lord is perfect," says David, "*converting the soul*." And Moses says to the Israelites, and his saying deserves the particular attention of many in this generation who are always diving into mysteries and speculations and trying to find something where there is nothing, Moses says to them, "The *secret* things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which *are revealed* belong unto us, and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." The converting power of the law must have been in the "words" in which it was written, or rather in their meaning, as the power of a word is always in its *meaning*. And is the Gospel, that glorious consummation of revealed religion, less perfect and less powerful than the Law, which contained only a shadow of the good things to come under the Gospel, and which was to be done away? Oh, no. "The gospel of Christ, * * * is the *power of God unto salvation* to every one that believes." "The *word of the Lord*," says Peter, "endureth forever. And this is the *word* which by the *gospel* is preached unto you." The saving power of the gospel must then have been in the word of the Lord which was preached by it. We do not read in the New Testament of any other converting power besides the gospel. If that is his power unto salvation, what other power can he have or exert? But dont this idea do away the operation of the Holy Spirit? Oh, no. "The *sword of the Spirit* * * * is the *word of God*." "The *word of God* is *quick* [living] and *powerful*, and *shaper* than any *two-edged sword*, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a *discerner* of the *thoughts* and *intents of the heart*." The word of God is the word of the Spirit, for the Spirit inspired the men who wrote it. The word of God then can do every thing in the conversion of men that the Holy Spirit can do; for whatever the word does, that the Spirit does; and whenever

and wherever the word operates, then and there the Spirit operates; for the Spirit is as omnipresent as God himself, and is every where that the word is, and does not operate without the word, nor the word without the Spirit. There is no such thing taught in the Scriptures, as *abstract* word or *abstract* Spirit. "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder." Hence in being born again of the Spirit we are born by the word of God. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever. * * * And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." It is in those that believe that "the word of God effectually works;" and it is to the believer that the "gospel is the power of God unto salvation." For "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized * * * for the remission of sins." "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Christ gave himself for the church, "that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing [bath] of water by the word."

EDITOR.

Work of the Holy Spirit in Regeneration.

Nothing is more plainly taught in the New Testament than the agency of the Holy Spirit in Regeneration. There can be no regeneration without the Holy Spirit. If to be born again is to be regenerated,* and to be regenerated is to "be born of water and the Spirit," then it is impossible to be regenerated or born again without the operation of the Holy Spirit. All who are regenerated are saved from their past sins, and enjoy the present Salvation from the guilt, pollution and dominion of sin. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us"—But are we saved by his mercy alone, without any thing else, seeing

*From *palin* again, and *genesis*, a being born, a birth, a being born again.

that all works of righteousness which we have done are excluded? Oh, no. Let us finish the sentence.—"by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit;"—not by either alone or one without the other;—not by the washing of regeneration alone, or the renewing of the Holy Spirit alone;—but "according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration AND the renewing of the Holy Spirit." "*Bath*" is the correct translation of "washing" here. *Loutron palin genesis*, "bath of regeneration." But what is the bath of regeneration? It is not regeneration itself, any more than the branch of a tree is the tree itself. The branch is a part of the tree, something that belongs to it; and the bath of regeneration is a part of regeneration, something that belongs to it, and without which we could not have regeneration. The idea of a bath generally invokes that of immersion in water, for we bathe by immersing. Accordingly, Paul says that Christ sanctified and cleansed the church "with the washing of water by the word." *Loutroo tou udatos ek remati*, "bath of water, with the word." The correct translation is, "that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it with a bath of water, with the word." The bath of regeneration and bath of water are synonymous expressions, agreeably to Paul. Hence it is, that in regeneration we are "born of water" as well as "of the Spirit." As the two expressions just quoted are synonymous in their meaning, so must be the "renewing of the Holy Spirit" and "by the word." That is, the Holy Spirit renews us by the word; and the bath of regeneration is represented by the bath of water. James speaking of God, says that, "of his own will begat he as with the word of truth." Having been thus begotten by the Holy Spirit with the word of truth, we are born of water and the Spirit when we pass through the bath of water, which thus becomes the bath of regeneration. As it is the "bath of water by the word," we are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." To be born of the Holy Spirit and to be born of or by the word of God, are synonymous expressions. As there cannot be the bath of regeneration without the bath of water, so there cannot be the birth of the Holy

Spirit without the birth of or by the word of God.—We are born of the spirit alone without the word, nor of the word alone without the Spirit. The Holy Spirit and water are in the spiritual or second birth, what father and mother are in the natural or first birth, and stand in the same place. We are begotten by the Holy Spirit with the word, the incorruptible seed, and then “born of water and of the Spirit.” To be saved, “by the bath of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit;” to be cleansed “with the bath of water with the word;” to be “born of water and of the Spirit;” and to “believe and be baptized” and be saved; are all synonymous expressions in their signification, meaning the same thing.—The Holy Spirit by whom we are renewed, begets and renews us “with the word,” through faith or belief, as that is the only way in which the word can affect us, for “faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God;” and in the bath of regeneration we are born of water, as there is a coming out of or from, born of water and of the Spirit when we have been baptized or immersed. “Whosoever believeth that *Jesus is the Christ is born of God.*”—Hence, “he that believes and is baptized shall be saved;” and, “he saved us by the bath of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.” Hence, “we are all the children of God by FAITH in Jesus Christ; for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,” “put on the new man, RENEWED in knowledge after the IMAGE of him that created him,” for, “if any man be IN Christ he is a new creature.” Renewed how in what kind of knowledge? “God, who commanded the LIGHT to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our [Apostles’] hearts, to give [by us Apostles] the LIGHT of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;” “the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the LIGHT of the glorious GOSPEL of Christ, who is the IMAGE of God, should shine unto them.

EDITOR.

NOTE.—We add to the preceding Essay the following note, containing the criticisms and comments of some of the most eminent Biblical Critics and Commentators, on some of the principal passages of scripture quoted in it.

“*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit*”—John iii. 5. Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it.—*John Wesley.*

Baptism by water was necessary to every Jew and Gentile that entered into the kingdom of the Messiah.—*Dr. Adam Clarke.*

It is probable that Christ had an eye to the ordinance of baptism, which John had used and he himself had begun to use. * * * The Jews cannot partake of the benefits of the Messiah’s kingdom they had so long looked for, unless they quit all expectations of being justified by the works of the law, and submit to the baptism of repentance, the great Gospel duty, for the remission of sins, the great Gospel privilege.—*Matt. Henry.*

“*He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.*”—Titus iii. 5.

The laver of regeneration, (that is, baptism, the thing signified, as well as the outward sign) and the renewal of the Holy Ghost.—*Wesley.*

Undoubtedly the apostle here means baptism, the rite by which persons were admitted into the church; and the visible sign of the cleansing purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, which the apostle immediately subjoins. Baptism is only a sign, and therefore should never be separated from the thing signified: but it is a rite commanded by God himself, and therefore the thing signified should never be expected without it.—*Clarke.*

The covenant sealed in baptism binds to duties, as well as exhibits and conveys benefits and privileges; if the former be not minded, in vain are the latter expected. Sever not what God has joined: in both the outer and inner part is baptism complete; as he that was circumcised became debtor to the law, (Gal. 5. 3,) so is he that is baptized, to the Gospel, to observe all the commands and ordinances thereof, as Christ appointed; (Matt. 28. 19.) *Disciple the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* This is the outward sign and seal of salvation, baptism, called here the washing of regeneration.—*Henry.*

Through the bath of regeneration:—through baptism; called ‘the bath of regeneration.’—*Macknight.*

“*That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.*”—Eph. v. 25.

That he might sanctify it through the word

—The ordinary channel of all blessings, *having cleansed it*—From the guilt and power of sin, *by the washing of water*—In *baptism*, if with the “outward and visible sign,” we receive the inward and spiritual grace.—*Wesley.*

With the washing of water] Baptism accompanied by the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit.—*Clarke.*

That he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word, (v. 26;) that he might endue all his members with a principle of holiness, and deliver them from the quilt, the pollution, and the dominion of sin. The instrumental means whereby this is effected, are the instituted sacraments, particularly *the washing of baptism*, and the preaching and reception of the Gospel.—*Henry.*

Regeneration by the Spirit alone.

Those who exclude baptism from the process of regeneration, generally ascribe it, if we are not mistaken, to the Holy Spirit *alone*. Their error is as great as that those who make “*faith alone*” the condition of salvation, justification, &c. Peter, speaking of regeneration, says that we are “born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God* which lives and abides forever.” Now if we are born of the Spirit *alone*, we cannot be born by the *word of God*. The truth is, in the process of regeneration God’s Spirit and his word are inseparable. What the word does, that doeth the Spirit, and what the Spirit does, he doeth by the word. There is no more regeneration without the word than there is without the Spirit of God. There is no *abstract* Spirit or *abstract* word here. Jesus says we are “born of the Spirit” and Peter says we are “born by the word.” They cannot contradict each other. We are “born of the Spirit” “*by the word.*”

The system of the Paidobaptists is widely variant and inconsistent here. They have infants regenerated by *water alone*, and adults, by *Spirit alone*!—The conclusion of the whole matter is this. The Spirit begets us by the word when we believe, and when we are baptized we are “born of water and of the Spirit.” How plain and simple all this!

EDITOR.

Baptismal Regeneration.

Many sneer at and speak contemptibly of what they call “baptismal regeneration.” The expression is not to be found in the religious vocabulary of Heaven, and is not used by either preachers, writers or others in this Reformation. Many cannot bear the idea of water having any thing to do with, or bearing any part in: the process of regeneration. It must all be of and by the Holy Spirit *alone*! We do not, we wish not, we cannot consistently with the Holy Scriptures, deny the agency or operation of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. On the contrary, we affirm that without the agency, operation or influence of the Spirit in some way there can be no regeneration. Now what is regeneration? Dr. Johnson defines it, “*new birth; birth by grace from carnal affections to a Christian life.*” It is compounded of *re* and *generation*, which the same Lexicographer defines as follows, “RE is an inseparable particle used by the Latins, and from them borrowed by us, to denote *iteration* or backward action. * * * It is put almost arbitrarily before verbs and verbal nouns;” “GENERATION, the act of begetting or producing. *Bacon*. A family; a race. *Shark*. Progeny; offspring. *Shark*. A single succession. *Raleigh*. An age. *Hooker*.” Generation is from the Greek word, *palinogenesis*, which Parkhurst defines, “*A being born again, a new birth, regeneration, renovation.*” This is from *genesis* and *palin*, which are defined by Parkhurst, “*Genesis, from geinomai, to be born;*” “*Palin * * Again.*” Regeneration then, according to these definitions, is to be *new born, reborn or born again*.—Hence our Saviour told Nicodemus, in his conference with him, “Except a man be *born AGAIN* he cannot see the kingdom of God,” the kingdom our Lord came to set up on earth, not the *everlasting* kingdom.” Jesus did not say born of water or born of the Spirit, but “*born again.*” Nicodemus having a fleshly birth and an earthly kingdom before his eye; asks how it is possible that a man can be born when he is old! Jesus explains the new birth to him: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Now mark, reader, that a man is not in being “*born again,*” born of the Spirit *alone*. Water is inseparably connected with the Spirit, and equally as much with it, made a condition of entering into the kingdom of God on earth. “Except a man be born of *water AND of the Spirit.*” “What God has joined together, let *not man* put asunder.” And in being *thus* born of water who can

deny that a man is not born *again*? In being regenerated or born again, man cannot be born of water without the Spirit, nor of the Spirit without water. There is no such thing in regeneration as abstract water or abstract Spirit. We are begotten by the word of inspiration or the word of the Spirit: for "of his [God's] own will begat he us with the word of truth," and the Spirit is the "Spirit of truth." Consequently we are begotten by the Spirit, we are "born of water and of the Spirit," born "by the word of God," the incorruptible seed, with which we are impregnated when we believe, for "faith comes by * * * the word of God."

EDITOR.

Baptist Advocate.

The CHRISTIAN REFORMER, is a new monthly paper, published at Paris, Tenn. J. R. Howard, Editor. It is to follow in the track of Alexander Campbell. The price is \$2.00 a year, while the quantity of printed matter is less than is furnished in the Baptist Advocate for \$1.00 a year. There is one difference.—*Cross & Baptist Journal*.

The above appeared in the Cross and Baptist Journal in March, and would not now be noticed by us but for the following on the cover of the last number of the Baptist Advocate, copied from the "Baptist Banner," a paper edited by Wm. Waller, the author of a libellous pamphlet against bro. Campbell and our brethren:

"It contains more than twice the matter of the Gospel Advocate and is published at the same price, and it has as much as both the Church Advocate and the Catholic Advocate together, and is fifty cents cheaper than either. * * * * A campbellite thinks nothing of paying two dollars per annum, for the Millennial Harbinger, and would probably pay ten dollars* rather than be deprived of it; and with that he will also take the Gospel Advocate, Christian Messenger, etc. and yet the Harbinger contains no more matter than the Baptist Advocate, which is published at one dollar per annum! Such is the marvellous difference between the disciples of the reformation," and the Baptists!"

Now this "one difference" between this

*We doubt this very much. We don't think that the brethren would any of them countenance such an imposition and extortion!

"Baptist Advocate," which some of the Baptist seem to extol as *the* cheap Baptist paper, is not so great or so marvellous as might be supposed, when every thing is considered. If the reader will notice that and the Cross and Journal, both edited by the same editor and published by the same publisher, he will find that the columns of the "Advocate" are made to fit those of the Cross and Journal precisely; so that the same type, once set up, will do without scarcely any trouble for both papers, and articles can easily be transferred from one to another. And accordingly the Advocate, as far as we have compared the two, contains in every number more or less of what is published in the Cross and Journal, and *vice versa*. Here is "one difference!" Add to this "one difference," and a considerable one in the item of expenses, between the quality of the paper on which the Advocate is printed and that of the Harbinger and Reformer! And add to this "one difference" in the quantity of original editorial matter, between them, the Advocate rarely ever containing any! And add to this "one difference" in the advantages in several respects which the Advocate enjoys in belonging to the same establishment of the Cross and Journal; a paper probably sufficiently well sustained to enable the editor to publish the Advocate much lower than he otherwise might do! When all these differences are added together, there would very probably be no difference at all; and no marvel about it.

We were not at all surprised to hear the editor of the Cross and Journal say that our paper was to "follow in the track of Alexander Campbell." Let a paper advocate the religion of the Bible to the exclusion of all others, and where 'A. Campbell is known it immediately becomes obnoxious to this charge. We do not see what else friend Stevens could have seen in our paper when he penned the remarks we have quoted, to have induced him to make such an assertion. We have been taught by our Master who is in heaven, to call no man master on earth. And we would as readily oppose what we conceive to be error in bro. Campbell as in bro. Stevens, and would not connive at it any more in one than in the other.

EDITOR.

NOTE—Since writing the above, we

find the following in the advertising columns of the last nos. of the "Cross and Baptist Journal." It will serve to shew, that the price of our papers is not so high as might be inferred from the "Baptist Banner."

"One thousand copies have been printed for each number from its commencement, whereas the list of subscribers has been and is now only between five and six hundred, and the amount received from subscribers falls considerably below the actual expense of printing, leaving no remuneration for the other labors bestowed in publishing and editing the work.

"Now such being the state of the case, the publisher presumes he will be justified in stating positively that *he shall not continue the Baptist Advocate after the close of the present volume, unless he shall have a list of at least one thousand responsible subscribers with which to commence the 3d. volume in January next.*"

Roman Catholic Discussion.

(From the Cincinnati Cross and Baptist Journal of Oct. 21.)

During the late session of the College of Teachers in this city, the general use of the Bible, as a reading-book in common schools, was advocated by Dr. Wilson. This was strongly opposed by Bisop Purcell and the Rev. Mr. Montgomery, Roman Catholics. Alexander Campbell, in a lecture before the College, found occasion incidentally to remark, that the intellectual elevation and intelligence which now pervade the mass of the people in Protestant countries, where the English language prevails, are to be traced, in part at least, to the influence of the Protestant Reformation. Bishop Purcell disputed this position. The discussion was considered out of place before the College of Teachers, and was not prolonged. Mr. C., however, apprized the Bisop of his readiness to meet him on the question at any suitable time and place. He gave a public address, in defence of his position, on Monday evening of last week, in the Sycamore Street meeting-house. Bishop Purcell replied in the same place on Tuesday evening. The reply seemed to us a signal failure; and at the close, the Bisop declined the overture of Mr. Campbell for a regular and formal discussion of the whole sub-

ject. On Wednesday evening, Mr. Campbell addressed a very crowded assembly in the Wesley chapel, and at the close gave notice that he designed to prosecute the subject no further. A very general feeling of interest had been excited by the discussion, and on Thursday the following correspondence took place, by which it appears that Mr. Campbell will return in about two months and take up the subject in a formal debate, if the Catholics please to meet him, otherwise, in a series of lectures. We are inclined to the belief, that good will come from this discussion.

Cincinnati, Oct. 13, 1836.

To the Rev. Mr. Campbell.

Dear Sir—The undersigned, citizens of Cincinnati, having listened with much pleasure to your exposure and illustrations of the absurd claims and usages of the Roman Catholic church, would respectfully and earnestly request you to proceed immediately to establish before this community the six propositions announced at the close of your lecture, last evening. This request is made under the conviction, that the present state of feeling in this city and the critical state of the country, with reference to Romanism, demand this and will fully justify such a course, and also with the expectation that it may result in much good to the cause of Protestantism in the West.

The above was signed by 57 ministers and others, belonging to the various protestant evangelical churches in the city, and in reply was received the following:

Cincinnati, Oct. 13th, 1836.

GENTLEMEN—When in the College of Teachers, which assembled in your city on the 2d inst. I heard Bishop Purcell, of the Roman Church, object to the truly Catholic views of Dr. Joshua L. Wilson, presented in his introductory lecture, because he recommended the Bible as a universal school-book. And on hearing this objection enforced by one of the inferior clergy, President Montgomery, I was not only reminded of the professed immutability of that community, but withal, somewhat astonished at the bold and pertinacious manner in which those learned Catholics, even in a Presbyterian meeting-house, sought to exclude the inspired volume from the common schools of our country. But, before I had,

to my own satisfaction, fully disposed of this rather unexpected indication of the spirit of Leo the Tenth, because of an allusion, in my lecture on Moral Culture, to the Protestant Reformation, I was called to an account for having, unphilosophically, connected the present march of English society* in every country, in all the useful sciences and arts, with that impulse given to the mind by the Protestant doctrine, of every one thinking for himself, on every subject, as introduced into England at the era of the Reformation. To this sentiment, Bishop Purcell was pleased to object; extending its signification beyond its contextual import, strongly affirming, that "the Protestant Reformation is the cause of all the contention and infidelity in the world!"

This being an allegation, in my judgment, uncalled for, and irrelevant to any thing by me affirmed; and it having been stipulated, that religious controversy was not to encumber the proceedings of the Convention, I could not honorably reply to those remarks from the bishop, in any other way, than by simply informing him, that if he wished a religious discussion of that question, I was prepared for it, and would attend to it the next week, or when convenient to him; but that in the College I could not, under all the circumstances, do more than defend my assertion, in its bearings on education, as contemplated in the lecture.

The worthy Bishop, time after time, declaring himself in favor of free discussion, saying that his "word was the Word of God, commanding, let there be light," approving of religious controversy, and rather complaining that in the College he was restricted; I took the occasion, the second time, to assure him of my willingness to render him all satisfaction, and to meet him, even on the consecrated ground of his own cathedral, and canvass the allegation, in all its latitude and longitude. The invitation he did not, however, accept during the meeting of the College; but after its close, I made an appointment to speak on the subject in the Sycamore Street meeting-house, on Monday evening following. We met according to appointment. The bishop, on my invitation to reply, rose and requested to be indulged with an adjournment to the next evening, which being granted, we dismissed the assembly.

On Tuesday evening, after expressing a concurrence in the necessity of persons ex-

amining the Scriptures, and of being enlightened by that good book, affirming that he would acknowledge no man as a worthy member of his community, who was not so enlightened, he went on to prove that the right of private judgment was annihilated by the church and the Bible; and that to the exercise of this feigned right was owing all the divisions in the world."

He spent the evening, however, for the most part, in pouring forth a torrent of the most unqualified abuse of Martin Luther, and his associates in the Reformation, representing him as a devil incarnate, the slave of the most brutal lusts and passions, to the extreme mortification, not only of every lady in the house, but to make even gentlemen themselves blush for his indelicacy and want of respect for public opinion.

The gentleman continued his speech till almost ten o'clock, when on my motion to have the discussion subjected to a competent presidency, and to be regulated by equal laws, he positively declined any further debate, alleging physical incompetency, and the liabilities of his office to ministerial calls. To obviate these difficulties, I in vain proposed to measure the debate according to his physical strength, (which appeared to be greatly superior to mine) and to leave the time and place, whether by night or by day, whether every day, or every other day, to his convenience and regulation.

In consequence of this failure to meet public expectation, and of the magnitude of the interests developing themselves, so far as this matter was agitated, and of the impressions made on the whole community, alive, as you are, to the great importance of this whole subject, religiously morally, and politically considered, you have been induced, gentlemen, to request me to deliver a series of lectures on certain propositions, which I sketched in my address of yesterday evening. These propositions being of superlative interest to every American citizen, I have carefully considered, and on receiving your very kind and polite invitation, I have arranged and expressed them in the following order and style.

1. The Roman Catholic religion, if infallible and unsusceptible of reformation, as alleged, is essentially Anti-American being opposed to the genius of all free institutions, and positively subversive of them.

2. The Roman Catholic institution, sometimes called the "Holy Apostolic Catholic Church," is not now, nor was she ever, catholic, apostolic, or holy, but is a sect, in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing; but not "the mother

* By English society, we mean all in every country who speak the English language.

and mistress of all churches," but an apostacy from the only true, holy apostolic, and catholic church of Christ.

3. She is "the Babylon" of John, "the man of sin" of Paul, and the empire of the youngest horn of Daniel's Sea-Monster.

4. She is not uniform in her faith, or united in her members; but mutable and fallible, as any other sect of philosophy or religion, Jewish, Turkish, or Christian.—a confederation of sects under a politico-ecclesiastic head.

5. Her notion of apostolic succession is without any foundation in the Bible, in reason, or in fact—an imposition of the most injurious consequences to society.

6. Boasting of unwritten traditions of apostolic authority, she has not one which she can prove by any species of credible evidence—all her traditions are the mere opinions of fallible men.

7. Notwithstanding her pretensions to have exclusively given to us the Bible, we are perfectly independent of her for our knowledge of that book, and our faith in it.

8. She is constitutionally opposed to liberty, the general diffusion of knowledge, and the general reading of the Scriptures by the whole community.

9. Her notions of purgatory, indulgences, auricular confession, remission of sins, and of other human traditions, essential elements of her system, are immoral in their tendency, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political.

These propositions are not more than enough to lay before the community the whole pretensions, moral and political, of Romanism, as now taught, and to be taught, in the United States.

But, gentlemen, while agreeing with you, as I do, in the vast importance of a candid, faithful, and friendly examination of this whole subject at the present crisis, permit me to say, that it out to be thorough; and for the following reasons, I must beg your indulgence in putting it off for a few weeks.

1. I have been from home since last May, on an arduous tour of speaking; at present much exhausted, and having urgent duties at home, demanding a portion of my attention.

2. I have some appointments in Kentucky, which ought to be fulfilled the present week.

3. But, of still more importance, I have not all the historic facts and documents here, necessary to a full, forcible, and vivid demonstration or proof of the preceding positions.

4. Permit me, Gentlemen, to add, that I wish it to be more extensively published

abroad, that if any of the Catholic priesthood, more vigorous, or of higher authority than the bishop of this diocese, out of this state, or if Bishop Purcell himself should feel desirous of a free and full discussion of the above propositions, they may have time to prepare themselves, and be present on the occasion.

For all these reasons I must ask your indulgence till about the beginning of the New Year, when I will, the Lord willing, either in lectures, or in a public discussion, attempt to sustain each and every of the above propositions.

All of which, gentlemen, is most respectfully submitted, by your ob't servant,

A. CAMPBELL, of Bethany, Va.

To Messrs. H. Norton, C. Elliot, S. W. Lynd, I. G. Barnet, Samuel Lewis, and others with them.

Cincinnati, Oct. 13, 1836.

Politico---Religious Newspapers.

The Newspapers of the country, velped *religious*, seem to be as much political, commercial, facetious, &c. as religious. Made up of articles of these different varieties, they present a pretty fair picture of the sects to which they belong. Their mixture of carnal and spiritual things, exhibits the taste of those who conduct, and those who read, them. They infringe upon the rights of the avowed political papers by thus cheating them out of what by right belongs to them exclusively. But the editor of the Gallatin (Tenn.) "Union," seems determined to retaliate upon them. We give here a list of the principal contents of the "Western Methodist" of Augst. 26th., and of "The Union" of Augst. 19th.

WESTERN METHODIST.

The Dying Widow—Life, Death and Eternity—Sure the Rose is like a sigh—Moral Sublimity illustrated—Beautiful Extract—Religion of the Pilgrims—From "Noble deeds of Woman"—Principle and feeling—Man and Woman—Mercy—A well-spiced arrow—Family devotion—Anecdote—Speak to that young man—Revivals again—This world and the next—A noble example—The President's visit—Composition—Revival—Obituary—We've no abiding city here—Late from Europe—Latest news from Spain—Latest from Mexico—A Letter from Mr. Spaulding—Dinner to the President—Great fraud and failure—The dying girl—Roman

Preists in France—An outcast—Puffing in London—Death bed of Napoleon—Fashionable Glossary—Woman—Anecdote of Mr. Madison—Music.

THE UNION.

Visit of the President of the United States.—The young wife's prayer—Gen. Washington on Swearing—Comforts of Religion—Hydrophobia—Directing Sinners to Christ—The dangers of young men—Medical Ethics—Learning—Farmer's Lyceums—Three days later from England—Attempt to assassinate Louis Philippe—General Court—Terrible affray—Drowning of a coal mine in France—Black Hawk—Shocking Murder—Gubernatorial reconre—News from the Volunteers—Mr. Maffitt in Gallatin—Death—More bloodshed—Presidential Election—The Louisiana Elections—Plucking a Bullfinch—A kitchen garden—Hours with Christ—Hours of bliss—Means for preserving potatoes—A remedy for the fly in the wheat.

We think that it would be rather difficult to tell from these lists of contents which is the more *religious* paper of the two! But what has made the editor of the "Union" so religious? Mr. Maffitt has been there and got up a "revival." The editor says, "There was about 70 that professed religion during these meetings and many more are seeking their Lord to know," and that the young converts "signified their determination to fight the battles of the Lord let the consequences be what they might." So religiously zealous has he grown, that he says, "May the good work now begun go on and not stop here."

We disapprove of *these revivals in toto*. They are in our opinion, the work of enthusiasm, and not of the Spirit of the Lord. There is not a word for them in the New Testament. Like the great *Methodist* preacher and writer, Saml. Drew, we would say, "I cannot join in these *reveries* without being an arrant hypocrite." "The history of past years," says he, "teaches that their [these new converts'] apostacy has been nearly as extensive and sudden as their reformation."

These remarks of the shrewd and philosophic Drew, are abundantly verified by the following in a communication from a Mr. Goodsell of Troy, N. York, upon the decrease in the members of the Methodist Episcopal church, and the number of "conversions" in that city for 1832, published

in a recent no. of the Christian Advocate and Journal. "By turning to the minutes of 1832," says he, "it will be found that a much greater number was reported then in our city than has been at any time since. The truth is, in that number was reported about three hundred probationers, gathered at a *revival*, under the labors of the Rev. John N. Maffitt. However disagreeable this fact may be, but few of these probationers comparatively ever became members of the Church, and now even but few of those who did are to be found." We have been informed that this is generally the case with Mr. Maffitt's "revivals."

EDITOR.

Political Parsons.

A new order of this description appear to be springing up out of the "clergy" in our land; who, not content with their "clerical" vocation, are fond of dabbling in the muddy pool of politics and besmearing their "holy garments" with its filth. They are well "taken off" in the following extract of a letter from Terry H. Cahal, Esq. of Columbia, Tenn. to the Editor of the "Observer" of that place.

"Many of the Clergy seem to have forgotten the saying of their Divine Master; 'My Kingdom is not of this world;' or rather appear resolved to tell him; 'if yours is not, ours shall be.' It appears to me to be a fearful state of affairs, when the clergy, seizing on the known and expressed preference of the President, are attempting to use his overwhelming popularity, and to add to it, the influence of their holy vocation in the choice of a successor. I have heard of the evils of uniting church and state. This looks a little like it. Let the people of all creeds and denominations beware. Whenever clerical influence is exerted in politics, the morals of the church—the purity of religion and the liberties of the people are alike endangered. Whenever a preacher of the gospel becomes a *noisy partizan politician*, he ought to quit the pulpit; and if he does not do it, his congregation ought to quit him."

Mr. Cahal is not the only one, by many, whose attention has been roused by these "signs of the times." Others, as well as he, have noticed the manifestations of this unhallowed disposition of the clergy to interfere in political affairs, and thus by pros-

tituting "clerical influence" to conciliate the political "powers that be" and secure their influence and favour. This is but another evidence of the apostacy in religion characteristic of this degenerate age; and is well calculated to excite suspicions in the minds of all real Christians who understand well their holy religion, of the erroneous and heretical tenets of these "political parsons." We do not see how any *christian preacher*, who lives up to all the precepts and commandments of his Lord, can be guilty of such conduct. It is one of the readiest methods he can take to destroy his influence and his usefulness.

EDITOR.

Christ's Kingdom not of this world.

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. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth, heareth my voice.—John xviii. 36, 37.

(From President Davies' Sermons.)

The occasion of these words was this: the unbelieving Jews were determined to put Jesus to death as an impostor. The true reason of their opposition to him was, that he had severely exposed their hypocrisy, claimed the character of the Messiah, without answering their expectations as a temporal prince and a mighty conquerer; and introduced a new religion,* which superseded the law of Moses, in which they had been educated. But this reason they knew would have but little weight with Pilate the Roman governor, who was a heathen, and had no regard to their religion. They therefore

*The Christian religion was not introduced until after the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The Mosaic or legal institution continued until nailed with Jesus to the cross, where it expired with him. The Jews thus destroyed their own religion! During the personal ministry of Jesus, they only feared that he would destroy their religion by introducing a new one.—They crucified him to prevent what they thus accomplished by his death!

Ed. C. R.

bring a charge of another kind, which they knew would touch the governor very sensibly, and that was that Christ had set himself up as a King of the Jews, which was treason against Cæsar the Roman emperor, under whose yoke they then were. This was all pretence and artifice. They would now seem to be very loyal to the emperor, and unable to bear with any claims inconsistent with his authority; whereas, in truth, they were impatient of a foreign government, and were watching for any opportunity to shake it off. And had Christ been really guilty of the charge alleged against him, he would have been the more acceptable to them. Had he set himself up as a King of the Jews, in opposition to Cæsar, and employed his miraculous powers to make good his claim, the whole nation would have welcomed him as their deliverer, and flocked round his standard. But Jesus came not to work a deliverance of this kind, nor to erect such a kingdom as they desired, and therefore they rejected him as an impostor. This charge, however, they bring against him, in order to carry their point with the heathen governor. They knew he was zealous for the honour and interest of Cæsar his master; and Tiberius, the then Roman emperor, was so jealous a prince, and kept so many spies over his Governors in all the provinces, that they were obliged to be very circumspect, and show the strictest regard for his rights, in order to escape degradation, or a severer punishment. It was this that determined Pilate, in the struggle with his conscience, to condemn the innocent Jesus. He was afraid the Jews would inform against him as dismissing one that set up as the rival of Cæsar; and the consequence of this he well knew. The Jews were sensible of this, and therefore they insist upon this charge, and at length plainly tell him, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend.* Pilate therefore, who cared but little what innovations Christ should introduce into the Jewish religion, thought proper to inquire into this matter, and asks him, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" dost thou indeed claim such a character, which may interfere with Cæsar's government? Jesus replies, *my kingdom is not of this world; as much as to say, "I do not deny that I claim a kingdom, but it is of such a nature, that it need give no alarm to the kings of the earth. Their kingdoms are of this world, but mine is spiritual and divine,* and cannot therefore interfere with theirs. If my kingdom were of this world, like theirs, I would take the same methods with them to obtain and secure it; my servants would fight for me, that I should not be delivered to the Jews;*

but now, you see, I use no such means for my defence, or to raise me to my kingdom: and therefore you may be assured, my kingdom is not from hence, and can give the Roman emperor no umbrage for suspicion or uneasiness." Pilate answers to this purpose: Thou dost, however, speak of a kingdom: and art thou a king then? dost thou in any sense claim that character? The poor prisoner boldly replies, *Thou sayest that I am a king*; that it is, "Thou hast struck upon the truth; I am indeed a king in a certain sense, and nothing shall constrain me to renounce the title." *To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth*; particularly to the truth, which now looks so unlikely, namely, that I am really a king. I was born to a kingdom and a crown, and came into the world to take possession of my right." This is that good confession which St. Paul tells us, 1 Tim vi. 13, our Lord witnessed before Pontius Pilate. Neither the hopes of deliverance, nor the terrors of death, could cause to retract it, or renounce his claim.

The Baptists and New Version—again.

We were mistaken when we expressed the opinion that the Baptists were done agitating the question of a new or amended version of the New Testament Scriptures. The following from the Cincinnati "Cross and Baptist Journal" of Sept. 20th from the "Rev." S. W. Lynd, the *pro tem*. Editor, speaks decisively on the subject. It is in reply to an article from Zion's Advocate.

"That a new translation of the Bible into the English language will be made, we have no more doubt, than we have that brother Adam Wilson edits the paper from which the above [article referred to] is taken. We must see better reasons urged in opposition to this work than we have yet seen to change our opinion. One editor informed us that there were 1000 reasons why it should not be done, but we will be satisfied with a title of them if they are worth any thing; and if they are worth nothing we hope never to see them in print. Some of our brethren seem to think that a new translation would be a horrible affair, but they have never yet written one word against the amended version of Dr. Webster. Our pedobaptist brethren are quite free in the purchase of this new work, yet none of their editors have denounced it as "*mending the Bible*," as a

certain editor of this city considers the suggestions of the Baptists in relation to a new English version. We have thought about it, and conversed about it in this city, and would have suggested a plan, if we had supposed that the time had arrived for it.—There are, no doubt, thousands of Baptists in the United States who will each give ten dollars to procure a single copy of a very common and small edition. And should such an offer be made, and proper arrangements secured, does any one suppose that a sufficient number of responsible men cannot be procured to undertake the work of translation? Will any one say that Baptists, as individuals, have not a right to procure such a translation if they are able to do it? And we verily believe that the more this is opposed, the sooner will the translation be produced."

Still more decisive, manly and independent is the following from Mr. Meredith of the (Newbern N. C.) "Biblical Recorder" of Sept. 28th, in reply to an article from the (Hartford, Conn.) "Christian Secretary."

"We are clear that when this work is done, it should be done openly, and with the consent and concurrence of the denomination at large. But from the intimation that "times and circumstances" do not call for such a work at present, we must beg leave to express our cordial and decided dissent. It is our confident belief, and has been for some time past, that the present (or at least as soon as may be) is the precise time for commencing this important undertaking. As we have given our reasons somewhat at large on this point, on former occasions, it is neither necessary nor proper to repeat them again now. We will not disguise the fact, however, that, in our view, the question respecting a new version is one of vast importance to the cause of truth. And we must be allowed to express our surprise, at the same time, at the excessive reluctance that has been generally evinced to give this subject a thorough investigation. Many, like our brother of the Secretary, have expressed their horror at the bare idea of a new version, and especially *now*—under existing circumstances. But few, however, have given the reasons of their apprehensions; and none, so far as we have seen, have attempted to meet the arguments advanced on the opposite side of the question.

"Will our brother of the Secretary, or any one else who is knowing on the subject, favor us with a solution to the following queries!—

"1. If the present English Version is not correct—so as to give a fair and full exhibition of revealed truth, why do Baptists make so much noise about the rendering of *baptizo, baptisma, &c. &c.*?

"2. If the present version is not correct—so as not to give a fair and full exhibition of revealed truth, is not a correct version to be regarded as a desideratum of the utmost importance?

"3. If a correct version is to be regarded as a desideratum of the utmost importance, why is not the *present* a suitable time to agitate and commence the undertaking?

"4. If a correct version is of so much importance in the Burman tongue, as seems to be allowed, why is it not equally important in the English tongue?

"5. If the Baptists, as a denomination, are under such weighty obligations as has been admitted, to give a correct version of the scriptures to the people of Burmah, why are they not under obligations to give a version equally correct to their own people—to their children, their domestics, their churches, their congregations?"

The reasons for a new version, couched in these queries, are, in our judgment, unanswerable.—The coincidence in date and sentiment between these eastern and western, Ohio and N. Carolina, editors, speaks something more than a mere understanding about this matter. It exhibits *personal*, more than *denominational*, independence of mind.—But why will not our New Version do for the Baptists as well as another?—since it is to be had both cheap and plentifully? Where is the objection, since *baptizo* and its cognates are *translated* as the Baptists want them?—It is too near the original and unfortunately has "*A Campbell*" on the title page!—But if the Baptists are determined upon having a *new* version, we know of none of their Rabbis more competent to preside over the business, as well as take part in it, than Mr. Meredith. EDITOR.

"Rev." Fountain E. Pitts.

We have sent all the nos. of our paper containing our review and exposition of this gentleman's "Book on Baptism," to him at Nashville, Tenn.; but from some cause he has, it seems, refused to take our paper from the Post Office, all the nos. sent being returned to us, as far as we know untouched by him. The following copy of

a letter we addressed to him when we commenced reviewing his work, will probably explain the reason.

Paris, Tenn, Sept. 1st. 1836.

Sir,

You will perceive from a number of the "Christian Reformer" sent you, that I have commenced reviewing and exposing your "Book on Baptism." This is to let you know, that if you wish to defend yourself against me my columns are open to you, as long as your communications may be characterised by decency, and of a length not exceeding my own nos. against you.—I address this letter to you, to leave you no pretext for resorting to the columns of your own papers, on the plea that you cannot have justice done you, by being shut out from mine. Besides, if you intend replying to me, my own paper will be the proper place for it, as it will be my readers who will be most interested in hearing what you may have to advance. Reserving to myself the right, as I do in all such cases, of making such replications to what you may write, as I may think proper,

I am,

Very Respectfully,

Yours,

JNO. R. HOWARD.

P. S. I intend sending my paper to you as long as it shall contain my Review and Exposition of your Book.

J. R. H.

In accordance with our promise here, we intend to still continue sending to him each no. of our paper, containing our review. The gentleman shall have no excuse. His *FALSHOODS* and *MISREPRESENTATIONS* shall, the Lord being willing, be exposed, & if the people will read, be made known through the length and breadth of the land. We intend that he shall be fully reviewed and exposed, if it take us all the next year to get through with him. Thus our opponents libel and misrepresent us, and refuse to hear, or let us be heard, in self-defence!

Is Mr. Pitts *afraid* to look into our paper? The moral courage of the *guilty* sometimes fail them! He says in his "Book," that "it is ingenuous and fair that EVERY man's honest opinions relating to salvation, however erroneous, should be candidly examined." How his practice contradicts his sentiments or principles as here avowed! Is he "ingenuous" or "fair"?—As we shall be late in closing the present volume of

our paper, and as we intend removing to Nashville, we expect to defer a further review and exposure of his "Book," until we commence our next volume there.

EDITOR.

Faith and Works.

BY HANNAH MORE.

Good Dan and Jane, were man and wife,
And lived a loving kind of life;
One point, however, they disputed,
And each by turns his mate confuted.

'Twas Faith and Works—this knotty question

They found not easy of digestion.
While Dan alone for faith contended,
Jane equally good works defended.
They are not Christians sure, but Turks,
Who build on faith and scoff at works;
Quoth Jane—while eager Dan replied,
'By none but heathens faith's deny'd.'

'I'll tell you wife,' at length quoth Dan,
'A story of a right good man.
A patriarch sage, of ancient days,
A man of faith, whom all must praise.
In his own country he possess'd,
Whate'er can make a wise man blest;
His was the flock, the field, the spring,
In short, a little rural king.

Yet, pleas'd, he quits his native land,
By faith in the divine command.
God bade him go; and he, content,
Went forth, not knowing where he went.

He trusted in the promise made,
And, undisputing, strait obey'd.
The heavenly word he did not doubt,
But prov'd his faith by going out.
Jane answer'd, with some little pride—
'I've an example on my side—

And tho' my tale be somewhat longer,
I trust you'll find it vastly stronger.
I'll tell you Daniel, of a man,
The holiest since the world began:
Who now God's favour is receiving,
For prompt obeying, not believing.

One only son this man possesseth,
In whom his righteous age was blest;
And more to mark the grace of heaven,
This son by miracle was given.
And from this child the word divine
Had promised an illustrious line.
When lo! at once a voice he hears,
Which sounds like thunder in his ears.
God says—Go sacrifice thy son!
This moment, Lord, it shall be done.

He goes, and instantly prepares,
To slay the child of many prayers.
Now here you see the grand expedience,
Of works, of actual sound obedience.
This was not faith, but act and deed,

The Lord commands—the child shall bleed.

Thus Abraham acted,' Jenny cried;

'Thus Abraham trusted,' Dan replied.

'Abraham,' quoth Jane, why that's my man!

'No Abraham's him I mean,' says Dan,

'He stands a monument of faith;—

'No 'tis for works the Scripture saith.'

'Tis for his faith that I defend him;

'Tis for obedience I commend him.'

Thus he—thus she—both warmly feel;

And lose their temper in their zeal;

Too quick each other's choice to blame,

They did not see each meant the same.

'At length, good wife,' said honest Dan,

'We'er talking of the self-same man.

The works you praise I own indeed,

Grow from that faith for which I plead;

And Abraham, whom for faith I quote,

For works deserves especial note;

'Tis not enough of faith to talk,

A man of God with God must walk:

Our doctrines are at last the same,

They only differ in the name;

The faith I fight for, is the root;

The works you value, are the fruit;

How shall you know my creed's sincere,

Unless in works my faith appear!

How shall I know a tree's alive,

Unless I see it bear and thrive?

Your works not growing on my root,

Would prove they were not genuine fruit.

If faith produce no works, I see,

That faith is not a living tree.

Thus faith and works together grow,

No separate life they e'er can know:

They're soul and body, hand and heart,

What God hath joined let no man part."

Immediate revelations and influences of the Holy Spirit.

MIRACULOUS, and supernatural means were employed in the establishment of the Jewish, and Christian religions. These are the only religions which are supported by such evidence. In the first age of Christianity, the immediate and miraculous operations of the Spirit, seem to have been indispensably necessary. How Christianity could have been established, and propagated in its commencement without miracles, and the gifts of the Spirit, which were conferred on believers in confirmation of the divinity of the Gospel, and for their edification, I cannot conceive. At that time there was no Gospel record; the gifts, and graces of the Spirit, and the teaching of the Apostles, seem to have supplied its place. The Spirit taught the mind, by immediate inspirations, and revelations, then, what it learns from the record of them now. Agreeably to

Christ's promises, the Spirit was to bring to the recollection of the Apostles what he had told them; this we are taught by what they have written, guided immediately by the Spirit, in the literal fulfilment of that promise. The Spirit was to take, and, by immediate revelation, shew to them the things of Christ, when in his glorious mediatorial throne; these, we are taught by the record of those things which the Spirit shewed them, agreeably to the promise. The Spirit was to teach them things to come; these, we learn, by what they have written concerning future events. *We have no true spiritual idea whose sign is not in the record, whether it relates to past, present, or future things.* These signs which are the words of God's Spirit, were stipulated by the Holy Spirit; and without them there are no spiritual ideas in the human mind:—Immediate revelations having ceased, by which those signs were first established, the propagation of spiritual ideas, and knowledge, is through the instrumentality of those signs which compose the word of God. This truth is conceded by all, except phrensied enthusiasts, the quakers, and shakers, and those other religionists who approach to them.—When any of them can exhibit an original spiritual idea, whose sign is not found in the word of God as the mean by which it was produced, I will yield the point; and acknowledge that I have done them much wrong. As long as the signs of their ideas are found there, or the constituent parts are, by the record, furnished to their imaginations as the materials out of which they have formed new associations or combinations of them; and their imaginations are possessed of their natural powers; they have as little reason to claim immediate revelations, as a mechanic has, for asserting that the materials which he employs in constructing a watch, or in building an house, were immediately created by the Spirit of God to his hand—or that their particular arrangement in the construction of the watch, or house, is effected by immediate miraculous inspirations, and power.—*Dr. Fishback.*

All men stand, by nature, in the very same relation to their Creator and Preserver; and therefore he who pretends that *supernatural privileges* have been conferred upon himself, must either produce *supernatural proofs* of the truth of his pretensions, or be content to have them rejected with scorn, and himself treated as an enthusiast or impostor. A secret communication with heaven, enjoyed by one or two individuals only, is a deviation from the common laws of nature, to which those individuals alone are privy;

and to make such a deviation credible to others, or indeed worthy of consideration, no proof can be sufficient but the power of *working miracles*; which is a palpable deviation from the same laws, of which every man who has paid attention to the course of nature is competent to judge, * * * *. Were every person instructed in the knowledge of his duty by *immediate inspiration*, and were the motives to practise it brought home to his mind by God himself, human nature would be wholly changed; men would not be masters of their own actions, they would not be moral agents, nor, by consequence, be capable of either reward or punishment.—*Gleig.*

Physical Operations of the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of outpourings of the Spirit, &c. is near akin to physical operations.—Supernatural operations, illuminations of the Spirit, outpourings withheld or afforded regardless of the constituted laws in the kingdom of grace, involve the Almighty in difficulties with his creatures, with his word, out of which I can see no retreat. If the world is to be evangelized by extraordinary outpourings of the Spirit, whose fault is it that the mighty work is not done! Not man's; for the operations requisite are withheld. iniquity abounds, the love of many waxes cold, because the time for the outpouring of the Spirit is not yet come. Any thing superior to, or different from, the light and motive presented to the mind of man in the word of God, must be physical, and not moral operations, and not in consonance with man's agency.—*S. M. McCorcle.*

Congress of Churches.

The Olive Branch, a Methodist paper, states that a proposition has been made for a "Congress of Churches," made up of representatives from all the different sects in the United States, which shall hold a session in some central place, for the purpose of adopting measures for the consolidation of all sects into one.

Which one shall it be!—*Phil. Saturday Courier.*

We ask, "which one shall it be?"—*ED. C. R.*

Christian Messenger.

We copy the following from the August no. of the above periodical, edited and published by Barton W. Stone at Jacksonville,

Illinois; which we intended to have inserted in an earlier no. of our paper, but have generally been prevented by press of matter. There seems to be an unnecessary jealousy existing among some of our brethren, in regard to whom credit is due in commencing the present Reformation, father Stone or bro. Campbell. Both these brethren would we think, be inclined with us to quote the language of Paul to the Corinthians, as respects this matter. "Whether it were I or they, [it makes no difference,] so we preach, and so ye believed." If bro. [Campbell has been mainly instrumental in stripping the gospel of the human appendages, additions and glosses by which it was clogged and obscured, it must be acknowledged that father Stone was greatly instrumental in preparing the people for its reception.—The pious, venerable and able fathers, Stone and Thos. Campbell, would suit well for co-editors.

EDITOR C. R.

NOTICE.

The Editor respectfully tenders his thanks to his patrons in general for the interest they have taken in the "Messenger." He is greatly encouraged by their approbation of the work. At the close of the last volume, I had almost determined to cease publishing the work any longer—but advices to continue, together with a large subscription, have inclined me to persevere. I have determined to enlarge the work to 32 pages, on better paper, and a smaller neat type, stitched; covered in a printed cover, and neatly trimmed—it will contain about double the matter of the present volume, and of course the price must be increased to ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS a copy. The postage will be 18 cents a year under 100 miles, and 30 cents over 100 miles.

My agents are requested to obtain as many responsible subscribers as they can, and to give me certain information of the discontinuance of my fold subscribers. I request all my brethren in the ministry, who are friendly to the Messenger, to become active agents; also I request my influential friends to do the same in their neighborhoods. They will see the propriety of letters containing the names of subscribers to be free of postage to me. The post Masters in order to increase the national revenue, will cheerfully send the names franked, if they be applied to. I wish to receive the subscriptions against the first day of October next, and sooner if possible, that I may have time

allowed me to procure the paper, and have it here against January next.

EDITOR.

N. B. My present subscribers will please to subscribe again, if they desire to take this work. My agents can inform them of the work, price, etc. so as to supersede the necessity of a prospectus.

CHRISTIAN REFORMER. PROSPECTUS FOR THE SECOND VOLUME.

THE prospects for an increasing and extensive circulation, the flattering hopes of ultimate success, and the commendatory letters received from almost every quarter where our paper circulates, together with the advice and solicitation of intelligent brethren, have determined us upon continuing the publication of the Christian Reformer, at least for another year.

We expect, therefore, to commence the publication of the next volume (for 1837) at NASHVILLE, Tenn. The wishes and solicitations of the brethren there, with various considerations, induce us to remove from our present place of residence and our paper from that of its publication. The advantages to be enjoyed at Nashville in every point of view as regards a religious periodical, devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity and advocating the cause of the Messiah, are numerous and various, and superior to any that a mere inland village can offer. Nashville being the central point in the great South-West, and possessing numerous facilities for intercourse, enjoys constant, public and private communications, not only with the South-Western country, but with every part of the United States.—Here also is congregated probably the largest and most intelligent body of Christians in the United States, perhaps in the world; This is also one of the principal rallying points of opposition of the different sects, and the place of publication of several of their various religious newspapers and magazines. A paper devoted to the cause of pure and uncorrupted Christianity, is needed here to defend it from their attacks and

to counteract the deleterious influence which they may exert. Added to all this, Nashville possesses facilities for procuring paper, for printing and publishing, not to be met with in places of less importance.

As to the future course which we design to pursue in conducting our paper, we intend that it shall be the same with that by which it has been characterised thus far, with the exception of any improvements which may be suggested or presented to us. The outline of the course which we have commenced and intend pursuing, was given in our "Prefatory Address;" and our Prospectus contained all the principal points which can come within the range of our discussions.— Upon most of these we have as yet but generally touched, the first volume being prefatory & preparatory to those we intend to succeed it, while we have not commenced any of the Essays promised in our first number. Among the numerous & various topics which present themselves for discussion in the succeeding volumes, we intend particularly attending to the subjects of, the Evidences of Divine revelation, the design and interpretation of Prophecy, rules and principles of Scriptural Interpretation, Christian faith and practice, and religious, moral and intellectual Education. In addition to the assistance already received, we have the promise and the prospect of more valuable aid, which, with the communications of new correspondents & our own articles, we expect will enable us to present our readers with more original matter than in the present volume. We intend, however, to still continue to publish good and well selected articles, which we may extract ourselves or which others may for us. We design using all necessary efforts to improve our paper, and make it what such a work ought to be.

It is still objected to the name of our paper, that it implies a reformation in Christianity. This objection we attempted to meet in our first No. by observing that Christianity being a perfect system and having God for its Author, could not be reformed, and that it was through its instrumentality that we

designed making our paper what its name imports, the *CHRISTIAN Reformer*. We wished to connect Christian and Reformer together in the name of our periodical, and we saw no other way to do it. Besides, we cannot pitch upon a more appropriate and less objectionable name; and to alter the name of a paper is generally injurious to it.

As it will require a large subscription list of PUNCTUAL advance-paying subscribers to sustain our paper and enable us to prosecute our undertaking as it ought to be done, we shall expect our brethren who are disposed to encourage works of the character of ours, to use their CONSTANT unremitting exertions to procure subscribers for us and extend its circulation. It is an acknowledged fact, that our brethren have generally been too negligent in obtaining subscribers for our papers and too remiss in making punctual remittances.

The size and terms of the *Christian Reformer* will be the same as heretofore; each No. containing 32 pages of large double column octavo, stitched and covered with a printed cover, at \$2 per annum if paid within six months after subscribing, and \$2 50 if no paid until after the expiration of that time.

☞ All letters and communications must, after the first of January next, be addressed to the subscriber at Nashville, Tenn. The postage on each letter being small and unimportant to the writer, and in the aggregate onerous and expensive to the Publisher, the postage must always be PAID, except where remittances of money are made. The larger the sums remitted, the less will be the expense. By making remittances when subscribers' names are sent, expense is saved to both parties. *Post Masters* can send the names of subscribers, and make remittances for them, retaining their commissions.

☞ Several hundred sets of the first volume, containing a great variety of valuable original and selected matter, can, it is expected, be supplied to new subscribers who may desire it.

JOHN R. HOWARD.
Paris, Tenn. Oct. 31st, 1839.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

J. R. HOWARD, Editor.

VOLUME I.]

PARIS, TENN. NOVEMBER, 1835

[NUMBER 11.]

Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to SUFFER and to RISE FROM THE DEAD the third day: And that REPENTANCE and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem Luke XXIV. 46, 47.

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that BELIEVETH and is BAPTIZED shall be SAVED: but he that BELIEVETH NOT, shall be DAMNED.—Mark XVI. 15, 16.

CHRIST'S COMMISSION TO HIS APOSTLES.

EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS Jude, 3.

Design of the New Testament Writings.

(From the Prefaces to the New Version.)

PREFACE TO THE EPISTLES.

Epistolary communications are not so easily understood as historic writings. The historian writes upon the hypothesis that his reader is ignorant of the facts and information which he communicates, and therefore explains himself as he proceeds. The letter-writer proceeds upon the hypothesis that the person or community addressed is already in possession of such information as will explain the things to which he only alludes or simply mentions. This is more especially the fact when the writer of a letter addresses a people with whom he is personally acquainted, amongst whom he has been, and with whom he has already conversed upon most of the subjects on which he writes. A letter to persons who have heard the writer before, who know his peculiarity; and, above all, who are perfectly acquainted with their own circumstances, questions, debates, difficulties, conduct, &c. may be every way plain and of easy apprehension to them, when it may be very difficult, and in places unintelligible, to persons altogether strangers to these things. It is a saying to which little exception can be made, that every man best understands the letters addressed to himself. It is true, if another person were made minutely acquainted with all the business from first to last, with all the peculiarities of the writer, and circumstances of the persons addressed, and with all the items of correspondence, he might as fully and as clearly understand the letter, as those to whom it was addressed.

There is no doubt but that the apostolic letters were plain and of easy apprehension, as respected the style and sentiment, to the persons who first received them, though some of the things contained in them might be difficult to be comprehended or fully understood even by them. The difficulties that lie in our way of perfectly understanding them, though much greater than those in the way of the persons to whom they were first sent, are not at all insurmountable. The golden key of interpretation is very similar to the golden rule of morality. To ascertain what we ought to do to others, on moral principle, we must place ourselves in their circumstances; and to ascertain the meaning of the apostolic epistles, we must place ourselves in the circumstances of the persons to whom they were written. So far a resemblance exists between the golden key and the golden rule. But to develop this principle and to exhibit its practical use, we shall lay before the reader a few considerations which will embrace the chief difficulties in our way, and the best means of surmounting them. What we advance on this subject may be considered as an answer to the question, *How shall we place ourselves in the circumstances of the persons addressed.*

In the first place then, we are to remember that these letters were written nearly eighteen centuries ago. This fact has much meaning in it: for it follows from it, that, excepting the prophetic part of these writings, not a word or sentence in them can be explained or understood by all that has happened in the world for eighteen hundred years. We might as well expect to find the meaning of Cicero's orations, or Horace's epistles, from reading the debates of the British Parliament, or of the American Con-

gress of last year, as to expect to find the meaning of these epistles from the debates and decisions of the Council of Nice, or of Trent, or of Westminster—from the ecclesiastical history, the moral philosophy, or the scholastic divinity of any age since John the Apostle resigned his spirit.

From the above fact it follows that the most accurate acquaintance with all those questions of the different sects, with all their creeds and controversies, which have engrossed so much of the public attention, if it does not impede, most certainly does not facilitate, our progress in the knowledge of the Apostolic epistles. As the Apostles did not write with any of our questions before their minds, or with a reference to any of our systems, it is presumptuous in the extreme to apply what they have said on other questions, to those which have originated since. And as they did not write with any design of making out a system of doctrine, it is preposterous to attempt to make out a system for them, and oblige them to approve it.

In the second place, as the Apostles wrote these letters with a reference to their own times, to the character and circumstances of the people with whom they were conversant, a knowledge of the character and circumstances of these people is of essential importance in order to understand the letters addressed to them.

By the *character* of the people, we mean not only their character at the time the letter was written, but also their previous character—what sort of persons they were before their conversion, as respected religion and morality—what their peculiar views and prejudices—and what their attainments in the learning and science of their age and country. By the *circumstances* of the people, we mean not merely their political and commercial standing, but as regards unity of views and co-operation—whether they were living in peace and harmony among themselves—whether they were persecuted by those of different sentiments—or whether they were enjoying tranquility unmolested from without.

In the third place, a knowledge of the character and circumstances of the writer of an epistle, is of essential importance in understanding it. His character as respects style and method—what his peculiar art of reasoning and modes of expression—what relation he bears to the persons addressed—whether personally acquainted with them, or by report—whether their father or brother in the faith—whether his letter is the first or second to them, or one of a series not extant—whether it was solicited on their part,

an answer to one from them, or written of his own accord—whether he addresses them alone, or others in conjunction with them—and whether he writes in his own name, or associated with others—and what their character and standing.

In the next place, great attention must be paid to his *design* in writing to them at that time. It must be ascertained whether he writes with a reference to their whole circumstances, or to some one more urgent consideration—whether that consideration was one that respected themselves merely, or others equally with them—whether he aimed at the full accomplishment of his design in one letter, or in more—or whether he reserved some things to a special interview, or to some persons soon to visit them.

In the fifth place, the reader must recollect that no one sentence in the argumentative part of a letter is to be explained as a proposition, theorem, proverb, or maxim, detached from the drift and scope of the passage. Indeed, neither words nor sentences in any argumentative composition, have any meaning but what the scope, connexion, and design of the writer give them. Inattention to this most obvious fact has beclouded the apostolic epistles, has introduced more errors into the views, and unmeaning ceremonies into the practice of professing Christians, than any other cause in the world. To this the cutting up the sacred text into morsels, called *verses*, has greatly contributed. Many passages, otherwise plain and forcible, have been weakened and obscured by this absurd interference.

The difficulties in the way of our understanding these epistles may be easily gathered from the preceding items. We must place ourselves in Judea, in Rome, or in Corinth, and not in these places in the present day; but we must live in them nearly two thousand years before we lived at all. We must mingle with the Jews in their temples and synagogues. We must visit the temples and altars of the Pagan Gentiles. We must converse with Epicurean and Stoic philosophers—with Pharisees and Sadducees—with priests and people that died centuries before we were born. We must place before us manuscript copies of these epistles, written without a break, a chapter, or a verse. We must remember what the writers *spoke* to the people before they *wrote* to them. We must not only attend to what they said and wrote, but to what they did. And we must always bear in mind the numerous and diversified enemies, in and out of authority, with whom they had to conflict. Now all these are apparently great difficulties, and, at first view, would seem to put

the golden key of interpretation out of the reach of all.

They are not, however, insurmountable. In reading any epistle, on any subject, written by any person, we are accustomed to attend to all these things, in substance, if not in form: Indeed, these are but the dictates of common sense, regarded by every person in the common occurrences of every day. Who is there that reads a letter from any correspondent without placing before his mind the character, views, and all the circumstances of the writer? Who is it that reads a letter addressed to himself or any other person, that does not attend to his own circumstances, or those of the person addressed, with a reference to the items of correspondence? Does he not regard the date, the place, the occasion, and the apparent design of the communication? Does he divide the letter into chapters and verses, and make every period or semicolon in it a proverb, like one of Solomon's; a theorem, like one of Euclid's; an axiom, like one of Newton's? Does he not rather read the whole of it together, and view every sentence in it in the light of the whole, and with a reference to the main design? Most certainly he does. All that is contended for in these remarks, is, that the same common sense should be applied to the apostolic epistles which we apply to all other epistolary communications.

We have said that the above-mentioned difficulties are not insurmountable; and in proof that they are not, and that we may place ourselves in the circumstances of those addressed in the epistles, with more ease than at first sight appears, we would call the reader's attention to the documents which the New Testament itself furnishes, to aid us in an effort of so much importance.

In the first place, then, the historical and epistolary books of the New Covenant afford us the necessary documents to place ourselves in the circumstances of the persons addressed, in all those points essential to an accurate apprehension of what is written to them. It presupposes that the reader is in possession of the ancient oracles; or that he has, or may have, the information contained in them. As much is recorded of the peculiar character and views of the Jews and Gentiles in the apostolic age, of the sects and parties of both people, as is necessary to understand the allusions to them in these writings; and in proportion to the important bearings that any historic facts have upon the apostolic epistles, is the amount of information afforded. For exam-

ple; there is no historic fact which explains so much of Paul's epistles, as the opposition which the Jewish brethren made to the reception of the Gentile converts into the Christian congregations, on the same footing with themselves; and there is no historic fact in the history of the lives and labors of the Apostles, so frequently and fully presented to the view of the reader as this one.

Indeed the number of facts necessary to be known in order to our associating around ourselves the circumstances of those addressed, in most of the apostolic epistles, is by no means great. It is rather the *importance* than the *number* of them which illustrates these writings. A few facts belonging to the apostolic commission explain a large proportion of the writings of the Apostles. For instance, they were to announce and proclaim to Pharisees, Sadducees, Samaritans, and men of all nations, that **JESUS THE NAZARENE WAS THE SON OF GOD AND THE SAVIOUR OF MEN.** When this was done, and some of all these people were persuaded of the truth of this proposition, the next work of the Apostles was, to associate them in one religious community by opening to their apprehension the import and design of the facts which they already believed. In making one new religious body or association of persons, whose former views, prejudices, partialities, and antipathies were so discordant, lay the chief difficulty, and constituted the most arduous part of the Apostolic labors. The Jew with great reluctance abandoned his prejudices against the Gentile; and the Gentile, with no less difficulty, was reconciled to the Jew. The Jew conceived that it would be an improvement upon the Christian religion to incorporate with it a few of the essentials of Judaism; and the Gentile fancied that some of his former much-loved philosophy would be a great acquisition to a Christian congregation. The infidel, or unbelieving Jews, attacked their brethren who associated with the Apostles—first by arguments, and lastly by political power; and the Gentile philosophers and magistrates alternately ridiculed and persecuted such of their brethren as united with this sect every where spoken against. The Apostles labored to keep the doctrine of the Messiah pure from any mixture with Judaism and Gentile philosophy, and to fortify the minds of the disciples with arguments to maintain their controversy against their opponents, and with patience and resolution to persevere amidst all sufferings and persecutions. Now these few facts, so frequently and fully stated in these

writings, go a great way in explaining some entire epistles, and many passages in others.

But in a preface to one of the Epistles we can illustrate and apply these principles to much better advantage than in such general remarks; and for this purpose we shall present the reader with a short preface to the epistle to the Romans, which has generally (both by the ancients and moderns) been considered the most obscure and difficult of all the epistles:—

PREFACE TO THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

As this epistle, when understood, is a sort of key to the greater number of Paul's letters, much depends on forming clear and comprehensive views of its import. As far as our limited means of furnishing such preparatory information as may assist the reader in examining it for himself will permit, we shall contribute our mite. In the first place we request the reader's attention to a few facts of great importance in the investigation of this epistle; and, indeed, of all Paul's epistles

I. The main question discussed in the narratives of Mathew, Mark, Luke, and John; or the grand topic of debate from the time John the Immerser appeared in the wilderness of Judea, till the resurrection of Jesus, was—*Whether Jesus the Nazarene was the Messiah?* The Jews on the one part, and the Saviour and his Apostles on the other, were the only persons engaged in the controversy—the principal parties in this discussion. Hence it was altogether confined to the Jews. Indeed, they only had the means of determining this point, as they were in possession of the oracles which foretold his coming, identified his person, and attested his pretensions.

II. The grand topic of debate from the resurrection of Jesus till the calling of the Gentiles, (an interval of several years.) was—*Whether Jesus who was crucified had actually arisen from the grave and ascended into heaven?* This, though different in form, was, in effect, the same as the preceding. It was differently proposed and argued, though tending to establish the same grand point. The Jews in Judea, the Samaritans, and the Jews in all the synagogues among the Gentiles whether the Apostles went, were the only persons who took an active part in this controversy.

III. After the calling of the Gentiles, and the number of disciples among the Jews had greatly augmented, a new question a-

rose, which, among the converts generally, and especially among those of the Jews, occupied as conspicuous a place as the first question did among the Jews in Judea. This question is as prominent in many of Paul's epistles as the former is in the historic books of this volume. It is thus—*Whether the Gentile converts had a right to be considered the people of God equally as the Jewish believers; or whether they should be received in the christian congregations of believing Jews, without submitting to any of the Jewish peculiarities, on the same footing with the circumcised and literal descendants of Abraham?*

IV. Many questions grew out of this one, which for a long time occupied the attention of the christian communities throughout the world, and called for the attention of the Apostles. But as Paul was the Apostle to the Gentiles, he was obliged to take a more active part in these discussions, and thus we always find him the bold and able advocate of their rights, however, or by whomsoever assailed. To this question we are doubtless indebted for much of the information which this Apostle has given us, as it was the occasion of so much being written on many topics connected with it, such as—

1st. The genius and design of circumcision. 2d. The promises made to Abraham. 3d. The nature and design of the Law of Moses, or Old Covenant. 4th. The righteousness of the Law, and the righteousness of Faith; or justification by works and justification by grace. 5th. The Jewish priesthood and sacrifices. 6th. The sacrifice of Christ. 7th. The grace of God, or the divine philanthropy. 8th. The election and calling of the Jews. 9th. The nature, design, and glory of the christian constitution and assembly; and many other topics subordinate to, and illustrative of, the one grand question concerning the reception of the Gentiles.

To simplify still farther, & to comprehend under a few heads the whole apostolic writings, it may be said that there are three gospels, with their circumstances, which engross the whole volume.

The first is "*the glad tidings,*" emphatically and supereminently so called, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, exhibited and proved to be the only begotten Son of God, sent to bless the people among whom he appeared, who credited his pretensions. The second is "*the glad tidings of salvation to the Gentiles,*" called "*the Gospel of their Salvation.*" This exhibits Jesus as the Saviour of the world, and his death as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. John,

in the common version called "*the everlasting gospel*," or good news, that the long apostacy, that the long dark night of anti-christian superstition, tyranny, and usurpation is passed; and that the kingdoms of the whole world have become the kingdoms and empire of Jesus, the King of kings.

The circumstances that gave rise to these three gospels constitute the shade in the picture of God's philanthropy. The development of the character and condition of the human family, relative to these *three gospels*, in connection with them, engross the whole apostolic writings. On this a hint or two must suffice.

As to that which is by way of eminence called "*the Gospel*"—the degenerate and apostate state of the most enlightened and favored nation among men, the descendants of the Father of the Faithful, form the contrast; and, as a foil, set off and brighten this most splendid of all exhibitions of the mercy of God, from which spring all other good news to men.

As to the second gospel or good news—the deplorable condition, the ignorance of God, and the nameless vices of the Gentile world, their long alienation from God, and scandalous idolatry, constitute a theatre on which to exhibit to advantage the glad tidings of God's gracious purposes towards them from the beginning, evinced in sending his Son to make a propitiatory sacrifice for their sins, and in calling himself the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews.

And as to the third gospel—the awful apostacy of the professed christian communities, and gross departure from the letter and spirit of the christian institution; their schisms, strifes, persecutions, which this apostacy has given rise to; the long rejection and continued infidelity of the Jews, with awful grandeur prepare the way for the proclamation of the everlasting good news—the joyful era when it shall be sung, "*Babylon the Great is fallen, never more to arise?*" The kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and his saints shall triumph with him for a thousand prophetic years! These engross the whole apostolic writings.

The first of these three has been fully discussed and established in the testimonies of the four Evangelists. The second is recorded in the book of the Acts of Apostles and developed in the epistles. The third, in some passages of the epistles, but particularly and fully in the last revelation made to the Apostle John.

The epistle to the Romans is altogether devoted to the second—and was written

with a design to prove that the believing Gentiles are, equally with the Jews; entitled to all the rights and immunities of citizenship in the kingdom of God's own Son.

This brings us to the epistle to the Romans in reference to which let it be remembered, that although the term *Roman*, in its most restricted sense, denoted a Pagan citizen of Rome, yet both Jews and proselytes who lived there were called *Romans* as well as the Pagan citizens of Rome. Hence Luke informs us that Roman sojourners, both Jews and proselytes, heard Peter announce the glad tidings on Pentecost in Jerusalem. Hence we may conclude that a congregation in Rome was formed soon after the return of the Roman Jews from Jerusalem. Though the congregation in Rome was at first composed exclusively of Jewish disciples; after the calling of the Gentiles, and especially at the time when Paul wrote this letter, it was composed of Jews and Gentiles.

Without going into a long detail of particular proofs to come at the *design* of the Apostle in writing this letter, we may readily gather from the epistle itself that the Jewish and Gentile disciples in this congregation were not perfectly reconciled on account of certain questions and debates involving the Jewish peculiarity; that the great question between the Jews and the Gentiles was not decided in this congregation, though so eminent in the Christian faith; that Paul wrote with a reference to the actual condition and circumstances of this people, according to the best information he had respecting them, not having been himself at Rome. As this congregation was placed in so conspicuous a place and was known to the whole Christian communities throughout the Roman empire, the settling of this question in Rome was a great object; and as the Apostle, though anxious to visit the city, had been prevented for a long time, he conceived the noble design of settling the difficulties between the Jewish and Gentile brethren in this city, by a long and argumentative epistle, embracing all the points of chief difficulty between the Jews and Gentiles in Rome and elsewhere. Such was the *design* of writing this letter, as the circumstances and allusions found in it, and all evidences, internal and external, evince.

Having formed such a design, the Apostle was at no loss how to execute it. He was well skilled in all the questions and customs, and expert in all the arguments of the Jews in the support of their peculiarity. He knew all that a Judaizer or an infidel Jew could say in support of his favorite theme. Besides,

as the Judazier, who aimed at bringing the Gentiles under the law, argued from the same topics that the infidel Jew handled to show the superiority of the Jew's religion and to oppose the Christian, the Apostle so arranges his arguments as to silence both. He was well aware that this letter would soon become public property, and that it would be read by all parties, as well as by the brethren to whom it was addressed; for all would be anxious to know what "the apostate Jew," as some called him, or the great "Apostle to the Gentiles," had to say with reference to these questions. He writes with all these things before his mind.

It is worthy of notice that the Apostle does not attempt to settle such questions merely, or, indeed at all, by his apostolic authority. Though his decision, without assigning a single reason for it, would be final amongst all Christians who recognized him as an Apostle; yet he does not attempt to settle the point in this way. He appears as a logician, and meets opposition, not by a decree, but by argument. In this way he enlightens and confirms the Christians in the faith, and qualifies them to convince and silence those who would not receive the decree of an Apostle, as that from which there is no appeal.

Now placing before our eyes the congregation of Christians in the great city of Rome, the mistress of the world, A. D. 57; every day visited by travelling Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, from all nations; considering the notoriety of this congregation having the eyes of the philosophers, priests, and illustrious men of Rome fixed upon it; bringing near to ourselves the prejudices of Jews and Gentiles against each other in former times, and the high conceptions of the former, as being the only people, righteous, elected, approved, and beloved of God; remembering, too, their contempt of the Gentiles, rulers and ruled; their keen sensibility on every topic affecting their national honor; at the same time fixing our eyes upon the author of this letter, his deep knowledge of the human heart, his profound acquaintance with the Jews' religion, and with the character and feelings of his countrymen; his great abilities as a logician; his divine skill in the Christian religion; his tenderness towards his brethren of the Jews; his zeal for their conversion;—keeping all these things in remembrance, and above all, his design in writing this letter, let us attempt an analysis of the argumentative part of it:—

1st. After his introduction and usual sal-

utation, he gives an exact exhibition of the religious and moral character of the Gentile world.

2d. He delineates the religious and moral character of the Jewish people.

His design in this part of the epistle is to prove, that the mass of the Jews and Gentiles were equally vile and obnoxious to divine vengeance; that neither of them could constitute any claim on the righteousness of God; that they were equally destitute of national righteousness, and of every plea founded upon their own character or works. He also shows that individuals amongst Jews and Gentiles, who acted in conformity to their means of knowing the character and will of God, were also in the divine estimation. In a word, he proves the Gentiles and Jews, whether considered nationally or individually, as "without any difference" respecting the great question which he discusses. He proves them "all under sin" and that God is equally "the God of the Gentiles and of the Jews."

3d. He, in the next place, exhibits "the righteousness of faith" as equally accessible to them both, as bearing the same aspect to them nationally and individually. In establishing this point, the difficulties existing between Jews and Gentiles, converted to Christianity, are decided. For let it be admitted that the Jews and Gentiles, before converted to Christianity, were without difference; that when converted to Christianity they were without difference as respected the righteousness of faith; and the consequence would be, that they should, without difference be admitted into the Christian communities. This is the scope, design, and termination of the argumentative part of this letter, which closes with the end of the eleventh chapter.

But the Jews had many objections to make to the positions which the Apostle lays down; and in exhibiting their objections, they argued from various topics, which the Apostle was obliged to discuss before he could triumphantly establish his positions. The principal topics were—*Circumcision, the Covenant with Abraham, the Promise of Canaan, the Law of Sinai, the Election and calling of the nation as the covenanted people of God.* These embrace the chief topics of argument, and these Paul must meet and repel, before he can carry his point argumentatively.

In the third chapter he meets the first objection. He introduces the Jew saying, "What profit is there in circumcision upon this hypothesis?" This objection he meets,

and while he acknowledges that it was an advantage to the Jew in several respects, he shows it avails nothing against the question he discusses. That circumcision made no man righteous, he fully proves, for in this respect the uncircumcised was as acceptable to God as the circumcised, and in some respects the Gentile condemned the Jew. After meeting a number of subordinate objections, growing out of this one, and fully proving from David's own words that the Jews were no better than the Gentiles, in the fourth chapter he meets the second grand objection, viz: *What do we on this hypothesis say that Abraham, the father of the Jews, obtained from the covenants of promise and the works enjoined upon him?* He shows that neither his circumcision, nor any work proceeding from that covenant, was accounted to him for righteousness; but that his *faith*, which he had as a Gentile, or "*before he was circumcised*," was "accounted to him for righteousness," and that his becoming the heir of a world, or of the promises made to him, arose not from any of the Jews' peculiarities. And while meeting their objections on this topic, he introduces those drawn from *the law*, and shows most explicitly that neither righteousness nor the inheritance of Canaan was derived through the law;—that Abraham was the righteousness in which the Gentiles are now accepted, and secured Canaan for his seed, without respect to law: for God gave Canaan to him and his seed by a promise, centuries before the law was promulgated. And thus he makes the covenant with Abraham an argument in favor of his design, proving from it that the Gentiles were embraced as his seed. And here let it be noted that the justification by works, and that by faith, of which Paul speaks, and of which our systems speak, are quite different things. To quote his words, and apply them to our questions about faith and works, is illogical, inconclusive, and absurd.

In proof that the Gentiles were included in the promises made to Abraham, and actually participated in his faith, in the beginning of the fifth chapter, he introduces their "experience," and identifies himself with them. After detailing these, and showing that Jesus died for them, as well as for the Jews; and that they, being reconciled by his death, would, most certainly, be saved through him; from the twelfth verse to the end of the chapter he shows the *reasonableness* of this procedure. For although the Jews might continue to cavil about the covenant of peculiarity with Abraham, he shows that the Gentiles were equally concerned with the Jews, in the consequences of

Adam's fall; and this section of the letter is decisive proof of the correctness of his arguments from the covenant with Abraham. While on this topic he expatiates on the superabundance of favor, that presents itself in the Divine procedure towards mankind, irrespective of national peculiarity, in a most striking contrast of the consequences of Adam's disobedience and the obedience of his antitype.

He meets an objection, in the sixth chapter, to the superabundance of this favor, and expatiates on it to the close; and in the seventh resumes the nature and design of the law, and by placing himself under it, and showing in himself the legitimate issue of being under it, proves its inefficacy to accomplish that for which the Jews argued it was designed.

In proving that the believing Jews were not under the law, he carries his arguments so far, as to lay the foundation for the Judaizers to object that he represented the law as a sinful thing. He might say "*Is the law sin, then?*" an apparently natural conclusion from what he had said of its abrogation. This he refutes, and proves it to be "holy, just and good." Then the Judaizer retorts, "*That which was good, then, was made death to thee!*" No, says Paul, but the law made sin death to me. This he demonstrates to the close of the chapter; in which he most lucidly represents the wretched condition of a Jew seeking eternal life by a law, which made his sins deserve death, and which he was unable to obey. The law clearly demonstrated goodness, righteousness, and virtue, but imparted no power to those under it, by which they could conform to it.

Thus he is led, in the eighth chapter, to exhibit the privileges of the believing Jews and Gentiles as delivered from the law. In expatiating on the privileges and honors of these under the New Covenant, he represents them as the adopted sons of God, as *joint heirs* with Christ. He also shows that while they continued in the faith and "jointly suffered" with the Messiah, they were considered as the people of God, the called, elected, justified, and glorified ones; and that no distress nor power in the universe could separate such joint sufferers from the love of God. On this point he is most sublime. But in representing the Gentile believers as the called according to God's purpose—as the elected, justified, and glorified members of his kingdom, he wounds the pride of the infidel and Judaizing Israelites, whose were the adoption, the glory of being God's people, the covenants, the law, the worship of God, the promises, the fathers, the Messiah! He invades their preroga-

tiya. This leads him to discuss their right to be always exclusively considered the chosen people of God. He examines their arguments, points out their mistakes, and repels their objections, with great ability, tenderness, affection, and zeal, to the close of the eleventh chapter.

In the ninth chapter he meets *three* objections to his leading argument:

1st. That on the hypothesis of God's choosing the Gentile nations, in calling them to be his people, his "promises to Israel (that is, to the nation) had fallen." This he refutes by showing *who are Israel* in the sense of the promises.

2d. That in choosing Jacob, and excluding Esau from the honor of being the progenitor of the nation, (as Paul represented it,) and in now excluding Israel and choosing the Gentiles, there appeared to be *injustice* with God. Paul, from the lips of Moses, their own lawgiver, demonstrates that there was no injustice in this procedure; that his humbling the Egyptians and exalting Israel was an act of justice as respected the Egyptians, and of merciful good pleasure as respected Israel; and that in so doing he advanced the knowledge of his character and exhibited his glory through all the earth.

3d. That from the principles which Paul exhibited as the basis of this procedure; the question might be put, "*Why does he find fault, for who has resisted his will?*" The Apostle, from the just and acknowledged principle of human action, shows the wickedness of such a question; that God had carried, with which long suffering, the Jews long since ripe for destruction, for the purpose of making their example, or his procedure to them, of benefit to the whole human race, and of rendering conspicuous his mercy to such of the nation as believed in the Messiah, as also to the Gentiles. And all this he proves to have been foretold by their own prophets.

In the tenth chapter he again exhibits the righteousness of faith as still accessible to both people, and the fatal ground of mistake which must consummate the ruin of Israel; and meets other objections, growing out of the ancient oracles, which he applies to this case. In the eleventh he answers other objections, such as "Has God cast off all his people?" "Have they stumbled on purpose that they might fall forever?"—"Were the natural descendants of Abraham broken off from being his people to make room for the Gentiles?" After removing every objection to the calling of the Gentiles to be God's people "*through the righteousness of faith,*" whether drawn from any thing in the past election, calling, or treat-

ment of the Jews; from the promises made to their fathers, from their own prophets, or from the moral character of the God of all nations; after triumphantly proving the positions with which he had set out, he concludes this chapter with appropriate admonitions to the Gentile believers, against those errors which had been the ruin of Israel. He corrects some mistakes into which they might fall, from what he had said concerning the election and rejection of Israel. From this to the close of the letter he admonishes and exhorts the brethren in Rome, both Jews and Gentiles, to bear with, and receive one another, irrespective of those peculiarities which had formerly been ground of umbrage or alienation; that as Christ had received them both to be his people, they should mutually embrace each other as such, and live devoted to him who had called them to the high honors and privileges which they enjoyed.

Such is the scope, design, and argument of this letter. To go farther into an investigation of it, would be to assume the office of a commentator, which is foreign to our purpose. These very general hints and remarks may serve to suggest to the reader a proper course of reading and examining the apostolic letters, and to impress his mind with the vast importance of regarding the *design* of each letter, and to guard against the common course of making detached sentences the theme of doctrinal expositions, and of "classifying texts" under the heads of scholastic theology—a method, the folly and pernicious tendency of which, no language can too strongly express.

The Church of Christ.

The Greek word *ekklesia* from which is translated the term *church* in the New Testament, simply means an *assembly* or *congregation* of people, of any kind and for any purpose or on any occasion convened. Dr. Adam Clarke has an excellent note on the meaning of the original term in his comment on the xvi chap. of Matt. "The term *CHURCH*, in Greek, *ekklesia*, occurs, for the first time, in ver. 18. of this chapter. The word simply means an *assembly* or *congregation*, the nature of which is to be understood from connecting circumstances; for the word *ekklesia*, as well as the terms *congregation* and *assembly*, may be applied to any concourse of people, good or bad; gathered together for lawful or unlawful purposes. Hence, it is used, Acts xix. 32. for the *mob*, or *confused rab-*

ble, gathered together against Paul, *ekklesia sungkechumenee*, which the town-clerk distinguished, ver. 39. from a lawful assembly, *ennomoo ekkleesia*. The Greek word *ekklesia*, seems to be derived from *ekkaloo*, to call out of, or from, i. e. an assembly gathered out of a multitude; and must have some other word joined to it, to determine its nature, viz. the *church of God*; the congregation collected by God, and devoted to his service. The *church of Christ*: the whole company of Christians wheresoever found." Dr. C. further observes: "In primitive times, before Christians had any stated buildings, they worshipped in private houses; the people that had been converted to God, meeting together in some one dwelling-house of a fellow-convert, more convenient and capacious than the rest; hence the church that was in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, Rom. xvi. 3, 5. and 1 Cor. xvi. 19. and the church that was in the house of Nymphas, Col. iv. 15. Now, as these houses were dedicated to the worship of God, each was termed *kurioi oikos*, the house of the Lord; which word in process of time, became contracted into *kurioik*, and *kuriake*; and hence *kirk* of our northern neighbors [Scotch], and *kirik* of our Saxon ancestors, from which, by corruption, changing the hard Saxon *c* into *ch*, we have the word *church*. This term, though it be generally used to signify the people worshipping in a particular place, yet by a metonymy, the container being put for the contained, we apply, as it was originally, to the building that contains the worshipping people." If the proper meaning of *ekklesia*, is assembly or congregation, as shown, then meeting-house, or some other appropriate term would be most proper to designate the building; as the people and the building are not the same, and cannot be made so by any figure of speech.

Where a particular congregation is alluded to it would be most correct and proper to say, the *Congregation of Christ* at such a place, meaning a part only of the general congregation or church of Christ, which assemble together; where more congregations than one, the *Congregations of Christ*; and where all the Congregations of Christ are alluded to as one body, *THE Congregation or Church of Christ*, using the definite article. Accordingly, with this

idea, it is said of him, that, "*Christ is the head of the church [congregation]*: and he is the Saviour of the body;"—"his body's sake which is the church;" and God is said to have given him, "to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." Hence Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians, in exhorting them to Christian unity, tells them, "There is *ONE body* and *ONE Spirit*, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; *ONE Lord*, *ONE faith*, *ONE baptism*, *ONE God* and Father of all, who is above all, & through all, & in you all." As Christians "are the body of Christ and members in particular," and "we are members of his body," there must have been a time when we were not members, and consequently some way in which, and sometime when, we became members. As there is but *one* head of the church, which is Christ, there can be but *one* body, the church. There cannot be *many* bodies any more than there can be *many* heads, and *many* Spirits. Accordingly Paul says, as quoted above, "there is *ONE body* and *ONE Spirit*," and "*ONE Lord*" or head. And as there is but one body, one Spirit and one Lord, there can be but one way of becoming a member of this one body, but one door of admission into it. Accordingly Paul says, as just quoted, "there is *ONE faith*, *ONE baptism*," one faith as the principle, and one baptism as the institution, of admission into this body, the Church. It was not an assent to a "Confession of Faith," or "Book of Discipline," or creed of any sort, or a confession of forgiveness of sins, that was made the principle of admission into the body of Christ and a prerequisite to baptism; but the confession that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God." It was upon the truth involved in this confession that our Lord told Peter he would build his church and the gates of Hades should never prevail against it. On his inquiry of his Disciples, "whom do ye say that I am?" Peter replied, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Upon this rock," says Christ to him, "I will build my church, and the gates of hell [Hades] shall not prevail against it." Accordingly Paul tells the Ephesians, that they were "BUILT upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ

himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the *building*, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom also ye are *built* together, for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Before this great truth can be confessed it must be *believed*, and it cannot be believed only upon prophetic and apostolic *testimony*; the testimony of prophets in predicting the Messiah, pointing out the circumstances of his birth, life, death, resurrection, &c. and thus characterising him,—and the testimony of the apostles who were the *witnesses* of the facts which constituted the fulfilment of the prophecies. These predictions centering in the Messiah, with the facts constituting their fulfilment, proved him to be the Son of God, the chief corner or foundation stone of his church. The prophets testified by the "Spirit of Christ" that was in them; and the apostles preached the gospel with the same Holy Spirit. Peter speaking of the salvation enjoyed under the Christian dispensation, says, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves but unto us [apostles] they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven."

This same confession of which we are speaking Paul makes a necessary prerequisite to receiving the present salvation. He calls it "the word of *faith*," preached by the apostles. "The word of faith which we preach," he says, "That if thou shalt confess with thy *mouth* the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be *saved*. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the *mouth* confession is made unto *SALVATION*." To confess the Lord Jesus is to confess that he is Lord, or the Son of God, on which his Lordship is predicated; as Paul says in another place, "every *tongue* shall confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord*, to the glory of

God the *Father*." As the resurrection of Christ was necessary to constitute him, "Lord both of the *dead* and *living*;" ("For to this end," says Paul, "Christ both died, and *rose*, and revived again, *that* he might be Lord both of the dead and living,") Lord of the dead as he will raise them from the dead and reward or punish them, and Lord of the living as we must obey him and live unto him as our Lord and Ruler,—a confession of him with the mouth involves a belief from the heart in his resurrection, for faith must necessarily precede confession, which without it cannot be made. Hence we are said to rise with Christ in baptism "by the *faith* of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead," or as it is more correctly and plainly rendered, "through the belief of the strong working of God who raised him from the dead." Without the confession unto salvation, how can any one reasonably or scripturally claim or expect to receive this salvation? The Eunuch made it to Philip who baptized him upon it. He commenced at the *prophecy* of Christ's death in Isaiah and "*preached* unto him Jesus," (the *prophets prophesied* and the *apostles preached*.) Coming to water he wishes to be baptized. "*If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*," replies Philip. The Eunuch confesses with his *mouth*, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Philip baptizes him. This is all the confession required before baptism, as we have asserted and proven; and not either assent to a creed or forgiveness of sins. So much here for confession.

As to the "one baptism," by which, upon the principle of faith manifested by confession, we are initiated into the body of Christ, it is the baptism of water, not of the Holy Spirit or fire, which would make two or three baptisms, and contradict Paul who says there is but "*one*." It is immersion in water, for in it and by it we are buried with Christ in the likeness of his burial. We are "*buried* with him *in baptism*," and "*buried* with him *in baptism*." As Jesus must be proven to be the Son of God before we can believe in him as such, and as we must believe in him, which is the one faith required, before we can be baptized; hence the order of the Apostle, "one Lord, one faith, one bap-

tism." As believers are "*buildd* to gether" in the Lord "for an habitation of God *through the Spirit*," they cannot on scripture premises receive this Spirit which inhabits, fills and animates the church, the body of Christ, neither before nor until they become members of that body in the way above pointed out. By being "born of water and the Spirit" we become the children or sons of God, and, "because ye *are* sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father;" not to *make* them sons or *before* they became sons. As a body must be formed before a spirit can inhabit it; hence the order of the Apostle again, "one body and one Spirit." The Church of Christ is a spiritual building consisting of living stones. "Ye also," says Peter, "as **LIVELY [LIVING] stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up SPIRITUAL sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.**" As they are introduced into this building by baptism upon a *CONFESSION of faith* in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, they must have been capable of having faith and making a confession, before they could form a part of this building. It is impossible for any one incapable of either, to be a *living* stone, living by *faith* and *spiritually* alive.

Thus built upon the rock, "the Christ, the Son of the living God," they form a building against which the gates of Hades shall never prevail. "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall never prevail against it." The Lord has always had such a building, ever since the foundation was laid by his death, burial, and resurrection, and the building commenced upon it in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after he arose from the dead. If he has not always had a people who were as really the people of the Lord as the first Christians; then has not the building been destroyed, the foundation left without it, and the gates of Hades prevailed?

Brethren of this Reformation; are you this spiritual building whose foundation is upon this Rock? Then fear nothing. "The gates of Hades *shall* not prevail against it."

EDITOR.

Only Foundation of Christian union.

(From T. Fanning's Discourse.)

We cannot expect to unite all sects by force of arms—threatenings and arguments cannot drive them together. No man will be suffered to be a leader in the union of any people. All must be equals and brethren. But the fact is, leaders and the led, as sects, cannot amalgamate. They have no affinity, or cohering properties for each other. No, there is not enough cohesive attraction in the best sect of the age to hold together but a few years. There is no human bond upon which all could agree, and, consequently, none that will permanently unite any two of them. 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.

It was not the wish of the Savior to unite all the corrupt sects of the Jews, but only to take down "the middle wall," so they could not help, as individuals, flowing together. We must also clear out the rubbish of accumulated ages, by blotting these sects, that have risen in a few years or centuries at most, from the arena, and go back to original ground, where all will grow spontaneously together, and form one body in Christ, our living Head. All must give up something; but let us be proud to sacrifice our errors at the shrine of truth.

But short-sighted mortals are we, to think some of our *isms*, such as Calvinism, Arminianism, Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Mormonism, &c. &c. are true, not considering these are only creations of yesterday, in comparison with Christianity. The religion of the Bible, all must confess, existed much more pure hundreds of years before any of these were born, than it has since: and it can only be, as it was anciently, when, like morning clouds, parties are blown away by the balmy breath of truth, and all return to the long forgotten constitution.

In this we have nothing to lose, but are all gainers; except those in high places, who will be dragged down, and put the least in the church, where only it is safe for them to be. But the world can never be convinced on this subject, till we are free from the pernicious idea, that all our Christianity has come through the corrupt church of Rome and its branches.

The church of Christ was established upon another foundation, "upon a Rock," and the Son of God said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The history

of this church, as far as the scriptures go, tells us, the saints "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching, prayers, breaking of bread," &c. But neither the Romanists, nor any other sect in the world, has ever thus acted. This was the state of affairs to the fourth century, but direct history goes no farther. Only, then, from incidental accounts, can we get a knowledge of this religion, in all ages to the present. Did we now have a correct history of Christianity, it would not be the bloody record of the wars of Romanists and dissenters for fifteen hundred years. No, it would be the blazing narrative of a people that studied not war, but followed peace with God and all mankind. To convince learned men there have ever been such people is no task, but to give such a volume of light that all the world could see it at once, would require many years of arduous labor. Still, I trust, there is a day, not far distant, when Christianity will be pointed out, on the map of time, as something different from what the great mass have been supposing.

Superficialists, and those who do not read and understand the New Testament, presume *the thing* among us called Christianity is the religion of Christ. But there is little more resemblance between them than sin and holiness—heaven and earth.

If it were shown to a demonstration that the religion of the apostolic age has not been seen or acted since, (which is not the fact,) yet it would be no reason persons seeing Christianity, as it was then, should not return to it immediately.

God is the same, his government has not changed, and, consequently, his worship can only be performed in precisely the same manner. Only one step, and we are on primitive ground. Let us unmanacle ourselves from partyism, and at one effort we are landed safely in the kingdom of the Redeemer. At the door of the kingdom we leave our party churches and names, and are born members of the church of Christ, and assume no titles the gospel does not recognize.

I make the solemn appeal to the pious and thinking world, while I ask, if taking the Bible alone, belonging to the church of Christ alone, confessing no names but these divinely given, such as, "disciples of Christ," "Christians," "Saints," "brethren," &c. is not the original ground of union? Moreover, is it not only the ground upon which all Christians can now unite? Such a plan was never proposed by Luther, Calvin, or Wesley, &c. consequently, none of their followers, in their divisions & pointing out new plans, have ever proposed and acted upon

this firm foundation. But it seems to be the prevailing sin of the age, to advocate any thing before God's manner of dealing, and all new worships and titles are preferred to Christ's. Yet it is in some respects, as it ever has been—Jesus came in his Father's name, and him the people would not receive, but he said, "if one come in his own name, him you will receive." So it is now.—Any rule before the New Testament, and any profession before the Christian. The reformers all stopped their reformation too soon, by prescribing rules, merely human dogmas, and making a party upon a creed; each supposing he had attained the *ne plus ultra* of Christian knowledge and improvement. This is the fatal rock upon which all the reformers have split, and wrecked their vessels to atoms, that are now drifting on the wide sea of conjecture and fanaticism.

But no one can say this is apostolic ground. No wonder, then, the followers of these men, thus hedged in, could never see and feel the liberty of the ancient Christians.

I persuade not the thinking to be convinced of these propositions, for I know the reflecting and honest must be, when the argument is felt in its full force.

But do my sectarian friends ask me for an example, now in the world, of apostolic order? Admitting, for the sake of argument, there are no churches now on earth constituted on the Bible, and living according to the ancient ordinances—it would be no excuse for us to remain partisans, after seeing, as clear as the noon-day sun, that all sects are opposed to Christianity and the conversion of the world. But, praise to God, the postulate is not true; a reformation has been proposed and acted upon with amazing success in the nineteenth century, such as all history is challenged to show, since the great apostacy. It is the sweeping proposition to turn from the delusions of Popery and all factions, to the entire adoption of God's revelation and primitive practice, in opposition to the systems of men, and worships merely human. For the information of many, and not as a matter of ostentation, I will be permitted to state a few facts about present prospects. In Europe there are some who have adopted the Bible and its worship as the only safe course in religion. But, in the United States, there are over a hundred thousand, mostly in the western country, who have taken the Bible, untrammelled by human philosophy and scholastic extravagances, and made a bold and solemn march for primitive ground and practices. In this movement Christ is our only Leader, and we need no teachers—

(No man is qualified to teach another to un-

when we are all "kings and priests," teaching each other, by the gospel, the way of salvation. It could not be otherwise, when we extricate ourselves from sectarianism and cleave to the unadulterated Christianity that gives peace. This, we are assured, is taking a different and higher stand than any worshipping community on earth, and, consequently, ours is the most responsible station now occupied. We have no bonds of union of our own, and no pride to be gratified, in asking men to come to us, as if we had something new.

No, the good old way of the New Testament is what we wish to see restored.—Therefore, by divine authority, we call on the religious world to renounce their fables and theological romances, and take up Christianity, pure and uncontaminated as it came forth from the plastic hand of its Maker—God. If ever those that love God are made to love each other, as they should, we are sure it must be upon this broad foundation. The platforms of sects we have already seen too narrow to hold any of them together but a short time. The views and feelings of all parties are entirely too contracted for the generous spirit of Christianianity. Therefore, in taking this high and original ground, we feel not only confident of our own rectitude, but also a strong assurance that this cause must triumph.

Our course is not one of theory and idle speculation, but of truth and practice. I am well aware the observing must see and approve this plan; but no party can walk in it. If it were, it would no longer be a sect. Though it is obvious persons may profess to take the Bible alone, and, in part, a scriptural name, yet, with many, it requires a considerable time to get from under the veil of superstition, dreams, whins, unaccountable ecstasies, and downright fanaticism, that, as a dark shade of night, have been entailed from our ancestors. It is a remarkable fact, in the history of the world, that the greatest blessings of heaven have been grieved, and Christianity more than any other. With factionists this religion has but little definite meaning, but is made a kind of a broad mantle, to cover over all the enormous heresies of fifteen hundred years. In adopting the revelation of God and the honorable appellations of Christ in the New Testament, we wish it to be with dignity and childlike simplicity; and in this cause we expect to strengthen and grow, while life and breath and being last. We refer to no party to know whether or not we are right, but always to the Bible, as the touchstone of all our truth. Thus, if we are to be sincere, we must be true

of the world, we take enough of our own whims to obscure and paralyze the Christianianity we have. Doubtless, many of the Christian principles are in Mohamedanism, Quakerism, Romanism, and all the Protestantisms, of the world; but so much tradition and human folly are lugged in with it, that the religion of Christ has lost its force and spiritual influence among them.

Again, we may connect any name in scripture with some fable, or appendage of our own taste, and thus make what is spiritual by itself, a ridiculous perversion of all propriety and scripture. For instance, "disciples of Christ," "Christians," and "saints," are gospel designations; but to say, Baptist disciples of Christ, Universalist Christians, and Quaker saints, is so far from denoting any thing in the Bible, that it is utterly opposed to the genius of the Christian institution. As before observed, "Church of God," "Church of Christ," and "Church of the saints," are gospel designations of the congregations of believers, and *Christian*, doubtless is "the name of Christ given to his disciples. But to connect this holy name with any thing human, it does not mean at all what it does in the Bible. A Universalist Christian, or a Calvinistic Christian, is an intolerable anomaly in the use of the Name. To say "Christian sect," "denomination," or "order" is giving a sectarian aspect, and is anti-scriptural phraseology, and therefore should be rejected. Mortal man dare not let his cold, death-like words fall among the Savior's as authority, for, like the pestiferous breath of contagion, they corrupt all the good around them. I am not arguing the point, whether or not any in these sects are christians, but this circumlocution I use, to show the danger of uniting carnal and spiritual things together. Therefore, as persons who love a pure speech, we declare we are members of the church of Christ, and, as members, we take all the names of the New Testament in their consecrated import. This is "the form of sound words," through which spiritual life can be restored and party feuds destroyed at once. In consequence of losing a pure enunciation, and the genuine form of sound teaching of the ancient Christians, the spirit and power of Christianity cannot be fully realized in sectarian ranks. It is true that parties quarrel much about the operations they perform upon them, but the considerable ones, say the most of these operations are unbridled fanaticism & a zeal for a sect. To see Christianity acted, when it engages the whole soul and energies of man, is the grand desideratum. The only way to see it so acted is to see it in its pure form. There

may be a form and not the substance, but the substance without cannot exist without the form. Then let us restore the ancient land-marks, and once more walk on holy ground, and breathe in a purely Christian atmosphere; for there, and there alone will we find the spiritual life of Christ.

An increase of vital piety, and a cultivation of all the finer feelings of the heart, is our great aim; yet this cannot be done but by leaving the corrupt atmosphere of party and returning to the heaven-born and spiritual religion of the Bible. The tall messengers of God would look with complacency upon all who would have a zeal for this cause according to knowledge. All heaven was once pleased with this worship & the same shining hosts must be again when it is acted. I long to see the day come when it will be done. Then will Zion shine forth as the sun in his noon-tide majesty, and the world will be attracted by the light of God's revelation, pouring its golden rays through the church into the dark bosoms of creation. May sects cease, and all Christian forces be united against the common enemies of God and man, that a better state of society may exist in the world, than the annals of time have recorded. May the day be near, when Christ shall reign alone, in all the God-like majesty, for which the faithful of the whole world are praying. Then the saints will stand,

"Amid the outrage of external things,
Firm as the solid base of this great world,
And through the closing ruin hold our way,
When nature calls us to the destined goal."

The Body and Members of Christ.

"Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular," says Paul in his first letter to the Corinthian Christians. And to the Ephesians, "there is one body and one Spirit." There is but one body of Christ then, which is "his body the church," of which he is the head, for he is the "head of his body the church." If there are more bodies than one, then there are more heads than one and more Spirits than one. As all the members of a man's body are animated and actuated by the man's spirit and directed by his head, so the members of Christ's body are animated and actuated by his Spirit and directed by the "head." And as one of the members of a man's body, his eye, foot or hand, if cut off and separated from the body, will be deprived of the life that

is in it and perish, so if one of the members of Christ's body be cut off or separated from that body, it will be deprived of spiritual life and decay and perish! Our Saviour has beautifully illustrated this by the similitude of the vine and its branches. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman, [or vine dresser.] Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth [pruneth] it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye [the twelve disciples] are clean [or pruned] through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, 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. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God;" and we are all the children of God by *faith* in Jesus Christ: for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ;" and are then grafted into him, as the branch into the vine, and being put him on are in him, in his body and members of that body, in which the Spirit dwells and which it animates and vivifies.

The Holy Spirit is to the body of Christ, what the sap is to the branches of the vine. Separate a branch, and it loses the sap; separate a member, and he loses the Spirit. It is by the word that the Spirit abides in the body and its members. "If ye abide in me and *my words* abide in you," &c. How important then to be engrafted and remain in the body of Christ, to let the *word* of Christ dwell in us richly, and Christ dwell in our hearts by *faith*! By mutual union, communion and sympathy, the Spirit pervades all the body. What can these promise themselves who do not belong to this body, or who belong to any *other* body? Where is any promise to *them* in all the Book of God? How can they feast upon the life giving sacrifice of Christ every Lord's day, through the medium of the

emblems of his broken body and shed blood, upon which his body the church is feasted and by which it is nourished, and strengthened, and invigorated, when they are not a member of that body, or belong to some other body that, not holding the head, neglect to attend to it regularly? "Except ye eat of 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."

EDITOR.

Christ the Head of his Body.

Christ is not called the head of the church, when the church is considered in the light of a congregation, but when it is spoken of under the figure of a "body." Those who have so much use for the stale phrase, "head of the church," would do well to find authority for such a phrase, or desist from its use. We will now instance a few passages for the purpose of shewing that disciples are not regarded as a church, but as a "body," when Christ is spoken of as the "head." "Till we all come to 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. 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 by speaking the truth in love, may grow up in him in all things, which is the head even Christ. From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplies, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, makes increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."—Eph. 4: 15. "And he is the head of the body, (the church,) who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence."—Col. 1: 18. "And not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and ligaments, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increases with the increase of God."—Col. 2: 19. We shall quote but one

passage more, and that is the one on which those who take the opposite side of the question rely. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the Savior of the body. Here the church is regarded as a body, sustaining the same relationship to Christ, so far as government is concerned, which a wife does to her husband.—Extracted from the "Primitive Christian."

Revivalism in New England.

The following are the titles of two works recently published in Vermont, and reviewed in the (Boston) Christian Examiner: "*Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, or JEDEDIAH BURCHARD & Co. during a Protracted Meeting of Twenty-six Days in Woodstock, Vermont. By RUSSELL STREETTER.*" "*Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, by Rev. JEDEDIAH BURCHARD; with an Appendix, containing some Account of Proceedings during Protracted Meetings, held under his Direction, in Burlington, Williston, and Hinesburg, Vermont, December, 1835, and January, 1836. By C. G. EASTMAN.*"

We here extract a greater part of the review, as containing an exposition of the extravagancies of the revival system, when fully and legitimately carried out.

EDITOR C. R.

This man evidently owes most of the influence and notoriety he has obtained among Revivalists, to his having taken up the extravagancies of his predecessors, and carried them out a little farther. The agitators whom he has thus exceeded and supplanted are alarmed, it is true, or affect to be so, and watch all his motions with suspicion and jealousy; but the same sort of people who once followed them, now follow him in preference, and probably enough will next year leave him to follow somebody still more extravagant. It is the irremediable vice of the revival system, which by making religion depend on artificial excitements, or on excitements of any kind, requires that these excitements should be continually varied and increased, in order that the unnatural craving

ings they create may be met and satisfied. As for talent or ability, it will not be pretended, of course, that Mr. Burchard has given evidence of possessing any thing like a general power, or accuracy, or enlargement of mind; but for the single business of agitating a not very enlightened population, his gifts are certainly considerable, and his experience and training such as to turn them to the best account; his very want of intellectual and moral refinement being one of the secrets of his success. Of his early history we know nothing more than what he has told us himself. "I was as abominable a rebel against the law of God, till I was four-and-twenty years old, as ever trod the earth, rushing headlong to eternal perdition." His air, and manner, and personal appearance, are thus described by Mr. Stree-ter, in giving an account of his first discourse at Woodstock.

"When Mr. Burchard made his *debut*, his appearance was so different from what was expected by some, and feared by others, that they were taken by surprise. To the superficial observer, his appearance was prepossessing. He has a good forehead, dark searching eyes, and a stern expression of countenance. He was dressed in dandy-like form. All his movements were slow and studied to theatrical exactness. He opened his psalm-book wide to read, bringing the lids nearly in contact; and uttered his words generally in a low, impressive voice. His first prayer was singular in the extreme. It was delivered in a key barely above a whisper, as though he were afraid of disturbing the Object or objects of his devotion."—*Mirror*, &c., pp. 14, 15.

"It must continually be borne in mind, that with Mr. Burchard, '*manner is matter.*' He came here fresh to the work, having rested and restored himself a week at Windsor. He spake with great emphasis, and made small words appear large as mountains. His discourses were perfectly familiar to him, having been preached hundreds of times. He knew exactly how to pronounce every sentence, so as to produce the greatest effect. He was 'theatrical' in the highest possible degree. He frequently struck his hands together, making a loud report. Every nerve and muscle was called into requisition, and though his action was unsuitable for the pulpit, it answered his purpose. The house at once became a *heatre*, and the news went out as on wings

of lightning, that Mr. B. had performed in '*twelve theatres,*' to universal acceptance, but '*got religion*' a few years since, and is now the greatest preacher in the world."—*Ibid.*, pp. 16, 17.

Another and more painful question now arises on which both the books before us are intended to throw some light; we mean, as to the degree of honesty and sincerity he must be supposed to bring to these efforts. If any confidence is to be placed in the following statements, certified under oath, it is plain that his notions of commercial integrity are not such as to reflect much credit on his character and professions in other respects. That the reader may understand these statements, it is only necessary to premise, that Mr. Burchard, after much importunity, had succeeded at last in purchasing of Mr. Tenney, the stenographer employed by Mr. Goodrich, the short-hand notes of several of his own discourses, which Mr. Tenney had already taken for Mr. Goodrich.

"Mr. Burchard wished to conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, (not knowing that any one else was in the secret except Mr. Tenney.) and, with a view to this purpose, proposed, the following arrangement. Finding that Mr. Goodrich was wholly unacquainted with stenography, Mr. Burchard proposed that, on his return from his journey, Mr. Tenney should offer him *counterfeit sermons*, which were to be made simply by scribbling over a number of the books, such as had been used in writing down the sermons, with stenographic characters, put down at random. These were to be given to Mr. Goodrich on his return, as the *genuine manuscripts*. Mr. Burchard told Mr. Tenney that this was the only means by which he (Burchard) could conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, and that, when Mr. Goodrich called on him to write out the notes for the press, he must tell him '*that he could not conscientiously do it,*—that he had altered his mind, as to Mr. Burchard and his measures, and that as he had made no agreement to copy them for the press, he would not do it.' Mr. Tenney objected, that if he should desist from taking his sermons at any time before the meeting closed, people would at once conjecture that he (Burchard) had hired him to do so. This difficulty was to be removed by the following arrangement. Mr. Burchard marked a number of small

books, such as were used in taking down sermons, with a private mark, and Mr. Tenney was to continue, as usual, to write in the church, and to use the books which Mr. Burchard had marked. These were to be handed to him at the anxious-seats, if it could be done without observation; if not, they were to be delivered to him after the meeting, or in the crowd, while the people were going out. For these sermons also, counterfeits were to be prepared and presented to Mr. Goodrich as genuine, as before stated. In order to enable Mr. Tenney to do this, Mr. Burchard supplied him with the texts of all the sermons he had preached in this place."—*Sermons, &c.*, pp. 83, 84.

Many other facts are stated, which will go far to create a suspicion in some minds, that he is never less serious, than when for obvious reasons he puts on the appearance of being most so. Take, for example, an extract from an account of a scene in the Inquiry Room, given by Mr. Metcalf, the gentleman referred to therein, and known at the time by Mr. Burchard to be unaffected by what was going on around him, and to be capable of seeing through the whole.

"Having gained such a victory, he returned to me again and said, 'O, friend Metcalf, I wish you could give up your heart; but I suppose you can't,'—and smiled.*

"Then, all those who had given their hearts to God, were told to rise up, and when Mr. B. had questioned and advised each one, Mr. Southgate registered the names among the hopefully converted.—Standing near me, he commenced with a large lad or young man, who was next at hand, by saying, 'Now, you have given your heart to God; and it is infinitely the most solemn act of your whole life.' (The young man was sighing and sobbing, and Mr. B. put his hand upon my knee, and gave it a gentle grip.) 'If you go back into the world and live as you did before conversion, you will sin against the Holy Ghost, and be damned for ever; for that sin can't be forgiven. Now, young man, do you give yourself up to God, to be saved or damned, as God may see fit!' 'Yes, Sir,' was the reply, in a whimpering voice; and Mr. B. gave my knee another grip. I could hardly keep my countenance; not knowing wheth-

er the sign was gracious or roguish. The young convert was finished off with a prayer, and the scribe directed to put down his name. He went over with the whole, a dozen or more, in the same way, calling each, one by name in prayer, and implying that their souls were saved, and their sins were forgiven."—*Mirror, &c.*, pp. 130-132.

We cannot omit to notice, in this connexion, another charge, often advanced or insinuated in the book last quoted, and confirmed from other sources. "The matter is now conceded," says Mr. Streeter, "that Mr. Burchard is upon a money-making game. At the rate he is going on, he and his 'Episcopalian' lady, will clear three or four thousand dollars in a year. Their wages here, were not less than four hundred dollars per month!"

After all, however, we cannot bring ourselves to believe, but that Mr. Burchard is, in the main, sincere and honest in that sense in which alone most of the one-sided, "one idea" zealots of the present day can be said to be so. The history of the apparent and real moral obliquities of this description of persons, (and society was never more plagued with them on all sorts of subjects than now,) would seem to be this. By dwelling almost exclusively on one measure or project, and greatly exaggerating its relative importance, and allowing themselves to become unduly excited respecting it, they gradually lose the power of accurate moral discrimination, at least in regard to all questions implicated in the matter in hand. At length the judgment, and conscience, and whole mind, become radically and permanently disordered; so that right will often strike them as wrong, and wrong as right, according as it promises to hinder or promote the desired object. And in such a case we cannot properly say, that they are insincere or dishonest in regard to this or that particular act: we can only say, that by a blind zeal, often aided doubtless by ambition, and vanity, and still more sordid interests, their whole intellectual and moral nature has become perverted and corrupted in itself.

Some, we are aware, would prefer to have no notice whatever taken of a fanatic

*He then told me a long story about a club of opposers whom he converted, one after another, at Lockport, called *the five hard heads.*"

whose ignorance and coarse taste mark all his performances; but such persons are more fastidious than wise. Considered merely as a study elucidating the natural history of religion, and indicating the liability of tolerably enlightened communities to contagious delusions, it certainly is neither uninteresting nor useless to trace the causes and effects of every new manifestation of the revival principle. Besides, Mr. Burchard on many accounts is not a man to be despised; his ability to do mischief is not to be measured by his ability to do good, and the best security of the public against it is to be found in appraising them beforehand of the true character and tendency of what is peculiar in his spiritual mechanics. There is more to alarm us in the vaunt than in the argument contained in the peroration of his introductory sermon at Woodstock.

"So you see, my friends, that I have only taken your hearts right out, and held them up naked before you, and turned them over and over, that you might see them. There is no mystery—no charm about this matter. You can all understand it. I do here, just as I did at Springfield, Acworth, Perkinville, and Grafton, where God poured out his Holy Spirit with power, and lawyers, physicians, merchants, farmers, mechanics, &c. were converted and enjoyed the hope of salvation in their souls. Was it not the work of the Holy Ghost there, or were these men of intellect and learning such fools as to come right forward and take the anxious-seats and give their hearts to God, when it was the effect of mechanism and fanaticism, instead of the Spirit of God! Hark! look here; I have seen men of the greatest intellect—judges, and senators, and generals, & colonels, and captains, come and get down upon their knees and ask prayers of a feeble piece of clay, and God Almighty sent the Holy Ghost right into their souls, and they were converted [slapping his hands together] in a moment."—*Ibid.*, pp. 27, 28.

Mr. Burchard complains, that the most formidable opposition encountered by him wherever he goes, is not from sinners and misbelievers, but from the lukewarmness of men professing to be orthodox, and friendly to revivals "in the abstract," though not to his revivals. Accordingly, he does not hesitate to denounce these mangers of Calvinism, as no better than temporizers and "dumb dogs."

"Some preachers" says he, "are afraid to preach the plan of salvation, as the Scriptures declare it. They darst not say to transgressors, you will go to hell and be damned eternally, unless God has elected you to eternal life, and decreed your salvation according to his unalterable purpose.—They are afraid of offending some of the church that can't bear this doctrine, or some of the congregation that don't like such harsh preaching. So they fritter, and fritter, and fritter away the doctrine of election and decrees and endless damnation, till it is good for just nothing at all. They are afraid to say, 'Sinner, you will go to hell and be damned for ever, unless God Almighty elected you to eternal life, before the world was made, the planets moved, or the sun shone in the firmament.' They want to please everybody,—so they speak smooth things, and spend a whole week in writing one or two discourses, which they deliver on the Sabbath, in such a genteel way, that nobody is offended. The hearers say, 'What a mild preacher we have got here; how pleasantly he speaks. He don't preach about decrees, and purposes, and eternal damnation. He is a fine man; Come, let us go over to the tavern and take something to drink.' Ha! that's the way then, is it, to teach transgressors!—The way to lead them to hell!! Never was a sinner truly converted to God, by such miserable stuff. I have no allusion to the preaching here, nor to any person now present. But I tell you that I ain't afraid to preach Calvinism. Thank God, I am a Calvinist and ain't ashamed to own it."—*Ibid.*, pp. 76, 77.

He not only avows his innovations on the practice of other revivalists, particularly as regards the summary manner in which he hurries through the processes of conviction and conversion, but alleges reasons for the same, which those who maintain the expediency of artificial revivals, or who believe that these movements are to be resolved into special influences of God's Spirit, will not find it easy to set aside.

"But stop, sir, look here,—you like improvements in every thing excepting religion? Must things always go on the same old way? When I was young, we used to winnow grain with a fan, and it was slow work. Afterward, a machine was invented that would work much faster. And if an invention should be sought out by which one man would winnow an hundred bushels in a day, you would be pleased with it. The more work it would turn off, the better. So it should be

in revivals. I used to work a week, as hard as I could, to get eight, nine, ten, eleven, converted. And when we made twenty converts in a week, it was noised all about the country, as though we had wrought wonders. But now you see I count an hundred and a hundred and ten, as at Grafton, Chester, Springfield, and Acworth. And I expect to live to see the day, when I shall see *three thousand souls converted in a day.* Yes, three thousand souls saved from hell in a day!"—*Ibid.*, pp. 48, 49.

Again, in a discourse on our Lord's stretching forth his hand to save Peter, he goes into the following characteristic defence of his own way of doing these things, in an imaginary conversation between the Apostle, after he is safely on board the vessel, and the Saviour.

"Another query which might have arisen in Peter's mind. 'I don't know as I was in the water *long enough.* I rather think I ought to have been there about three weeks!' 'What's that, Peter?' 'Why—I am afraid I was not in the water *long enough.*—If I had only laid there three weeks, then the Master might have taken me out, and it would have been a complete cure.—I should have felt perfectly safe.' 'Well, Peter, is there any other reason why you feel dissatisfied?' 'O yes. I don't know—I believe I *didn't feel but enough* when I was in the water! I ought to have gone down two or three times. (I believe they drown the third time.) but if I remember, I didn't go down at all. I don't believe I felt bad enough. They say it is *indispensably necessary* to feel like death in order to be safe.' 'O! what nonsense?'"—*Ibid.*, p. 25.

The two measures on which Mr. Burchard chiefly relies as the means of "breaking down" sinners, and inducing them to "submit to God," are Special Prayers, and the Anxious-Seat. The converts, on saying at the Anxious-Seats that they "give up their hearts," are passed next into the Inquiry Room, where they are called upon to answer a series of questions proposed by Mr. Burchard, and introduced thus; "Now if you will tell me the truth, I will tell you eighteen times out of twenty; yea, ninety-five times out of one hundred; yea, more, ninety-eight times out of one hundred, who are Christians." This done, their names are

immediately enrolled for admission into the Church. Mrs. Burchard, also, has her "Department," meanwhile, doing for the children what her husband does for the adults.

Mr. Burchard's own account of what once befell him at the Anxious Seats, will let our readers sufficiently into "the history and mystery" of his operations.

"In one of our large towns, where I held a protracted meeting, some years since, salvation was flowing like a mighty river. Forty or fifty frequently gave up their hearts to Christ in a single day, and it continued so for days together. Well, one day, (we had the anxious-seats in the basement story,) I sent some of the professors up stairs to pray, while I was conversing with the sinners on the anxious-seats. The result was glorious. Seat after seat full gave up their hearts to God, and I felt the spirit of God in my very soul. At last I got the seat filled, (it was the third or fourth time, I believe,) and they would n't give up their hearts, *not a soul of them.* I sent the deacon up stairs to see what the matter was, for I concluded the trouble was there *if anywhere,* for I felt cold, stupid and disheartened. Well, the deacon went up; not a single professor was praying; but, there stood a *great, tall, country gawky, speechafying!* The deacon told me what the case was; I went up, and ordered the fellow to stop, and told the people to get down on their knees, and go to God in prayer. They did so. I felt the Holy Spirit come right down *rush! rush! rush!* into my soul. Salvation came right into the hearts of those very sinners, who just before had been *so obstinate.* They submitted to Christ the very moment I asked them. They were converted and I had the pleasure of seeing them taken into the church myself. Well, I got on another seat full; I couldn't do any thing at all with them. So I went up myself to see what the matter was now, and found the people had all *cleared out home!* I went back and *dismissed the meeting immediately.* It was n't of any use to go on and keep 'em there waiting, unless prayers were ascending up to the throne in their behalf. Now, there is nothing but prayer—the prayer of faith, that will bring salvation to the people of Burlington. You can't *speechafy a soul out of hell.*"—*Ibid.*, pp. 115, 119.

It is hardly to be supposed that there are many among the "judges, and senators, and generals, and colonels, and captains" of Vermont, who can be made to witness such

proceedings, or listen to such discourses, except with feelings of unmitigated disgust. The Protracted Meetings at Woodstock, which lasted *twenty-six days*, was regarded, we believe, by those engaged in getting it up, as signally blessed; yet what were the immediate results? It divided and estranged families and friends; it gave infinite occasion for scoffing at religion in general; it was pronounced by a vote of the town a public nuisance; and of those whom it made serious for a time, but a very small proportion, judging from past experience, can be expected to persevere, the rest relapsing into a state of sin or indifference, which all admit, commonly proves much worse, and more hopeless, than before.

"Let not an intelligent community," says Mr. Streeter, "be deceived by the rumors of Mr. Burchard's success, in this place, as well as others. For, considering the duration of the meeting, the efforts that were put forth, and the circumstances of the case, it was 'a mountain in labor.' There are, in this town, and those adjoining, *ten thousand* souls. The weather and sleighing were excellent, during the whole twenty-six or twenty-seven days, and people came from various directions, in the circumference of more than an hundred miles in diameter—Whole families of children, from three or four years old and upwards, were put under Mr. and Mrs. Burchard's care, to manage or mangle them as they pleased; and all who would be made to say that they 'gave their hearts to God,' were reckoned as converts. Some of them, as facts declare, only said it, to get out of the clutches of the inquisitor. Well, instead of *thousands*, the braggadocio reported only *four hundred*, not half of whom can now be produced. And although people were hurried into the churches, before they got cold, (lest, as Mr. Burchard said, the Devil should catch more than half of them,) including unstable youth, and little, inexperienced children, yet the whole number amounted to only one hundred and twenty. Why, a Mormonite with half the advantages that Mr. Burchard had, would make *three* converts to his *one*."—*Mirror*, &c., pp. 165, 166.

Mr. Burchard at Saratoga Springs.

We extract the following from bro. Campbell's "notes on a Tour to the North

East," now publishing in the *Millennial Harbinger*.
ED. C. R.

I heard a half of one of Mr. Burchard's discourses. This is the gentleman, who is said to have converted the preacher Finney, and who has got up the new converting process so successful in New York. He is admirably for such a work: of an interesting appearance—an eccentric Whitfieldite phiz and voice—wild, enthusiastic, and persevering—impassioned in his oratory, illogical in much of his reasoning, and extremely hazardous in his quotations and applications of Scripture—vehement, boisterous, and declamatory, he compels his audience to be prayed for, and will have them on the penitential benches whether or not. Like a tornado in passing through the country, he upturns every thing that can be moved and will make some two or three hundred converts in two or three weeks. It is "the Holy Ghost" first, last, and middle of his prayers and sermons. I dare not repeat the stories I have heard of this revivalist, or of his *ephemeral** converts. They are all in the superlative. Like perfectionism, Mormonism, and New-Lightism, this revivalism will have its day. The people now—a-days love excitement, strong feeling, noise, shouting, vehemence, and passion. He that shouts loudest, cries longest for fire from heaven, and talks most of hell, damnation, and eternal burnings, will catch the greatest multitude, and be most sainted by the ignorant and thoughtless mass, who cannot tell the difference between Old Testament and New, Sinai or Jerusalem.

I should, perhaps, have had a better opinion of Mr. Burchard's personal religion and morality, if I had not learned from a respectable source that he represented me as a Unitarian, and my followers as all Unitarians or Deists.* While I believe the ninth commandment I cannot believe any man acts like a good man or a christian, who "bears false witness against his neighbors." The cause which I plead can only be withstood by such a course as that now adopted—false witnesses, misrepresentations, proscriptions of our writings, and stopping the ears of the people. So long as this can be done, the people will be an easy prey to all these delusions; but in spite of such efforts the truth will be heard and shall prevail.

* This is the character of Mr. Maffet's as well as Mr. Burchard's converts. See an article in our last no. on Politico—Religious Newspapers."
ED. C. R.

Drew's opinion about Revivals.

The following is from the life of Samuel Drew, by his eldest Son. Drew was an English Wesleyan *Methodist*; and by his own exertions arose from the humble occupation of a shoemaker to be one of the first men in the Methodist Society. He was well-informed, sagacious, philosophic, and possessed unusual and well cultivated powers of discrimination. Ed. C. R.

To a correspondent, who required his opinion of religious revivals, Mr. Drew replied thus:—"If the phrase, *revival of religion*, be taken in its proper sense, as denoting the extension and increase of vital godliness, I should be no Christian were I to view it with indifference or aversion. If you couple it with noise and excited feeling (and without these many would think the term inapplicable,) I pause before I either approve or condemn. In point of reason, speculation, propriety, and decorum, my voice is decidedly against the manner; and if I thought that it was the effect of human artifice operating upon weak intellects and strong passions, I would condemn it altogether.

* * * * *

I fear, however, there is an artifice with some preachers and people to light up this contagious fire. I have been behind the curtain, and have seen a little of it; and am filled with disgust in proportion to the discovery. If the work be of God, he does not want the tricks I have witnessed. The question of permanency, too, presents itself. Are the present effects beneficial? Do these new converts stand? The history of past years teaches us that their apostacy has been nearly as extensive and sudden as their reformation*. The benefit in such cases is lost, while the disgust excited in the minds of sober persons still remain. In many instances, I conceive, these things have created and confirmed prejudices which an age will hardly wipe away. With my present views, and with all I ever had, I cannot join in these reveries without being an arrant hypocrite.—*Life pp. 333, 334.*

*See the preceding article, and one in our last no. on "Politico—Religious Newspapers."—Ed. C. R.

Progress of Christianity.

We have been hesitating for some months whether to publish all of the following letter or not, but have now concluded to do

so. Those well acquainted with the worthy and beloved brother whose name is to it, (and he is extensively known,) know that he does not bestow his commendations for the purpose of *flattering*. May the Lord ever preserve us from the evil and seductive charms of vanity and flattery, and may *self* and self-aggrandisement be swallowed up in zeal for, and devotion to, his cause! Ed. C. R.

SPRING HILL, [near Covington, }
Tipton Co. Tenn.] July 1st. 1826. }

Beloved Bro:—I acknowledge the receipt of 4 nos. of the Christian Reformer, have examined its execution and matter, and consider it entirely worthy of so good and high a cause as it purports to sustain. Its typography is neat and correct. Its matter is well chosen, fraught with truths sublime, well calculated to make a wise head and pure heart. The front pieces to each no. are well adapted, calculated to diffuse useful knowledge, so much needed in our land of ignorance and superstition. The editorial items are instructive, particularly the essay on the Christian name. I have never been fully satisfied that the *name* Christian was given by divine appointment. However, permit me to tell you, Brother Howard, that your essay has produced a new train of thoughts on that subject. I acknowledge it the best essay* by far I have ever seen on that topic, calculated to bring the mind to a focus, an object greatly to be desired among the brethren. A hint here is sufficient.—Dear brother, I feel confident that your good sense will not suffer you to receive any thing as flattery from so obscure a person, that has but little to gain or lose, save his own soul.

The next item I shall notice, is your criticism and replication to the Rev. John W. Hanner's Sermon. I was much pleased to find your replication rich in argument without being mixed with the alloy of scurrility. Your criticisms are rational and scriptural, and entirely free from vanity (O vanity! vanity! one of the strongest evidences of a weak head and base heart!) The Apostle rejoiced to hear his children walked in the truth. I rejoice to see you ably and zealously contend for the truth, and that in the spirit of the truth. The letters of L. V. C. are admirably well calculated to produce devotional exercises of the mind, which universally result in good practice, I doubt

* Much of the best matter was *extracted* from a writer in the Christian Baptist.—Ed. C. R.

not but that the writer of those letters is an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile. I know not who it is, save a beloved disciple; and as such I beg to be presented to him* in token of my most sincere respect.

I exceedingly regret that we are not able to refresh the hearts of the disciples abroad with any very pleasing intelligence from our section. There are a few brethren. We still continue to meet. There is an opening for some humble and talented Proclaimer, if he would come and dwell with us, or spend much of his time with us.† I would say, he shall not suffer while I have a morsel to divide. But a vain, self-conceited one we have no use for. * * * I close by subscribing myself your most sincere friend and Brother.

PEYTON SMITH.

Marrowbone [Ky.] August, 1836.

Brother Howard,

I have just received the back numbers of the Christian Reformer, by the favour of bro. Reneau, one of your agents of Kentucky; and I am well pleased with them; for I have long desired to see that the Editors of Religious Periodicals and their correspondents were directing their energies more particularly to the subject which the title of your paper imports; a Reformation among Christians. It seems to me that it is high time, that both writers and readers should have their attention turned more directly to the errors of Christians, who have professedly renounced *tradition*. Much good has been done by exposing the errors of the sects, and much more may yet be done by opposing and exposing the errors of the so called Reformation. I speak not in respect to theory here, but in respect to *practice*. I rejoice to see that your paper having this for its main object, is marching forth. And I pray God that his word through it may have free course and be glorified; that worldly minded professors may be influenced to turn their attention to the Bible; and instead of grappling with both hands in full stretch after the things of this world, and *laughing* at the contest between truth and error, (the most solemn contest that ever arose on the theatre of this world,) may humble themselves

* The writer is a *sister*, and "an Israelite indeed."

† A wide field indeed is open here. Can no proclaimer be found to labor in it!—Ed. C. R.

‡ Our bro. is some what mistaken in the import of the name of our paper. Through the instrumentality of Christianity we wish to aid in reforming ourselves, the sects, and

the world from error and vice.—Ed. C. R. in the sight of the Lord, that he may raise them up;—that all stumbling blocks may be taken out of the way, so that "sinners may be delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his [God's] dear Son." & stand complete, not only in theory, but also in *practice*, according to the will of God. There was much difficulty in the Apostles' day in getting the saints to leave behind them all the rubbish of Judaism and Paganism, "and stand complete in all the will of God." And so now there is also much difficulty in wiping off the foul stain of sectarianism and the influence of an ungodly world, among those who have professedly renounced tradition, the world, the flesh, and the devil. If I was capable, I would be more than willing to lend my aid in trying to rouse the slumbering soldiers to "awake to righteousness and sin not;" that when the Captain of our salvation comes, they may be ready to meet him in peace and not in shame. * * * * Grace be with you, all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. I subscribe myself

Your Brother in Christ,

ABRAHAM S. SALLEE.

FLAT CREEK, Maury Co. Ten. Sept. 27 1836.

If you desire to know any thing relative to the progress of Reform here, we inform you that our number increases. Some two or three lately (a three days meeting in August last,) determined to be on the Lord's side; and after making the good confession, were baptized "for the remission of sin."—Many are searching to see whether these things are so. We met on the first day of the week to attend the holy commandments of the Lord's house. May we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And O! that we may never despond till we have fought the good fight of faith.

Your Bro. in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,

RICHARD B. HARDISON.

LEXINGTON, Homes Co. Miss. Sept. 28 1836.

Brother Howard,

I have received several numbers of the Christian Reformer, and am well pleased with its matter and manner. I hope it will be sustained. * * * * There are a few disciples of the *Master* in this County, but they are very much scattered. How their walk and conversation are I am not able to speak particularly. Circumstances have thrown me into the giddy whirl of adventure and the duties of my profession, in

which for an indefinite time I expect to be engaged.

R. S. DULIN.

NASHVILLE, Oct. 15th 1836.

Beloved Brother Howard,

I seat myself simply to inform you, that I attended a meeting in Lebanon, Tenn. on last Lord's Day and on the Monday following, in company with our worthy brethren, Giles and Clemous. The citizens favoured us with patient and serious attention; and it is to be hoped that many of them will act the part of the noble Bereans. We immersed *one*; collected the scattered disciples in the town and neighborhood, and organized a congregation of about twenty members upon the word of God. It is their request, that teaching brethren call on them when passing; or visit them if they can.

Yours truly,

J. W. DAVIS.

ELLIOTT'S CROSS ROADS, Clinton Co., Ky.,

Bro. Howard:

Though I am a personal stranger to you; yet, as we are both subjects of the same King, I call you, Brother.

I, through the agency of Bro. Reneau, your agent here take the C. Reformer; I have read it from the commencement, and I am highly pleased with it.

In compliance with a request of yours, in the Reformer, for religious intelligence, I send you this letter, for insertion.

The progress of reformation, in this section of country, is much impeded by our not carrying out, in actual practice, the principle, for which we so zealously contend; and, also, by the allied powers of sectarianism in general. Though the conflict has been long and severe, yet the *Mythological notions*, and *Romish traditions*, taught by the clergy, have had to yield to the force of that *all-conquering* and *all-admiring* TRUTH, taught by the pleaders for the "ancient order of things."

Notwithstanding the opposition has been violent; yet there have been, in the surrounding country, 60 or 70 persons immersed within the last 9 months.

There is a district, of country here, comprising some five hundred immersed persons, with but *two* congregations meeting on the first day of every week!! One of these is at Albany, the county-seat of Clinton Co.; the other is in Cumberland Co. Ky., 15 miles from this place. Some time in the fall of 1834, in company with a relative who was, also, a brother in Christ; I visited Corydon, Ia.; we were strangers, in the place; however, the intelligence soon got

out, that two Christian preachers, from Ky., had arrived. Shortly after it was understood in town, that we were preachers, a gentleman came to the house, in which we were, and told us that some of our kin wished to see us—"some of our kin"? we replied to the messenger, with astonishment.—"We have no kin here"! Though we went with the man to the house, in which, he said they were.

When we entered the door of the house, we were greeted by four females; the oldest one advancing toward us; upon our meeting, between the door and fire, she said; "Well, gentlemen, we understand you are preachers from Ky.—We are four females alone; we have been praying to the Lord to send us help; and, believe he has answered our prayers."

This is, *verbatim et literatim, et punctum*, if I mistake not, the language of this worthy sister.

Please give the preceding account of the church in Corydon, and the following letter from sister Spencer, a place in the Reformer; for by doing so, you will, probably, transmit to posterity, the exemplary zeal of these four sisters of religious fame; whose conduct exhibited in the practice of meeting together frequently, to sing, pray, instruct, and advise upon the subject of the Christian religion. This conduct is worthy of all imitation, even the imitation of many preachers. After advising you to continue the Reformer, permit me to close this letter, by subscribing myself your brother in hope J. R. Howard,

ABRAHAM SALEE.

Nov. 12, 1836.

SISTER SPENCER'S LETTER.

CORYDON, Harrison Co., Ia., }
August 8, 1836. }

Dear Bro. Sallee:

I received your letter, requesting me to give you an account of the rise, progress, and present state of the church in Corydon. Though I am inadequate to the task, yet I will try. If I should speak of myself, in giving the history, you will please excuse me.

I was immersed, in 1801, into the Baptist church. While a member of that church, I spent many a joyful season; and, also, went through many a "slough of despond," with my Baptist brethren.

I thought the gospel of the Son of God, consisted in the following items, viz. Particular election, Final perseverance of the saints, and the special operation of the Holy Spirit, according to the Philadelphia *confession* of opinions. But when I was induced by bro. Campbell's Christian Baptist, to

read the Bible for myself, and think accordingly, I read and understood things otherwise, and acted accordingly. I thank God for having raised up such an advocate of the Truth as bro. Campbell, together with many others, is. Myself and daughter came out from the Baptist church, three years ago. We were visited by a bro. Mitchel, from Ohio. He immersed two sisters from the Methodist church. We four could do little else, but pray to the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into the vineyard. He heard our prayers, and has sent once and again to our relief. Of our joy at the sight of the face of a reformer, you are a witness.

About a year ago, two more joined us—a brother and his wife.—We were then six in number, and determined to meet together to worship, on the first day of every week.

Recollect, our number, a year ago, was six—5 females and one male. It is, now twenty two.—20 females, and 2 males.—One of the male members, is a colored man.—The addition has been made by bro. W. Brown, an evangelist. Your sister, in the good hope, bids you farewell.

ELIZABETH SPENCER.

Prophetic and Apostolic Testimony.

Prophetic testimony is as necessary as Apostolic, in order to believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the promised Messiah, and Saviour of the World; and in order to faith in his death as a sacrifice for sin and in his resurrection for our justification, pardon or release from it. Jesus had been predicted and pointed out by the prophets, in the various circumstances of his conception, birth, life, death and resurrection, as the long promised Messiah that was to come. All the ideas which past generations could have concerning him and of restoration from the grave by him to an eternal beatific existence, were from promise and prophecy. The Jews among whom he was to appear looked for the accomplishment in him of all the predictions concerning the Messiah. All the miracles which he performed in confirmation of his claims to the Messiahship and of the divinity of his mission as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, attested him to be the subject of the predictions by which he was foretold. The miracles done by our Saviour could have been performed by others, in whom the prophecies concerning him would

not have been fulfilled. The miracles themselves were foretold. Hence the importance of prophecy. It was necessary too that the Jewish and heathen world be prepared by prophecy for his reception and that of his religion. We see then the importance of prophetic testimony. Hence our Saviour, to his disciples as recorded by Luke in his testimony, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that *all things* must be fulfilled which were *written* in the *law of Moses*, and in the *prophets*, and in the *psalms* concerning me." Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the *scriptures*, [the prophecies, &c.] and said unto them, "Thus it is *written*, [in the prophecies, &c.] and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." This last was "written" or prophesied of too, for Isaiah and Micah had both said, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."—Hence, "the *testimony* of Jesus is the *spirit of prophecy*;" and, "to him give all the *prophets witness*." "Search the Scriptures [Old Testament] * * * and they are they which testify of me." Hence we find our Lord before and after his resurrection, and his Apostles after, continually applying to him the prophecies which were fulfilled in him. Hence Paul says that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and "rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."—But Apostolic testimony was as necessary as prophetic. It was as necessary that the facts constituting the fulfilment of prophecy should be witnessed, as that they should be foretold. For of what use would their fulfilment have been to the world, if they had not been reported by credible witnesses and by their testimony made known to others and handed down to succeeding generations? "Prophetic testimony is necessary to show, that the King, whom Jehovah would Anoint, was to suffer death as a propitiation for iniquity, and afterwards to rise from the dead; Apostolic, that Jesus was that Anointed King, and that he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures." Without either we cannot be "Built upon

the foundation of the *apostles and prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Take away either prophets or apostles, and *half* of the foundation is gone. We cannot build upon prophets without apostles, nor upon apostles without prophets. Their joint testimony is necessary in order to that faith through which we are saved, by which we are justified and sanctified, and have access into the state of favour wherein we stand. It is through the testimony of both that we are begotten and renewed by the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, Peter on Pentecost, proved from prophetic testimony, of the fulfilment of which the apostles were all witnesses, that Jesus had arisen from the dead and was made both Lord and Christ. Let our modern preachers imitate Peter, and make his discourse a model for their own; and we will have far more real conversions, and much fewer spurious ones!

EDITOR.

Confession and Ceremony at Baptism.

In attending to the ordinance of baptism, there is something required from the mouths both of the baptist or baptizer and the baptized. The subject for baptism or the person to be baptized, has simply to confess that Jesus Christ is the son of God. It cannot be shown from the New Testament, that any thing more or any other confession was required. Those requiring any thing else, demand that for which they have authority from God's word; though they may have it from tradition, the *custom* of the church, or some such thing, which is nothing but *men's* authority, and should have no weight in religion. Those who require more in religion than the Lord required, are equally culpable and condemnable with those who require less. What did our Saviour tell Peter was the rock upon which he would build his church? "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," says Peter to him, when he asked, "Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" "Upon this rock," says Christ, "I will build my church, and the gates of hell [hades] shall not prevail against it." If this truth or *confession* was such a firm and good foundation to build upon, how can men consistently with the Bible require any thing more or any thing else? When Phil-

ip baptized the Eunuch was there a church convened to hear his *experience*?—and did he have to tell that his sins were *forgiven*? We are not informed that any other person was present besides Philip, the administrator. The Eunuch simply confessed to him neither more nor less, as we are informed, than, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And Philip baptized him. Now it cannot be denied that we have just as much authority as Philip had, to baptize any one upon the same confession, made to but one individual, and that at the water. And no one can deny, that the baptism of the individual thus immersed, would be just as valid as that of the Eunuch by Philip. There is not a single case recorded in the whole New Testament where the church assembled together to hear the experience of a person before he was baptized, nor where forgiveness of sins was required as a pre-requisite; and not a single sentence to favor either. In requiring in religion what the Lord has not required and omitting what he has enjoined, we are incurring his displeasure and the punishment which he has denounced against all such. So much for the baptized.

Now for the baptizer. The commission runs thus: "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." I will conclude this with an extract from a correspondent of the "Christian Messenger," (Wm. Rawlings, Stilesville, Ill.) "Now as there are some in Christ and some that are not, we ask how did those that are in obtain entrance? By believing the gospel, reforming their lives, and being baptized into Christ. We enter into a house before we are in it—into a city, country or kingdom, before we are in them. Now as we cannot enter Christ as into a house or city, it is necessary that we enter by submission to a positive institution of his own device for that purpose; hence 'as many of you,' says Paul to his brethren, 'as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' And now for the fitness of the ceremony proposed by our rightful Lord, 'Baptizing them into the name of the Father,' [our life is hid with Christ in God, the name of the Father into whom we are immersed], 'and into the name of the Son' (supplying the ellipsis.) 'Know ye not that as many of you as were baptized out-

Jesus Christ, the name of the Son, not into the Son but the Saviour Anointed, the name of the Son, (and of the Holy Spirit) — before we can live in the Spirit, or walk in the Spirit, we must enter into the Spirit; and thus we place ourselves under the government, and influence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." In reply to this old bro. Stone says; "We accord with you in your views of baptism expressed in your communication. We ought in every thing to regard the *form of sound words*."

EDITOR.

Confessing Christ and Rising with Him in Baptism.

There is a connection between *believing* with the *heart* that God has raised Christ from the dead, *confessing* with the *mouth* that he is *Lord*, and *rising* with him in baptism through the *faith* of the operation or belief of the strong working of God who raised him from the dead, not apprehended or understood as it ought to be. We cannot confess that Jesus Christ is Lord nor rise with him in baptism, without first believing with the heart that God has raised him from the dead, or the faith of the strong working of God who raised him from the dead, nor confess that he is Lord without first believing it. Hence the connexion above.

Paul tells the Colossians that they had been buried with Christ in baptism and had risen with him in the same. "Buried with him in baptism, *wherein* ye are *RISEN* with him *through the faith* of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead;" or "*through the belief* of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead." It is not by the mere abstract act, or that alone, of emerging or rising from the water after immersion, that we are raised with Christ in baptism; but through belief in his resurrection, produced by testimony confirmed by miracles. We must *believe* that he was raised from the *dead* by the supernatural power or *strong working* of God, in order that we may rise with him *through faith*. Our resurrection in baptism must be both a literal and moral one. We must be raised with Christ, morally as well as literally. And the faith by which this is done must be the belief of prophetic and apos-

tolitic *testimony*. "*Prophetic* testimony is necessary to show, that the King, whom Jehovah would Anoint, was to suffer death as a propitiation for iniquity, and afterwards to rise from the dead; *Apostolic*, that Jesus was that Anointed King, and that he rose from the dead according to the scriptures." The *Prophet* predicted that Christ would die for our sins and arise from the dead, and the *Apostles* testified to the facts that constituted the fulfilment of these predictions, that he died and arose from the dead, "according to the *scriptures*" or *writings* of the Prophets. Hence those who have been thus raised with Christ in baptism, are addressed by an Apostle as being "*Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the *chief corner-stone*."

Christ "was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Justification is absolution from the guilt of sin or charge of it, or the declaration of one to be just; and is the consequence of pardon or release from sins. And as Christ was raised from the dead for our justification, pardon or release from sins, hence says Paul to the Corinthians, "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." We are buried with Christ in baptism, the likeness of his burial, in order to bury the "body of sins," crucified and dead, and rise with him, released from it, acquitted, pardoned, justified. "God was manifest in the flesh, *justified in the Spirit*." Our Saviour was unjustly charged by his enemies with being a malefactor and impostor, and put to death by them. The Holy Spirit by raising him from the dead, demonstrated his innocence, and proved him to be a just person. He was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," and "justified in the Spirit." As he left mortality in the grave and arose justified in Spirit from the false accusations of his enemies, we arise justified by him from sins of which we have been really guilty. Hence in accordance with the sentiments previously expressed, Paul says that "the word of faith" which the Apostles "preached," was "That if thou shalt *confess* with thy *mouth* the Lord Jesus, [that Jesus is Lord.] and believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the *heart* man

believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The proper translation of righteousness in this quotation, is justification; "With the heart man believes unto justification." In believing with the heart that God has raised Christ from the dead, man believes unto justification; for it is thus by faith in his resurrection that he rises from baptism released and justified from his past sins. Hence the connexion between believing with the heart in the resurrection, and justification. As it is at baptism that the confession is made that Jesus is Lord or the Son of God, and as it is made in order to baptism, so it is *unto* salvation; for he that believes and is baptized shall be saved. Hence the connexion between confession and salvation. We believe with our heart upon prophetic and apostolic testimony that Jesus Christ died a propitiation for our sins and arose from the dead for our justification or release from them; we confess with our mouth at the water that he is Lord or the Son of God; and we are buried with him in baptism and rise with him through the faith of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead, saved and justified from our sins, "having forgiven" us "all trespasses." Hence the connexion between our faith, confession, and rising with Christ in baptism. EDITOR.

Pernicious influence of inconsistent Christian conduct.

(From the Imperial Magazine.)

An unnecessary association with carnal company, is not the least inconsistency of professing Christians. We are sometimes forced to be with the ungodly, but there are professors, & men bearing the name & office of ministers, who choose such for their companions; as this induces a want of spirituality, & is inseparably connected with a habit of rivalry & love of the world; it creates a want of decision of character and produces a base temporising and a vacillating spirit, to accommodate the church of God, and the principles and maxims of the world. It is our duty to be civil and obliging with all, but not to be familiar and friendly with all.—If ministers and professors were to reprove

the vices of their sinful associates, to warn them of their danger, and to introduce religious and spiritual conversation, their company would not be often courted. But it has often happened, that ministers and professors so forget the dignity of their character, and the holiness of their calling, as to disregard the injunctions of the Bible in reference to this point, and thus they give a tacit countenance, to all the profanity of their wicked friends. This becomes worse when the ungodly are made confidants, and still worse when they are made advisers in the management of spiritual concerns. St. Bernard has well said in reference to this subject, "not a word of the Scriptures; nothing of salvation; but trifles, toys and laughter, and words as light as the wind, eat up the time." Christians should imitate the conduct of the disciples in the journey to Emmaus; and conversation concerning a crucified Redeemer would cause our hearts to burn with holy love, and would produce greater enjoyment of religion, and more intimate communion with our God.

Covetousness, is an inconsistency not altogether unknown. Many a Christian, who would shudder at the commission of open profanity, is quite contented to have his heart deaf to the calls of humanity, and hardened by the cursed influence of avarice.—His prayers are always ready, but his purse is ever closed. He is a stranger to the "luxury of doing good." What can the world think of a Christian who is covetous as Demas? And what does the Bible declare respecting him! It excludes him from heaven, and ranks him with the vilest idolater. Covetousness is like the grave, which never says, "It is enough;"—It is like Solomon's lecece always crying, "Give, give." Many feel more anxiety at the loss of a few pounds, than at the loss of the favour of their God.—The more the covetous man has, the more he wants. Solomon wisely compares riches to *things which are not*,—they are only a shadow: religion is a substance.

Violence of Temper, is another evil, chargeable on professors. Does this correspond with the meekness of the Christian character! Does it agree with the conduct of Christ! They do not hear the scoffing world exclaim, "where is his gentleness?" Violent tempers produce violent actions.—A headstrong disposition and an unrestrained spirit have been the curse and bane of many a Christian society. A man endued with such a temper is the last person who ought to govern others, because he cannot govern himself. In his family, he is a domestic tyrant; in the world, he is a turbulent oppres-

**Preachers* is intended, and the only appropriate term.—Ed. C. R.

nor; and in the church, he is an ecclesiastical despot, "lording it over God's heritage." But, if religion does nothing for the temper, it does very little for the soul.

Detraction, is also found amongst Christians. Those who are not guilty of evil-speaking and backbiting, often do more injury by base insinuations, than they would by specific accusations and open charges. Connected with this, is a spirit of envy, which will pass by a thousand moral beauties, to expose a single blot. "Cursed is he that smiteth his neighbor secretly." Detraction is generally accompanied with dissimulation, and I know not what can be more awful, than the habit, not only of speaking lies, but of manufacturing them: "Oh, my soul, come not thou into their secret; into their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united." These evils often proceed from idleness: if these persons were more active in the world and in the church, they would find no time for detraction:—but many Christian congregations are infested with drones.

Want of Love, is a gross inconsistency. Some professors will rend a Christian community, and destroy every particle of affection, rather than abandon a preconceived opinion, or relinquish a favorite maxim. "These things do not so to be:" We are brethren, and should act as brethren. Our great Exemplar not only preached love in His sermons, and petitioned for it in His prayers, but he practiced it in His life;—I would say to every Christian, "Go, and do thou likewise."

There are many other inconsistencies, which I merely mention, such as * * * absence of family discipline, bad example to servants, neglect of instruction to children and domestics, an undue severity and moroseness of temper, ingratitude for mercies, murmurings under adverse circumstances, pride and conformity to the world, and want of family prayer:—these are not *imaginary* evils—would to God they were! They are too true, and too frequent: "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph."

By these inconsistencies the Holy Spirit is grieved, and a disgrace is entailed on our holy religion. We should never forget that the world is, in a certain sense, omniscient in reference to our faults. We are "lights on a candle," and we ought not only to be concerned to shine with steadiness, but with brilliancy. We should not only live above sin, but above the suspicion of it; not only flee from evil, but avoid the very appear-

ance of it. The glory of God, and the advancement of vital godliness, are inseparably connected with the consistency of our conduct. The taunt has often been heard, "What do ye more than others?"—More is expected and more is required. We naturally expect more splendor from the shining of the sun, than from the burning of a candle, and more water from the bursting of a cloud, than from the emptying of a cistern; so, more holiness and piety are expected from the Christian than from the man of the world, and if he *does* no more than others, it is a presumptive proof that *he is* no more than others.

These inconsistencies produce fearful evils in reference to the young inquirer: he sees those who ought to be his spiritual guides showing him the worst examples, and he beholds those whose lives ought to be practical comments on the Bible, trampling its holy precepts under their feet; perhaps buoyed up by presumptuous hope "that Christ has done all," and that "they are complete in him." Away with such a libel on Christianity. Call it not religion—call it the vile blasphemies of antinomian licentiousness. The eagerness of the young convert is not only checked, and the faith of the genuine believer damped, but religion itself is made the scoff of the profane, and the jest of the alehouse. A sanctimonious appearance, and a canting conversation, will not counterbalance errors in practices: it is not what a man *professes*, but how he lives, that must decide the reality of his religion. Good works are the *only evidence* we can offer to the world. Carnal men always decide upon the goodness of religion by the conduct, or rather by the misconduct, of its professors instead of judging from the principles of the system itself, although they do not reason in the same manner in reference to other concerns. A holy life is the best and most convincing argument for Christianity, and I know not what right those have to imagine that they are Christians, who cannot give evidence; when our Savior himself has erected the immutable and universal standard. "By their fruits ye shall know them." J. G.

Dorsey, Gloucestershir, [England].

Professor Ryland and Mr. Meredith.

(From the Biblical Recorder.)

"Baptism for the Remission of Sins; Examined in a Discourse by Robert Ryland. Text—"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized 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."—Acts ii. 38.

We have read this discourse with considerable interest; and our interest has been not a little enhanced by the consideration, that it treats of a topic which we have long feared was not well understood. We allude to the relation sustained by baptism to the remission of sins. The views of the author on this point, will be found in the following paragraphs:—

"The next subject in order is forgiveness. There are two theories on this doctrine each claiming origin from the word of God and each, therefore, demanding our assent. The one makes forgiveness consequent upon repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, which are shown to be genuine by their purifying effects—by the universal obedience to which they prompt. The other suspends the enjoyment of a pardon till the believer has submitted to baptism—an ordinance which is thus made the only medium through which the Holy Spirit can avail to the purification of the heart. The controversy, then, is not respecting the obligation of baptism, or the import of the term, but respecting its relative importance and position in the analogy of faith. As I believe the last named view of this subject is unscriptural and dangerous, I shall now attempt to show its incorrectness.

"The passage before us is adduced to prove the position I am now to controvert. The advocates of this theory tell us that Peter is to be literally understood as commanding the people to be baptized *for* the remission of their sins, or that the remission of sins was an end to be secured only by baptism. Let us examine the passage.—The Greek preposition *eis* here rendered *for* though frequently capable of this meaning seems to me to have, in this passage and in this connexion, the force of *into*. This is indeed the primary and acknowledged sense of the word, when used with verbs expressing motion from one place to another.—And in the New Testament it seems to be used to express the transition from one relation to another. Examples of this will presently be adduced. The meaning of Peter's words, then, may be thus stated: 'Be baptized into the confession or doctrine of forgiveness.' You are to repent of your sins and to believe in Jesus Christ. By that faith you are justified, pardoned, forgiven. You are then to submit to an institution in which you confess the forgiveness of sins as having been conferred

by the Saviour, and by which you publicly enter into the relation of disciples to him. This obedience is the evidence of faith. It is an effect, not the cause of salvation.

"Let us now see if this interpretation can be sustained by the usage of the New Testament writers. We shall cite every passage from these writers in which the same Greek preposition is used in connexion with baptism, that Peter employs in the text under examination."

We must be allowed to say candidly and frankly, but with the utmost respect and diffidence, that we do agree with the author in the above, in several material particulars.

In the first place, we by no means admit the conclusiveness of his criticisms. That the preposition *eis* does very frequently have the sense of the English particle *into*, will be denied, we presume, by no one. Nor will it be denied that it has this sense in most of the instances adduced by the author. But that this term does not very often have the sense of *for*, and that it does not have this sense in the text in question, the evidence, we think, has not been furnished. It by no means follows that a term which is allowed to have some dozen or twenty significations, because it has a given sense in a few or a very many cases, must therefore necessarily have the same sense, in any particular case which may happen to become a matter of inquiry. *Eis* may have the meaning of *into* in all the cases mentioned by the author, and yet in the text may have the meaning of *for*.

The proper question to be asked here, it appears to us, is this—What is the scriptural import of the phrase *eis apheisin amartion*—in the text rendered "for the remission of sins? To answer this question in short, we turn first to verse xxx. 28, and read as follows—"For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, *eis apheisin amartion*, for the remission of sins." This passage is, in our opinion, decisive.—That the blood of Christ was shed "into the remission of sins," or "into the confession or doctrine of forgiveness," we are sure no one will contend. On the contrary, that it was shed *for* the remission of sins, as an end, is

equally beyond the possibility of a doubt.—The same phrase occurs Mark i. 4.—“John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance, *eis aphasin amartion*, for the remission of sins. This passage when interpreted by the former, as it ought to be, is not less certain and decisive in its import. To say that John preached the baptism of repentance *into* the remission of sins, would be to employ language singularly obscure, if not altogether unintelligible. See again Luke iii. 3.—“And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance, *eis aphasin amartion*, for the remission of sins.” The same remark applies to this case which was made in relation to the preceding. These, including the passage in question, are the only instances in which the phrase *eis aphasin amartion* occurs in the New Testament.—That the first case is decidedly in favor of the present rendering, *for the remission of sins*, and that the others are but little less so, it seems to us cannot admit of a doubt. To say the least, there is certainly no evidence in favor of the rendering proposed by the author.

That *eis*, when employed in the same construction as above, very commonly has the meaning of the preposition *for*, any one may satisfy himself by referring to such cases as the following:—“And after the gift that Moses commanded *eis marturion utrais*, for a testimony unto them.” Matt. viii. 4. See also Matt. x. 18.—Mark i. 44.—vi. 11.—xiii. 9.—Luke v. 17.—xvi. 14.—ix. 15.—xxi. 13.—1 Pet. iii. 5.—James ii. 5.—11 relating to the single phrase *eis marturion* and all correctly rendered “for a testimony.”

In the next place we object to the rendering of the passage as proposed above. Truly the author has not given a literal version of the text agreeably to his criticism; but the passage must be translated, and if his reasoning be correct, the rendering must be this—“Repent and be baptized every one of you *into* the remission of sins.” That the rendering is not very intelligible we think

the author was aware, from the fact that he gave a paraphrase rather than a literal version. A rendering which requires a paraphrase to make the sense intelligible may always be suspected.

In the third place, we object to the *sens* as given in the paraphrase—because we believe that it destroys the point and meaning of the apostle’s reply. The convicted multitude had just required to be told what they must *do*—what they must *do* to be saved—to obtain deliverance from the guilt and penalty of sin, as we must suppose of course. In answer to this question, the apostle uttered the language of the text:—“Repent and be baptized every one of you,” &c. Now, when we suppose the apostle to have informed the Jews, in the sense of the common version, what they must do for the remission of sins, we suppose him to have given a direct answer to the question proposed; but when we suppose him to have told them what they must do for the *confession* or the *doctrine* of forgiveness, we suppose him to have answered altogether another question; and to have given them information which, at that particular juncture, to say the least, could have afforded but little satisfaction.

In the fourth place, we object to the *theology*—the sentiment inculcated in the above construction. It will not be doubted, we presume, that the phrase *eis aphasin amartion*, is proposed in the text as an end not of baptism only, but of repentance also. “Repent and be baptized,” &c. Now when a man is required to be *baptized* into the confession of remission, the doctrine, though not a little doubtful, may perhaps be received, but when he is commanded to *repent* into the confession of remission, a doctrine is inculcated which is as difficult of belief as it is of intelligible comprehension.

We object in the last place, to the necessary *tendency* of the argument before us. This argument, if we understand it correctly, goes to show that baptism has no sort of connexion with remission; and that, though a positive institution of the New Testament, and the only authorised medium

of admission to the christian church, it is nevertheless a matter in which the sinner's salvation is in no way concerned. Now, when we hear two evangelists speak of the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"—when we hear the King himself, in his last commission, affirm that "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved"—when we hear an apostle, acting under that commission, require the people to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins"—when we hear Ananias say to Saul, "And now why tarriest thou! arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins"—we believe that all this must mean something. And when we call to mind that three thousand were baptized on the same day of conversion—that the household of Cornelius had no sooner given evidence of repentance, than Peter demanded their baptism—that the Ethiopian eunuch was baptized in the midst of his journey—and that the Philipian jailor and his household were baptized at midnight—we cannot but believe that baptism has a much more important connexion with remission and salvation than is now generally supposed. At any rate, we cannot but suspect the expediency of any attempt to explain away the force of passages, which, if we be not much mistaken, are well sustained by the analogy of faith and the *usus loquendi*.

Let no one suppose that we are an advocate for the views of Mr. Campbell on this point. We believe that Mr. Campbell is in one extreme, and that our bro. Ryland is in another. Mr. Campbell makes baptism just about every thing, by making it identical with regeneration: bro. Ryland makes it just about nothing by disconnecting it entirely with remission. We believe the truth lies between these two extremes; and, although it may be difficult to define the precise point, as the scriptures have not done it—yet we believe that the two extremes are about equally remote from the truth, and equally to be avoided.—*Edt. Bib. Rec.*

Remarks on the preceding article.

The above is from a number of the Bib-

lical Recorder, published at Newbern, N. Carolina, and edited by Mr. Meredith of "Millennial Harbinger" memory, one of the ablest and most talented Baptist writers. It made its appearance two or three months ago; and we intended to have copied it into our columns before this, with remarks upon it, but the paper containing it was lost.

We were both surprised and gratified at the appearance of the above article: surprised because when we first saw it we expected to see the pamphlet referred to, commended, and its views and criticisms defended, rather than controverted, censured and condemned, as they really are; and gratified, because we did not expect to find in this quarter such stress laid upon the import of an institution, the real meaning of which has been so long lost sight of,—and such independence of mind as is here exhibited in boldly expressing sentiments at variance with the opinions of the Baptists, on a subject on which there is so much sensitiveness manifested by the mind of the religious public.

On this much controverted point, we do not see how Mr. Meredith can oppose us consistently with the sentiments which he has here avowed. He says of Matt. xxvi. 28, where Jesus says, "For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins;" he says, "that it was shed for the remission of sins, as an END, is equally beyond the possibility of a doubt." Agreeably to this comment, we might say of Acts ii. 38, where Peter told the penitent Jews to "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" we might say, "that they were to be baptized, for the remission of sins, as an END, is equally beyond the possibility of a doubt;" seeing that the same Greek words, *eis aphesin amartion*, are used in both places. Where, we would ask, is the difference? Must not Mr. Meredith's remarks unavoidably lead to this conclusion? There is but this difference, in the two places: Jesus shed his blood to procure the remission of sins for us and we are to be baptized to procure this remission from Him for ourselves. As His blood was shed for the remission of sins, the shedding of it could not have affected Him in any way, as

he was "without sin," to remit which it was shed. The remission of sins being thus procured for us and for all mankind, by the standing provision of his sacrifice, all who would possess and enjoy this remission, must be baptized (as well as believe and repent) to obtain it. This Christ on his part has procured remission of sins for us; and thus we on our part must be baptized to procure or possess this remission. Hence the same Greek words, *ekphoresis amartion*, in both sentences. Thus pardon can be obtained and enjoyed by all men on the same conditions. We will offer an illustration. The inhabitants of a country are starving in consequence of the want of provisions. A rich man procures a supply for them. He invites them to partake; but it is on the condition of bringing their waggons to his granary and hauling the provisions to their homes. Do they procure them by their hauling as the rich man did? He prevented them by having the earth cultivated. By shedding his blood (in connexion with his sacrifice) Jesus procured pardon for man; and man by being baptized (in connexion with the necessary concomitants of baptism) procures or obtains this pardon from our Saviour.—In conclusion we would ask, where has Mr. Campbell made "baptism just about every thing, by making it identical with regeneration?" Will the following from his Extract on Remission suffice as a refutation? "The Spirit of God," says he, "is the begetter, the gospel is the seed; and being thus begotten and quickened, we are born of water. A child is alive before it is born, and the act of being born only changes its state, not its life. Just so in the metaphorical birth. Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the Word, and born of the water." Does this make baptism and regeneration identical? EDITOR.

Trying and knowing the Spirits.

"Believe not every Spirit," says John in his first epistle, "but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." He then furnishes us with an infallible rule to try these spirits by. "We [apostles] 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." It is in the writings of the Apostles that we now hear them; and it is by these we are to "try the spirits."—Our Saviour has also given us a criterion to know them by. "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves: Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth corrupt fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." By the rule which John gives, we can know whether they are "sound in the faith or not," by their acknowledging and submitting to the authority and doctrine of the Apostles. By the criterion of Christ here, we can know whether their profession is real and sincere, by their conduct, actions, life and character. By the first we can ascertain whether they deny the Lord in doctrine; by the second, whether they "a works deny him." EDITOR.

Divine revelation.

REVELATION has not merely the object of salvation beyond the grave in view, but it is designed for, and actually produces that effect upon the believer, of exalting, and improving his nature in this world, and thereby prepares him for a future happy existence. It exalts him here, by teaching him his divine origin, and high destiny; it discovers to man his true dignity, and pours contempt upon all earthly objects, by unfolding prospects of a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of glory than any temporal concerns can possibly promise, or the precarious, and fleeting state of human life can permit him to hope for.—Dr. Fishback.