

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

Stone-Campbell Movement Pamphlets

Pamphlets

1863

“The Contrast Fairly Stated,” a reply to N. L. Rice’s “Campbellism: its Rise, Progress, Character and Influence.”

Benjamin Franklin

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/all_pamphlets

Number Eight.

TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE:
THE
CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED;
OR,
REVIEW OF
REV. N. L. RICE'S TRACT,
ENTITLED
CAMPBELLISM; ITS RISE, PROGRESS,
CHARACTER, AND INFLUENCE,
BY
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN & RICE.

1863.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
1101 - 19th AVENUE, SOUTH
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37212

Number Eight.

TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.
THE
CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED;

OR,

REVIEW OF
REV. N. L. RICE'S TRACT,

ENTITLED

CAMPBELLISM; ITS RISE, PROGRESS,
CHARACTER, AND INFLUENCE.

BY

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN & RICE.

1863.

1903

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF

STANDARDS

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

1903

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF STANDARDS

1903

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

1903

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

D153
F231a
1863

THE CONTRAST

CHARLES J.

THE CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED.

DEDICATION.

The Presbyterian Board of Publication, in Philadelphia, has issued a Tract, numbered 175, styled "Campbellism, its Rise, Progress, Character and Influence, by Rev. N. L. Rice." A promise was made, in the *American Christian Review*, of a tract in return for the Doctor's kindness. To the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Dr. N. L. Rice and the Presbyterian Church at large, are the following pages dedicated, hoping that they may be received in the same spirit of kindness in which they were written, and prove a blessing to all concerned. Read both sides, and then decide for yourselves where the truth lies.

Edgar A. Abbott
New Library

19619

CHAPTER I.

What is *Campbellism*? One would have supposed that in a Tract prepared for a great benevolent Society, on "Campbellism, its Rise, Character and Influence," by a learned Doctor of divinity, one of the first things found, would have been a clear, perspicuous and faithful definition of Campbellism. But this we do not find in the Doctor's Tract. It is hard to find out precisely what it is. Not a man yet, of all who have been engaged in fighting this monster, has defined it, explained it, or told us what it is. It has been called a dangerous *heresy*, and so many zealous, pious and fervid warnings have been put forth against it, that the hair almost stands upon a person's head to hear it mentioned. Why has no one defined it, given us a clear explanation and a description of it, so that any good person might know and avoid it, on sight? For one of the best reasons in the world, and that is *that there is no such thing in existence*, except in the imaginations of some misguided doctors, whose craft is in danger, and who are troubled in their efforts to

satisfy their members with their partisan human platforms. As near as we can now ascertain what they mean by Campbellism, if we were explaining for our life, we should say, it is *Christianity itself unmixed, unadulterated, without any other name than the one God gave it.* It is so different from what they have been taught, all their ideas and experiences, that they imagine it to be some master heresy. This is evident, for when they hear a man who preaches nothing but Christ—the gospel—Christianity, as God gave it, simply aiming to convert men to Christ—turn them to God, and induce them to receive Christ as their only leader, they suppose him to be opposing them and style the teaching *Campbellism.* It is really nothing but an ugly name they have given the gospel of Christ, to keep the people from hearing it; in the same way, they call the man, who will preach nothing but the gospel a *Campbellite*, to create prejudice against him and prevent the people from hearing him. In precisely the same spirit, here comes Rev. N. L. Rice backed up by a Publication Board, in a tract of forty pages, against Campbellism, about which the reader may think as he sees fit,

but which is as much against the religion of Christ, and those advocating, practicing and maintaining it, and *it alone*, as was in the power of Dr. Rice to make it, in a covert and insidious effort. No man in this country, at this time, can preach simply the gospel of Christ, in the name of the Lord, under no other name, and maintain, the Constitution and Law of God, as the only authoritative law, without being called a Campbellite, and charged with preaching *Campbellism*. This is precisely that to which Dr. N. L. Rice is opposed, and against which he has directed much of his time for the past twenty years. This shall be fully developed in the following pages. The first point of contrast between himself and those he opposes, or the Disciples of Christ, as here instituted, is that they think Christianity itself, as the Lord gave it, sufficient—that to receive it in all its fullness, be a Christian, in the Bible sense, governed by the law of God, is sufficient. This the Doctor does not believe. This he dislikes more than anything now maintained in this country. To it sundry human appendages must be added, to make it acceptable to him, as will be seen hereafter. Here is the real issue.

CHAPTER II.

On page 1 the Dr. says, "It is no ordinary work which he (Mr. Campbell) and his friends proposed to themselves; it was a *radical reformation* of the church throughout the world." Here is the head and front of the offence. Here is the issue, as stated by the Doctor himself. The Disciples propose to reform the church throughout the world, and the Doctor opposes it. Strange too, if bad men should propose a radical reformation of the church throughout the world, and good men oppose it! Here is the issue, or contrast, *reformation*, and *opposition to reformation*. What is the radical reformation proposed? It is briefly summed up as follows:

1. Abolish all unscriptural names for the people of God.
2. Abolish all human laws now bound upon the people of God.
3. Restore the Constitution and Law of God to his people.
4. Abolish all Sectarian church organizations.

5. Unite all the people of God, under Christ their living and glorious head, under the Constitution and Law of God.

6. Preach precisely what the apostles preached, no more, no less.

7. Believe precisely what the first Christians believed, no more no less.

8. Do precisely what the first converts did to become Christians, and do it for the same purpose.

9. Practice precisely what the first Christians did, after conversion.

10. Hope for the same heaven for which the first Christians hoped.

11. Use the same religious designations they did.

To this "radical reformation," Dr. Rice stands opposed. Against it he writes his tract.

CHAPTER III.

The Doctor quotes from the *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. III, Page 362, the following question and answer: "And what of the apostacy? do you place all the sects in the apostacy? Yes, all religious sects who

have any human bond of union, all who rally under any articles of confederation other than the apostles' doctrine, and refuse to yield all homage to the ancient order of things." This the Doctor looks upon as horribly reprehensible. With him it is no harm to have a "human bond of union." Nay, more; with him, it is necessary to have a "human bond of union," articles of confederation other than the apostles' doctrine," and to "refuse to yield all homage to the ancient order of things," and to call a people who do this, "apostate," is, with him, almost sacrilege. Let candor be appealed to; let solemnity and honesty be appealed to; let every sincere man tell what could make an apostacy, if having a *human*, in the place of a *divine* bond of union, other articles of confederation than the apostles' doctrine, and refusing all homage to the ancient order of things, would not do it. The contrast here is very striking. The Disciples maintain the *divine* bond of union and reject the *human*. The Doctor holds on to the human to aid the divine,—to enable the divine bond of union to accomplish that which it could not without the human! The Disciples oppose

all articles of confederation other than the apostles' doctrine. The Doctor maintains other articles of confederation than the apostle's doctrine. The Disciples maintain that we must yield all homage to the ancient order of things. The Doctor opposes yielding all homage to the ancient order of things, and maintains that those who refuse such homage are not apostate.

CHAPTER IV.

The Doctor says, "Christ and his apostles effected a radical reformation in the church, but it was when tradition had been substituted for the Bible." It would be truly interesting to know what church it was in which Christ and the apostles effected a radical reformation! They certainly never effected any radical reformation in the Jewish church; for it instigated the crucifixion of Christ, and persecuted the apostles till the last one of them was dead. The *one new man* which the Lord made of the two, the Jews and Gentiles, so making peace, or the Church of Christ, of which

the Lord was speaking, when he said, "upon this rock *I will build my Church,*" was not fully inaugurated in the Savior's life time, and had not apostatized so as to need any "radical reformation" in the time of the apostles. It did not, during this period adopt any "human bond of union, or articles of confederation other than the apostles' doctrine," nor "refuse to yield all homage to the ancient order of things," and consequently did not become an apostate church. The Jewish church, the old church, which was then truly apostate, and its doctors, like the *doctors* of our time, were teaching the people, instead of the commandments of God, the traditions of men, the apostles abandoned, giving it over to its own fated destruction. They gave it up, as past all reformation. The Lord wept over Jerusalem, saying to the members of this old church, "How oft would I have gathered your children as a hen gathers her brood, but you would not." Abandoning this old church, this apostate church, the Lord took *out of it* a people for his name, built a *new church*, upon the rock, the building of God, the temple of God, for a habitation of God, through the Spirit.

CHAPTER V.

The Doctor informs us, that, "Luther, Calvin and their co-laborers effected a glorious reformation, but it was when both clergy and people had long been ignorant of the Bible, and oral tradition, expounded by pretended infallibility was their rule of faith." But he says, "Mr. Campbell undertook a radical reformation among the people who took the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice." This statement is found on the second page of his tract, and he proceeds to page seven where he gives as one of the two principles on which to use his own peculiar style, "the Campbellite sect is organized, the rejection of all creeds, and union upon the Bible alone." According to his account of the matter, Mr. Campbell came among a people who took the Bible as their *only* rule of faith and practice, and undertook to effect a "radical reformation," by inducing them to reject all creeds and unite on the Bible alone!" This would not be a very radical reformation. If the Bible was their only rule of faith and practice, it is strange that

they should have opposed Mr. Campbell, who undertook to persuade them to unite on their only rule of faith and practice—the Bible alone! Why did they not say to Mr. Campbell, “my dear good brother, why, did you not know that the Bible is already our only rule of faith and practice? You are behind the times sir; we have already taken the Bible as our only rule of faith and practice, and your proposed reformation has nothing more than we already have.” How does the Doctor make it a radical reformation for the people to simply hold on to what they have?

Why did not the Doctor say that Luther, Calvin, &c. “effected a glorious reformation *in the church?*” He says, “Christ and the apostles effected a radical reformation *in the church,*” but when he mentions Luther’s and Calvin’s reformations, he leaves out the words, “*in the church.*” He knows how to look out for breakers. With him, Christ did not build a church, as he said he would; establish a new church, make *one new man*, or *one new body*, or *building*, but merely *reformed an old church!* But he saw that it would be ridiculous to speak of Luther effecting a “radical reformation *in*

the church, which he came out of and entirely separated from, which never was and never can be reformed. Luther and Calvin found many opposers in effecting their glorious reformations, and the glorious work of reformation had to be done in spite of them, precisely as it now has to be done in spite of Rev. N. L. Rice and all such men.

CHAPTER VI.

The Doctor says, "The success of this movement was, for a number of years, remarkably rapid." He then proceeds to file in order five reasons for this remarkable success. These reasons must receive a brief notice in the same order in which they are given.

1. "Mr. Campbell's zealous advocacy of *immersion* as the only valid baptism, and his opposition to infant baptism, gave him great fame among the Baptists." Both "immersion as the only valid baptism," and "opposition to infant baptism," had been maintained with as much zeal, perseverance and determination by all Baptists as they

ever were by Mr. Campbell. He had no new advantage in advocating these points, save what his superior ability gave him.— The Baptists had always had the same advantages, so far as the positions mentioned were concerned, but had not been able to make such an able advocacy, on the points at issue. But it is entirely natural that the Doctor should think of these points, when he mentions Mr. Campbell. He encountered him, in the celebrated and invaluable discussion in Lexington, Ky., and is aware of the force his noble energies had on the minds of that great audience and on the minds of the people, where the discussion has been read. Why does not the Doctor gain large numbers to the Presbyterian Church, by maintaining, as he does, infant baptism and opposing immersion? He certainly is as zealous and persistent as Mr. Campbell. He has certainly been as zealous and determined in maintaining infant baptism and opposing immersion, as ever Mr. Campbell was on the opposite side; but it does not appear that any remarkable success has attended his efforts. How is this to be accounted for? Zealous efforts result in remarkable success, in advocating immer-

sion and opposing infant baptism, but in no remarkable success, in advocating infant baptism and opposing immersion. How is this, Doctor? It is a clear matter to a man who reflects. It is not now generally known that infant baptism is not mentioned in the Bible, nor in any book written in two hundred years after the birth of Christ. For this to be revealed, held up before the people, in the prints and the pulpit, and commented on by a man of Mr. Campbell's ability, must, in the very nature of the case, make tremendous headway among all classes of opposers. It is not known, also, that immersion is admitted to be *valid* baptism by all men of all parties, of any considerable note and respectability in learning and knowledge; and that sprinkling or pouring for baptism, is not mentioned in the Bible, or any other book written in the first two centuries, and has been held in dispute and doubt ever since it existed, by a large number of as pious and learned men as the world ever had. It is a fact, too, not frequently mentioned, that every Greek Lexicon in the world, of any note, gives *immerse*, or its equivalent, as the primary meaning of *baptizo*; and that no Lexicon of any note

gives *sprinkle* or *pour* as a meaning at all. When this is brought out, shown up and commented on, as it was in the Lexington debate, by a man of Mr. Campbell's ability, in connection with the expressions of the common version, such as, they "went down into the water," "came up out of the water," "baptized in Jordan," "were baptized in Enon near to Salem, because there was much water there," "baptized in the river of Jordan," "were buried in baptism," "buried by baptism," and had their "bodies washed," it will tell on the minds of candid men. Success must attend the effort. But the most that can be done in the opposition is to retard, impede and hold back reformation. No remarkable success is expected or enjoyed.

2. The Doctor's second reason for the remarkable success attending the reformation is, that "the apparent zeal of Mr. Campbell for the union of all Christians, misled many well-meaning people." The Doctor is wide of the mark here. It was not Mr. Campbell's "apparent," nor his *real* zeal for the union of Christians, that was so much the secret of this movement, as the sacred doctrine of union itself, enforced

by the authority of the throne and crown in heaven, expressed in Holy Writ, not that *mised* so many well-meaning people, but *led them rightly*, into "one fold," where we have "one Shepherd"—the great Bishop of souls. It was the influence of the holy prayer of our Lord and Savior, that all who should believe on him, through the word of the apostles, should be one, as he and his Father are one, not that "mised so many well-meaning people," but *led them rightly*, according to the will of God, to unite on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus the Christ, the chief cornerstone, in "the faith once delivered to the saints." It was the divine and holy mandate of the Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation, speaking through Paul, with all the authority of the throne of the Eternal, beseeching them by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, all to speak the same thing, be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and that there be no divisions among them, not that "mised so many well-meaning people," but *led them rightly*, to unite on the law of God, under the name which the Lord gave his people, discarding all human laws and

names. The holy and righteous appeal, from these premises, not only reached the well-meaning, but the wise and good, the honest and pious, the pure and holy—those who love God and his people—and, we grant, was a mighty means, under God, in gathering the vast number now united in one fold and under one Shepherd, and inducing them to discard the numerous silly and unlearned disputes of the clergy, and unite under Christ; and this holy work and requirement of the Spirit of God and the prayer of Jesus, is what Dr. Rice not only resists, and fights against with all his power, but teaches men to resist and fight against with every power of their bodies, souls and spirits. The Disciples are laboring and praying for this union, and Dr. Rice is opposing it. All heaven and all the good on earth are in favor of union, while all the powers of darkness are opposed to it.

3. The Doctor's third reason for this remarkable success is, that "many were drawn into this movement by the extremely easy and simple way of becoming a Christian, proposed by Mr. Campbell." The Doctor is partly right here, but only right in part, as we shall see presently. The way of be-

coming a Christian, proposed by Mr. Campbell, or, which is the same, the way in which persons became Christians under the direction of the apostles, was easy, extremely easy and simple, it is true; yet not so easy or short as the way proposed by Dr. Rice, in the Lexington debate. He there insisted on a shorter and easier way than that proposed by Mr. Campbell; that while Mr. Campbell maintained that, to become a Christian, or obtain pardon, according to the gospel, a man must believe, repent and be immersed, Dr. Rice maintained that the sinner is pardoned as soon as he believes—that Mr. Campbell could not baptize the candidate for the remission of sins, for he admitted that the sinner must believe before he is baptized, and that as soon as he believes, he is pardoned! This is the easy way of Dr. Rice, but he does not have “remarkable success.” One reason of this is, that his way is so short and easy that the people are afraid *it is not the right way*. The easiest way yet proposed is justification by faith alone, as advocated in the Lexington debate by Dr. Rice, and not justification by faith, repentance and baptism, as set forth by Mr. Campbell. Dr. Rice has the *short*

and easy way, and is not very successful even then.

But the way set forth by Mr. Campbell is short and easy, as it is simply the way in which persons were made Christians in the time of the apostles. It was also plain.—The prophet, looking down through the long cycles of seven hundred and fifty years, said, “The way shall be so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, should not err therein.” The Lord says, “They who seek shall find.” In divine encouragement, the Lord says to those whom he would invite, “My yoke is easy and my burden is light;” and, at the close of the holy volume, he says, “Whoever will, let him come.”—It, being entirely of grace, of mercy, is, of course, free. So simple is the way, so easy to find, and admission so accessible, that when the Lord was seated on the throne, and sent forth the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth, and the first announcement of the gospel was made, from the infallible utterance of the inspired apostles, and the inquiry came up from the three thousand: “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” they were all told what to do to become Christians, did what was com-

manded, and "were added to them the same day." No account of a single failure, or a single one waiting till another day. No account of one of them going away seeking, or being put off till another day. Not a single case is found on the sacred record of persons seeking the way to the Redeemer, or the way to pardon, who did not find it on the first interview with the minister of Christ. All the tedious processes, such as commencing in infancy, with christening, commonly called "baptism," followed by "confirmation," or the process at the "anxious seat," the "altar of prayer," or the "mourner's bench," in which honest and sincere persons are kept seeking, mourning, grieving and agonizing for days, weeks, months, and even years, in doubts; in some instances driven into insanity, or despair, are as unscriptural as Romish penance, and as unreasonable as unscriptural or unevangelical. Who would have believed, had he been posted at some point in the time of the apostles, that the holy, the plain, the easy and infallible way of the Lord, in our time, would be spoken against and condemned on account of that which should commend it to our highest respect, viz.: *That it is adap-*

ted to the whole people, and made accessible to them, and not like some of those dark and gloomy systems which keep men groping in the dark for years, and, in numerous instances, till they die, without obtaining even the imagination that they are pardoned.

But simple and easy as the way of the Lord is, in that way persons were made Christians anciently, as they also are now, and nothing else. The practice of the apostles never made a Presbyterian since the world was made, nor was one ever heard of till many long centuries of the Christian era had passed away. We must have something more than the practice of the apostles, or the preaching of the gospel—something in addition—before we can make a Presbyterian. But Dr. Rice is one of the last men who should say anything about an *easy way*. The easiest way yet heard of is, to sprinkle a few drops of water on the face of an unconscious infant, in the name of the Trinity, without any faith, change of heart, "experience," spiritual influence, holy impulse, or feeling, to initiate it into Christ, or into his Church. Yes, this is the *easy way*, not to make Christians, for no one was ever

made a Christian in this way; but this is the *easy way* to deceive persons into the belief that they are in the Church when they are not; to introduce them into the Presbyterian Church; to deceive them when they come to the years of accountability; making them believe that that has been done for them which none but themselves can do—to give themselves to God; to “yield themselves” to be servants of God. This is the *easy way*, not to make *Christians*, but to get them into the Presbyterian Church, without being Christians, without regeneration, the new birth, or any knowledge what it is. This *easy way* has involved more persons in difficulty, in doubts, dissatisfaction, and perplexity, and hindered them from making an intelligent and personal profession of the Christian religion than all the other errors in teaching combined. Still Dr. Rice is for it, and doing his utmost to “draw” as many, not “well-meaning people,” but unconscious infants, before they mean anything, or know what those mean who have this empty ceremony performed, or even before they know their right hand from their left, into it as he possibly can. How can any man who thus “draws” unconscious

infants into a church before they know there is a church, Holy Spirit, Redeemer or Deity, have the assurance to talk of men *drawing* well-meaning persons into a movement, who make their appeal openly and to the intelligence of those who have attained to the years of accountability? Those operating through the agency of a mother, who is already in the church, as deeply biased and misguided as the preacher, to "draw" infants into the church, before they know anything, or can offer the least resistance, are the persons who "draw," not "well-meaning persons," but infants *without any meaning*, into the church. This is the *easy way*! What talent, learning and masterly ability it requires to do this great work—to christen babies! This honor no man taketh to himself more than Dr. N. L. Rice.

4. The Doctor's fourth reason for this "remarkable success" is, that "the popularity of this reformation was greatly increased amongst a large class of men by the zeal with which Mr. Campbell assailed the clergy and denounced all the benevolent enterprises of the age. The clergy of all denominations he represented as corrupt men, influenced wholly by ambition and the love

of money." That Mr. Campbell handled the clergy without gloves, no one is disposed to deny. Indeed, his lash must have cut keen and left a lasting sting which the Doctor feels sensibly to this day, seeming only to increase in intensity instead of abating, though the main work was done almost as long ago as the birth-day of Dr. Rice.—The Doctor, like young Saul, being exceedingly mad against the Disciples, appears destined to signalize himself in defense of the traditions handed down to him, and, being so constituted that he can learn nothing and feel no reason, outside of the little, narrow and contracted circle of Presbyterianism, till popular sentiment forces him, receives many severe cuts from which a little prudence would have saved him. Whether Mr. Campbell applied the rod too severely is a question of but little consequence now. If, however, Dr. Rice is a fair exponent of the clergy, and his temper, spirit and general bearing, represent theirs, it is exceedingly doubtful whether they ever received one stripe amiss.

As to the representation, that the move for reformation gained numbers by appeals to avarice, it is confronted, where success

has attended the effort, by the numerous houses for worship built, the institutions of learning erected, the preachers supported, contributions to the Bible Union, and numerous other good works. Who were they that left other religious bodies and united on the law of God? Were they the more penurious, the miserly, the narrow-hearted? or were they not as noble, free, liberal and whole-hearted as any they had? Have they not built more meeting houses in the several States, in the past twenty years, than the Presbyterians have since the settling of the country? Dr. Rice knows they have, and more in the very country where he has fought them most than any other.

5. The Dr. says, "This reformation gained popularity, too, because it made every immersed person, however ignorant, a *preacher*, and every little church wholly independent of all others." This is not true, in the sense in which the Doctor knew his language would be taken. "This reformation" never made "every immersed person, however ignorant, a *preacher*," in the sense in which he knew his language would be taken—that is, a *public preacher*

of the word. This reason, therefore, amounts to nothing. The disciples stand to the primitive practice, and intend to maintain it, though it should even give them popularity and an extended increase.

They are willing to throw all the restrictions found in the Christian Scriptures around preachers and preaching, but no others. But the truth is, the Dr. like many others who have never tried it, is under a grand delusion about it being so easy a matter for a man to become a preacher among the Disciples. He has not tried preaching yet where he was opposed by all parties and had to learn to ward off blows from all directions, from the Atheist, Deist, Universalist, and from all the ranks of sectarian partisans. He has never tried preaching yet, where he had to increase the numerical strength of his church by solid appeals to the intelligence of thinking men and women, inducing them to repent of their sins, turn to God and, for themselves, seek the salvation of their souls. He has never tried this yet; but if he ever should, he will find it a different work from persuading mothers, who belong to the church, and are already under his

influence, bound down under the same creed with himself, to bring their infants to be sprinkled, christened, made Christians and members of the church, and that it will require a different kind of talent. Men with a small amount of literature, whether regenerated or not, can *read* sermons, *say* prayers, hear an organ, and sprinkle infants, who never could come into the least notice or distinction, as preachers of the cross of Christ, in persuading men to *yield themselves* servants of God. Such men are the last who should open their lips about it being *easy* to enter a ministry, where the entire increase of the membership depends on the efforts of the ministry, appealing to the judgments and hearts of those capable of thinking and acting for themselves, inducing them to believe, repent and turn to God, in person, and *yield themselves* to the obedience of faith. The ministry having the *easy work* and the ministry *easy of access*, is that which operates on infants, *drawing them in*, before they can think or know anything about it. It is easy to become such a minister, and equally easy to do the work after becoming such an one. Such are the Doctor's five reasons for the remarkable success of the reformation.

CHAPTER VII.

The Doctor now approaches a little more closely to "examine the principles that lie at the foundation." He says, "The Campbellite sect was organized, if it can be said to have an organization, upon the two following principles: 1st. The rejection of creeds and union upon the Bible alone.— 2nd. Asking but one question of candidates for baptism, whether they believe Jesus Christ to be the Messiah." The Doctor appears to be so averse to what is right—so determinedly, persistently, and inevitably disposed to be wrong, that if there is any wrong way in reach, he is certain to find it. Both of the points here professedly stated as at the foundation of "the Campbellite body," which he appears to think himself called and sent to tear up, root and branch, are about as awkwardly stated as was possible in the number of words employed. He, of course, places the point, which naturally and Scripturally comes first, last. He has so long been accustomed to preaching church polity to men of the world, to convert them, or so

habituated to presenting and preaching his creed that men of the world may give their assent to it, that he can conceive of no other mode of procedure for us than "preaching union upon the Bible alone," first, and then preaching the confession of Christ next. Never in any pamphlet were there clearer evidences of confusion of mind, or the absence of a clear appreciation of what a man was aiming to combat, than in this case. If there is anything clear in Christianity, or in the evangelical procedure, as set forth in the New Testament, and as we have practiced, it is that preaching Christ, and confessing him go before church discipline or rules of Christian practice. The difference between such a preacher as Dr. Rice and primitive evangelists is as wide as between heaven and earth. The primitive evangelists went out with hearts overflowing with the love of Christ; with minds overwhelmed with the glories of Him whom they were sent to preach—whom God lifted up to draw all men to Him. They gloried in Him, preached Him, and induced men and women to identify themselves with Him. When persons were won to Him, loved Him, were

sorry for having sinned against Him, and demanded of the preacher, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" The preacher responded, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." The penitent man responded, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." The evangelist took the man down into the water and baptized him, and he went on his way rejoicing. Having thus placed himself under a new Leader, a new Lawgiver, with all confidence in him, he applies to his new Master, his Lord and King, for law, the rule of faith, that is to guide him, as a man of God, through the journey of Life. How different this from Dr. Rice. He preaches the Presbyterian doctrine, Presbyterian Church, and Presbyterian ministry, and explains how wisely and Scripturally the whole system is arranged, how it shuts out heresy; and if he makes a convert, which is not often the case, he is merely a convert to *Presbyterianism*, the Presbyterian Church and ministry. In this case, as a matter of course, it is necessary to ask many questions, take the applicant through a vigorous course of examination, to ascertain whether there is any unsoundness in

the intricate matters of an unintelligible catalogue of doctrines, many of which the preachers themselves never did and never can understand or agree on. The minister of Christ simply labors to convert men to Christ, and when the hearer believes in his heart that God raised him from the dead, confesses him with the mouth, and bows his whole being in personal submission to him, receives him according to the Gospel, he receives, *in him*, all he has for man, and binds himself to observe it. In other words, he receives the whole system, and takes its obligations on him, when he confesses and receives him who is the head of it. This, of course, does not suit Dr. Rice, for it leaves Presbyterianism out, *the whole of it*—including nothing but Christianity, *the whole of it*. The primitive evangelists received those who confessed and submitted to Christ. Dr. Rice receives two classes, viz.: 1st. Those who receive Presbyterianism, as set forth by the ministry and the Confession. 2d. Unconscious infants brought to him, that he may sprinkle water on their faces in the name of the Trinity, who never answered even "one question," or had one thought on the sub-

ject. What do these know about the doctrine of the Church which they are thus drawn into? or what do nine-tenths of those who bring them know about it? Not one out of ten of them know what is in the Confession, or what is not in it, and all the infants are brought in without knowing anything about it. Yet he who would continue this system, nine-tenths of whose advocates know no more of their entrance into the Church, and had no more personal agency or choice in it, than they had in their entrance into this world, opposes and ridicules the precise practice of the holy apostles and first evangelists of Jesus Christ, because they simply labored to save men, to turn to their Lord and Master—received them when they would confess and receive him! He also would sneer at all who occupy this ground, and prejudice the people against all those who now insist that we must preach precisely what the apostles preached—no more, no less; that those who become Christians now must believe precisely what those believed who became Christians under the apostles' preaching; that the converts must make precisely the same confession now that converts did

then—render the same obedience for the same purpose. This he opposes to the extent of his ability, and would improve on the wisdom of the infallible Spirit who guided the apostles and first evangelists, by adopting a few of the appendages devised by Presbyterian divines.

CHAPTER VIII.

The rejection of all creeds—all *human* creeds—and union on the Bible, the *divine* rule, the *only divine* rule, styled by Mr. Wesley, “the sufficient and the only infallible rule both for faith and practice,” the Doctor thinks a most dangerous and ruinous step. He proceeds to make war on those receiving the Bible as their only rule of faith, and presents the following proposition: “*The body possesses no unity of faith, but errors of every shape find a home in it.*” He then sets out, with almost the zeal and madness of young Saul, on his way to Damascus, scenting heresy. But one thing he fails to do, viz: *To find any error in the rule of faith adopted by those*

who take the *Bible alone*. This people have no error in their rule of faith. If the preachers commit blunders, they are only blunders *in the men*, and not in the rule of faith, bound on the members and their children. But Dr. Rice and his preaching brethren commit as many blunders, and show as many imperfections as other men, in their efforts to teach and practice their creed, and, as it abounds in errors, bound on him and his children after him, even when he follows his creed faithfully, he is plodding along in error much of his time. For instance, let us open the Confession almost at random, and see what will turn up. My edition falls open at page 23, and my eye falls on the following: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels, are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." Now, granting the truth of this, the conduct of men in this life has no more to do with obtaining eternal life than the

volition of an infant has to do with its being sprinkled and initiated into the Church. The predestination of God, before the world was made, and not the *actions of men* or angels, fixes immutably their eternal state, whether it be life or death, and the preaching, prayers, tears, and repentance of all the men in this universe cannot change the eternal condition of one human being or angel, or in any way affect it.

Let us hear this little book again. "To these officers" (the officers in the Presbyterian Church) "the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require." Con. p. 156. If the officers of the Presbyterian Church had claimed the keys of that Church, or power to open and shut it against whom they pleased, no reasonable man would have doubted the claim; but that they have "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," can "open and shut" it, or retain and "remit sins," will not be received as Pro-

testant doctrine in this country. It smacks pretty strongly of Popery. The Presbyterian Church is not the kingdom of heaven, or a person could not be in the kingdom of heaven and not be in the Presbyterian Church. The door into the Presbyterian Church is not the door into the kingdom of heaven, or a person could not enter by the door into the kingdom of heaven and not enter by the door into the Presbyterian Church. The keys which unlock the door of the kingdom of heaven are not the keys which unlock the door of the Presbyterian Church. The keys of the kingdom of heaven are not committed to the same hands that have the keys of the Presbyterian Church. The keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed to the hands of the Apostle Peter, and the keys of the Presbyterian Church are committed to the hands of Church officers in that Church. If the Apostle Peter were here, with the keys of the kingdom heaven, he could not open the doors of the Presbyterian Church with them. The door of the Presbyterian Church can only be opened with *Presbyterian keys*.

This same book, notwithstanding all Dr.

Rice's noise about the heathen, teaches that the heathen cannot be saved, without the Gospel. It says, "They who having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the laws of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess; neither is there salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the Savior only of his body, the Church." Con. p. 208. This speaks for itself.

Since Dr. Rice speaks of "all sorts of doctrine," we will let him rest a little after the lesson we have given from the Confession, and hear John Calvin, the principal man in giving birth to the Presbyterian Church. He says, "And, therefore, even infants themselves bring their own condemnation into the world with them, who, though they have not produced the fruits of their iniquity, yet have the seeds of it within them, as it were, a seed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God." Institutes, vol. II, p. 483. What if these sinful infants die? The answer of the Confession is: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved

by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth." Con. p. 64. Such is a slight sprinkle of *the sorts of doctrine* taught under the wise and prudent arrangement of Presbyterianism, and this is not a tithe of what may be selected from their standard works. Look, too, where a number of the strongest men they ever had in this country have strayed to, with all their Synods, Presbyteries, learned ministers aided by the Confession! Look at the Beechers, schooled in Presbyterianism, with their native great minds, perplexed and confused with the unintelligible subtleties forming the main features in the system! Where is it leading these to? More erratic men cannot be found in this country—one of them proposing to administer baptism to the same person every month; if the person desires it, and another teaching that man must have had a pre-existence in some other state, to have contracted so great sinfulness as he evinces here. Look at Finney, who was one of the most distinguished men in the Presbyterian Church! What did he think of it, after having been in it, through it, and all round it? Let us hear him a few words: He

says, "These things, in the Presbyterian Church, their contentions and janglings, are so ridiculous, so wicked, so outrageous, that no doubt there is a jubilee in hell, every year, about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly; and if there were tears in heaven, no doubt they would be shed over the difficulties of the Presbyterian Church. Ministers have been dragged from home, up to the General Assembly, and there heard debates and witnessed a spirit by which their souls have been grieved, and their hearts hardened, and they have gone home ashamed of their Church, and ashamed to ask God to pour out his Spirit upon such a contentious body."

This is the language of a man well acquainted with the system and the ministry. He speaks from personal knowledge. Look at the debates, strifes and divisions in this body, and then ask the question, Have the Presbyterians developed the wisdom, prudence and necessity of having a *human* creed, to accomplish what the law of God cannot do? Have they shown that all those who have taken the Bible as their only rule of faith, are "drawn in," deceived and led astray, and that they would do

wisely to abandon their Bible-alone position, and come under the Presbyterian Confession of Faith?

The truth is, A. Campbell and Barton W. Stone, being perplexed and confused in their younger days with unintelligible, mystical and dark language of Presbyterianism; involved in its subtle, speculative and untaught disputes; brought up in different countries, diverged considerably from each other on some points; but when they resolved to relinquish all unscriptural doctrine, and even unscriptural phrases, words and expressions, and give supreme honor to Christ, they united without regard to difference of opinion. After this, the difference vanished, the fruitless disputes of their more youthful days disappeared, and they dwelt in unity and love till Elder Stone closed his career on earth. That B. W. Stone honored our Lord Jesus the Christ more than Dr. N. L. Rice ever did, notwithstanding all the twaddle of Dr. Rice, about his Unitarianism, we think, is susceptible of the clearest proof, if the Doctor does refer to him as contemptibly as if he had been an Atheist. But B. W. Stone knew what was in Presbyterianism,

and so did A. Campbell, and both renounced it for the Bible, as their only rule of faith, of which they certainly have no reason to be sorry, either for time or eternity. There is not one ray of light from heaven that has ever reached the abodes of men, in any creed, or any book, or any man, that is not from the Bible. Mr. Rice may, to the day of his death, as most probably he will, try to create distrust in the minds of those who take the Bible as their only rule of faith, and unite on it; but it will amount to nothing at last, for every man must be as conscious as he is that he is a living being, that if the man who honestly reads the Bible to know the will of God, and does it to the best of his ability, fervently calling on the Lord for aid, both in understanding and doing, is not safe, infallibly safe, then no man in this world is safe. Suppose for the sake of the case, the step taken in receiving Bro. Raines, with the distinct avowal that he did not renounce Universalism, was wrong: it is no argument against the Bible-alone position, but simply *an error in their procedure*. It is evident that those who hold Universalism do not hold it as an opinion, but make it the principal

article in their faith. Bro. Raines, however, true to his profession, to take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, soon found that it was no system of Universalism, and from that day to this, he has been as sound on the whole question of future punishment as Dr. Rice himself, and has made a better defense of the truth against the empty and idle philosophy of Universalism than Dr. Rice ever did, or ever can till he abandons his own defenceless theory. Indeed, Dr. Rice holds and maintains, with the most determined pertinacity, the main error; the centre pillar of Universalism, viz: "That all that Christ died for will be saved." He is also involved in that other fundamental error of Universalism, viz: That nothing that man can do in this life can in any way effect his condition in the eternal state; that before the world was made, God, by an immutable decree, determined the precise number, and the very persons, to be saved, on the one hand, or lost, on the other; and if this be true, all the Bibles, missionaries, preaching, praying, circulating tracts, books and publications of every sort, with all the other efforts, ever made, or that ever can

be made, never saved one soul, and never can, and, on the other hand, all the sin in the world has never been the means of one being lost. The decree of God, without any foresight of faith, or deeds of men, settles this matter before the beginning of time. Such is the position of the man, such are the absurdities in which he is involved, who would set himself up to ridicule and oppose the effort of all the sincere and good men who are trying to escape from the delusions of this age and return to pure Christianity, as the Lord gave it—men who believe and maintain all that is divine, all that is from heaven and escape from all that is human.

Can men lead the people astray by insisting on their adhering strictly to the law of God, the whole law of God, and nothing but the law of God; uniting on it, living in peace and love! Certainly not. If anything is infallibly safe, this is. Let the Lord reign over us supremely. Let his law be the supreme authority. The Bible is right and reliable, if anything in this world is. All led by it are led rightly; all under its influence are under divine influence; all opposed to it are wrong—all the way wrong.

On page 8th, the Dr. Says: "The body possesses no unity, but errors of every shade find a home in it." This is not only untrue in itself, but it contains one of the most malignant, premeditated and deliberate mis-statements ever contained in the same number of words. The true state of the case is as precisely the opposite of this as language can express it. There is no such unity among any body of people on this earth as among the very people here misrepresented; and there is no body of people in this world among whom errors of every shade find so little repose, or one so far from finding a home. Every preacher and writer is entirely free and untrammelled, with the most perfect liberty to attack, assail, expose and refute every shade that makes its appearance. Their motto is, *the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth*. Every preacher is under the most solemn obligations to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints"—"preach the word"—to "make known nothing but Christ and him crucified"—to "glory in nothing but the cross of Christ"—to "stop the mouths of gainsayers," and "put to silence the foolishness of ignorant

men." Not only so, but every member has the right of "private judgment," and the privilege to express it, even to a preacher and this right is exercised.

No man among the Disciples has any right, or privilege, to preach any doctrine but the doctrine of Christ. The doctrine of Christ, the whole of it, and nothing else, is the length and breadth, the height and depth, of the faith of the Christian. Every man among the Disciples who oversteps the bounds of the doctrine of Christ, or stops short of it, is not, only liable to be assailed, but certain to be exposed, both publicly and privately, by both preachers and private members as far as he is deemed worthy of notice. If he is a popular and influential man the public journals lay their hands on him and his career is soon checked. This is not only the best means of securing the truth to a religious body, but the only divine means of keeping the faith uncorrupted and pure to the day of Jesus Christ. But Dr. Rice has the honor of belonging to a Church and preaching for it, that is not only a home for some of the worst errors in the world, but these errors are canonized, sanctioned and maintained

by the highest authority in the Church, and he dare not touch them; and, as to unity, the Disciples have maintained their unity, without any division of any importance, or any general division in the body, while Presbyterians are wrangling about Church government, New School and Old School, some maintaining the most ultra Calvinism, and others, as the Beechers, like wandering stars, seeking an escape from Calvinism in Unitarianism, pre-existence, or transmigration of souls. Look at the disputes of Dr. Wilson, Finney, and many others in the past thirty years, with the later disputes on Slavery, of which the debate between Dr. N. L. Rice and Blanchard is a fair example, and behold the *unity* of Presbyterians, and how beautiful it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! Here, if it were desirable to dwell on the frailties of human nature, or imbecility of human systems, a subject might be found, not only for a tract, but for many volumes, showing that the legitimate tendency of the main life's effort of all such men as Dr. Rice, is to prevent anything like harmony, unity and love, from ever obtaining among the children of God. How different from

all this where the effort has been made to unite the people on the law of God! Communities have been entered where the people were divided into parties, the gospel has been preached, infusing peace by Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all, and vast numbers have been collected from all the conflicting parties of these communities and united on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus the Christ the chief corner—seated together in heavenly places in Christ, the enmity which was between them being destroyed and the people made one—"one fold and one Shepherd." This is the work that troubles Dr. Rice.

CHAPTER IX.

On page 14, Dr. Rice proceeds to speak of "some of the acknowledged evils of the system." Here, too, we find pettifoggery in abundance. Here the Dr. gives us a fair and full exhibition of his old trade in *sophistry*. Where does he look to find "some of the acknowledged evils of the system." He gravely proceeds to quotations from Mr.

Campbell, in which he speaks pretty freely of mistakes *in practice*, or of men having failed to carry out the system. Of course, the errors *in practice*, in the eye of a deceived man, or one who would deceive others, are easily transformed into mistakes *in the system* itself; yes, more, even the "*acknowledged evils of the system!*" So sophistry teaches; so sophistical doctors think, or at least, if they could, would induce others to think. The logic is this: Some men who have received Christianity itself, nothing more, nothing less, as their system, Mr. Campbell acknowledges, have failed to teach and practice it correctly; therefore there are acknowledged evils in the system, or in Christianity itself! Dr. Rice might extend his reasoning still more widely. By the same sophistry employed by him, the same system might have been condemned in Paul's time. He confessed that there were divisions in the Church in Corinth; that a corrupt man had his father's wife; that brethren went to law with brethren; that the communion was turned into a pagan feast; and that some in that Church denied the resurrection of the dead. Some enemy to Paul and the gospel, desiring to oppose

and bring the gospel into disrepute, heads an article, "Acknowledged evils of the system," and proceeds to quote the apostle, where he makes these godly and candid admissions, that certain men had failed to practice the holy system which the Lord had given, and in the same style of our little pettifogger, exclaims, "Look here! what a list of 'acknowledged evils,'" I have collected from Paul's own pen! This same sophistry is used by infidels against the pure and holy religion of Jesus. They point us to the terrible defections, unloveliness and perverseness of such men as Dr. Rice; to their bitterness of spirit, disposition to misrepresentation, selfish and partisan course, and make their wonderful failure in apprehending the spirit and practicing the gospel an objection to the religion of Christ and the Christian ministry. The only reply there can be properly made is, the one that must now be made to Dr. Rice, viz. That we must distinguish between the *system* and the *practice*. The system is *divine*; the practice is *human*. The system is perfect; the practice is imperfect. God made the system, and man performs the practice, or *professes* to perform it, but some

times comes short. His failure in practice, in the place of being an "acknowledged evil in the system," is only an evil *in those who should practice the system, but fail*. The wayward course of such unlovely, opposing and averse men, under a profession of religion, or in the ministry, is no evidence against religion itself or the ministry, but an exponent of the perverseness, imperfection and weakness of such men. They will be perverse under any system. They are not exponents of the ministry, or the system they have adopted. The system is not to be judged by the men, but the men are to be judged by the system.

CHAPTER X.

"The system examined, and its errors exposed," is the next head. Under this head the Dr. attacks, demolishes, kills and buries "Baptismal Regeneration." If the dear little man could only invent some way of keeping it *killed*, so that it would not have to be killed over again every new moon, it would save an immense amount

of hard labor. But no method has yet been invented to kill it so that it will stay killed. It is impossible to tell how many times Dr. Rice has killed, buried and cast into oblivion this horrible monster, incessantly haunting the clergy of this country, exciting their imagination, and annoying their composure; and still, if we could believe him, it is alive, and efforts must again be made to kill it. Now that Dr. N. L. Rice knows that the Disciples no more believe in baptismal regeneration than he does himself, is as certain as that he is a man of common sense. But since he is haunted with baptismal regeneration, and determines to keep telling that the Disciples believe in it, he shall have a little baptismal regeneration from that pure and (with him) almost infallible source, John Calvin.

“From our faith derives three advantages, which require to be distinctly considered. The first is, that it is proposed to us by the Lord as a symbol or token of our purification; or to express my meaning more fully, it resembles a legal instrument, properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced and

obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all who believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which is the principal thing in baptism, which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.'—Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II. p. 477.

— We will hear Calyin again:

“Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past, so that for sins into which we fall after baptism, it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened, in other ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life—a prepos-

terous caution which is frequently censured in the writings of the ancient bishops. But we ought to conclude that, at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole life.—Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins.”—Calvin’s Institutes, Vol. II., p. 478.

Here is baptism, not only for *past*, but for *future* sins, and, by implication, baptism a “remedy of expiation” for sins.—But we will let the Dr. hear Calvin again:

“I know the common opinion is that remission of sins, which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone, is afterward obtained by repentance and the benefit of the keys. But the advocates of this opinion have fallen into an error for want of considering that the power of the keys, of which they speak, is so dependent on baptism that it cannot by any means be separated from it.”—Calvin’s Institutes, Vol. II., p. 479.

Commenting on the expression of Paul—“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 we should walk in newness of life"—Calvin says, "In this passage he does not merely exhort us to an imitation of Christ, as if he had said that we are admonished by baptism, that after the example of his death we should die to sin, and that after the example of his resurrection we should rise to righteousness; but he goes considerably further, and teaches us that by baptism Christ has made us partakers of his death, in order that we may be engrafted into it."—Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II., p. 480.

On the same page he further says:—
"Thus we are promised, first, the gratuitous remission of sins and imputation of righteousness; and, secondly, the grace of the Holy Spirit to reform us to newness of life." Again, page 481, he says, "Thus John first, and the apostles afterward, baptized with the baptism of *repentance*, intending regeneration, and, by *remission of sins*, absolution." Here Calvin teaches that John the Baptist and the apostles taught "the baptism of repentance, intending *regeneration*," and that this was "for the remission of sins," or "absolution."

Dr. Rice must be well instructed by his venerable father in the Presbyterian gospel on this subject. He says again, on the same page: "John and the apostles agreed in the same doctrine; both baptized to repentance; both to remission of sins; both baptized in the name of Christ, from whom repentance and remission of sins proceed." Still further, same page, he says, "For who will attend to Chrysestom, who denies that remission of sins was included in the baptism of John, rather than to Luke, who, on the contrary, affirms that John came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Nor must we admit that subtlety of Augustine, 'that in the baptism of John sins were remitted in hope, but in the baptism of Christ they were remitted in fact.' For, as the evangelist clearly testifies that John, in his baptism, promised the remission of sins, why should we diminish this commendation, when no necessity constrains us to it?"

Let the Doctor have patience, and he shall be well enlightened from Calvin.— Hear him in regard to infants: "And, therefore, even infants themselves bring their own condemnation into the world with

them, who, though they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, yet have the seed of it within them; even their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God. But by baptism, believers are certified that this condemnation is removed from them; since, as we said, the Lord promises us, by this sign, that a full and entire remission is granted, both of the guilt which is to be imputed to us, and of the punishment to be inflicted on account of that guilt; they also receive righteousness, such as the people of God may obtain in this life; that is only by imputation, because the Lord, in his mercy, accepts them as righteous and innocent."—Institutes, Vol. II., p. 483.

We must hear Calvin a little further.—He says: "Ananias, therefore, only intended to say to Paul, 'That thou mayest be assured that thy sins are forgiven, be baptized. For in baptism the Lord promises remission of sins; receive this and be secure.'"—Institutes, p. 487. Again, p. 488, he says: "By baptism God promises remission of sins, and will certainly fulfill his promise to all believers; that promise

was offered to us in baptism—let us therefore embrace it by faith; it was long dormant by reason of unbelief—now, then, let us receive it by faith.” Please hear Calvin yet again: “The virtue, dignity, utility and end of this mystery have now, if I mistake not, been sufficiently explained. With respect to the external symbol, I sincerely wish that the genuine institution of Christ had the influence it ought to have to repress the audacity of men. For, as though it were a contemptible thing to be baptized in water according to the precept of Christ, men have inherited a benediction, or rather incantation, to pollute the true consecration of the water.”—*Institutes*, Vol. II., p. 490. Be not surprised, Dr., at the mention here of being “baptized *in* water,” for on the next page Calvin says: “The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church.”

To close these quotations from Calvin, let us hear him once more, urging the necessity, not only of infant baptism, but *infant regeneration!* “For if they pretend that infants do not perish, even though they are considered as children of Adam,

their error is abundantly refuted in Scripture. For when it pronounces that 'in Adam all die,' it follows that their remains no hope of life but in Christ. In order to become heirs of life, therefore, it is necessary for us to be partakers of him. So, when it is said, in other places, that 'we are by nature the children of wrath,' and 'conceived in sin,' with which condemnation is always connected, it follows that we must depart from our own nature to have any admission to the kingdom of God.— And what can be more explicit than this declaration, that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' Let everything of our own, therefore, be destroyed, which will not be effected without regeneration, and there we shall see this possession of the kingdom of God. Lastly, if Christ speaks the truth when he declares himself to be 'life,' it is necessary for us to be engrafted into him, that we may be rescued from the bondage of death. But how, it is inquired, are infants regenerated, who have no knowledge either of good or evil? We reply, that the work of God is not yet without existence, because it is not observed or understood by us. Now it is

certain that some infants are saved; and that they are previously regenerated by the Lord is beyond all doubt. For if they are born in a state of corruption, it is necessary for them to be purified before they are admitted into the kingdom of God, into which 'there shall in nowise enter anything that defileth.' If they are born sinners, as both David and Paul affirm, either they must remain unacceptable and hateful to God, or it is necessary for them to be justified."—Institutes, Vol. II., p. 508.

After this lesson, if the Dr. please, he will turn to the Confession of Faith, page 144, and read as follows: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in the Church, unto the end of the world." Now the reader will bear in mind that it is here stated that baptism is "for the admission of the party

baptized into the visible church." Please compare this with the Confession, page 394: "Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, till they profess faith in Christ and obedience to him; but the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized." This cuts off all children whose parents are not members of the visible church, and debars them from admittance into the visible church, and from the "sign of regeneration and remission of sins." Now, what becomes of all those infants who die out of the visible church? Let the following answer: "They who never having heard the gospel know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved."—Confession, p. 203. If we would be certain in regard to all children—those not in the church, with the whole pagan world—look at the following: "The visible church is a society made of all such as in all ages and places of the world do profess the true religion, and of their children."—Con., p. 209. Here is the body of Christ, or the visible church, consisting of those who *profess the true religion and their children*. Of whom is Christ the Savior? "He is the Savior *only*

of his body the church." According to this, Christ is not even the Savior of those infants whose parents are not in the visible church, and consequently, if they are saved, it must be *without a Savior!* This is no forced construction, but evidently the plain and obvious import of the Confession; hence, on page 64, we have the following: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, and how he pleaseth." But what of non-elect infants, who die in infancy? For if there be any non-elect, they must have been non-elect when in infancy, and "from all eternity." What of all those infants of parents not members of the true church, who are, by the Confession, decided to be out of the body, of whom Christ is not the Savior? Dr. Rice maintains that none of these die in infancy! No matter when they die; they always were non-elect, always will be, and cannot be saved, according to the creed, for they never had a Savior! Christ is the Savior only of his body, the church—the true believers and their children! For all the balance there is no salvation, either for adults or infants. Here we have, not "all sorts of doctrine,"

for then we should have some good, but the pernicious, revolting and absurd doctrine ever advocated, not only of water regeneration, or the absurd or preposterous doctrine of infant regeneration, but of infants without a Savior! not preached simply by some ignorant and irresponsible men, but put forth in standard works, bound upon the consciences of the people, and the preachers sworn to defend it! Nor is what is here presented even a tithe of the preposterous absurdities contained in this book, backed up by the tribunal of Presbyterian *divines!*

Would it not be a brilliant move for the Disciples to yield the scriptural doctrine of regeneration, which they hold and teach, that we are begotten not of corruptible but of incorruptible seed—the word of God; that we are begotten, not of blood, nor of the will of man, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God; that except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God; that a man must be born again; that if a man shall believe in his heart that God raised our Lord from the dead, and confess with his mouth, that he shall be saved; that whomsoever a man *yields himself* a ser-

vant to obey, his servant he is—to yield to the doctrine of personal submission to Christ, a personal and open confession, *with the whole heart*, in personal and willing obedience, under the influence of a previous divine change of heart, by faith, in which the man bows his entire being to the authority of the great King: we say, would it not be a brilliant move to give this up for an empty, lifeless, and spiritless system of infant regeneration, baptism and membership, in which the subject has no volition, choice or heart, and does not yield to God, but only *involuntarily yields to the will of the preacher*, and about all of which it has no more personal knowledge, agency or responsibility than a brick or stone in being placed in the wall of a building? No, Dr.; while the Disciples believe there is a God, a glorious Savior, in whom dwells all the fulness of the God-head bodily, a Holy Spirit, sent to reprove the world; that man is an accountable being, and that the Gospel of Jesus, the Christ, is divine—*never! NEVER! NEVER!* while they remember the confession of the immaculate name of Jesus, and the solemn covenant into which they have voluntarily, in peni-

tence, trembling and tears, entered, dare they, can they, will they yield their position for the poor, empty and unmeaning ceremony of an infant church-membership. No, Sir; nor can you have any heart, good feeling, nor pious emotions in your warning and entreaty with the people not to unite with the Disciples. You know, or if you do not, the fault is your own, that you do not hold a truth from heaven; that you do not have a holy impulse, act or thought, of a divine character, not possessed by the Disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know, or might, if you would lay aside your determined prejudices and make a reasonable effort to inform yourself, that if all truth held and sacredly maintained by the Disciples were stricken out of your Church, not one scrap of anything divine would remain in it.— You would then have nothing but the mere skeleton of *Presbyterianism*. What, then, is the meaning of your warning, only the expression arising from the struggle of a most determined and bitter partisan, in a sinking effort to maintain a system, waxed old and ready to vanish away, and which cannot stand the test of Gospel light and truth?

CHAPTER XI.

The Doctor says, "The only other doctrine of Mr. Campbell which claims particular attention, is his denial of the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification." See his Tract, p. 30. Now if Dr. Rice does not know that Mr. Campbell does not deny, but has all the time maintained the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, he is certainly much more blinded by determined partisan zeal than we thought possible to any man. The very first quotation he makes to prove that Mr. Campbell *denies the influence* of the Holy Spirit, asserts that the "Holy Spirit puts forth *moral and converting power.*" The question of which Mr. Campbell was speaking, was not whether the Holy Spirit *put forth converting power* or influence; for Mr. Campbell constantly asserted that he puts forth converting power or influence; but the question under discussion with Mr. Campbell was, whether he puts it forth *through the word*, or *separate from the word*. Mr. Campbell has from the beginning maintained that the Holy Spirit puts forth converting power, or influence, in conversion and sanctification, but that he puts it *forth through the truth*, and not *separate from it*, as in the following quotation, italicized by Dr. Rice: "As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words

Rice had been under the influence of the Holy Spirit when he wrote his tract. He would certainly have produced a very different document. The apostles, under the infallible influence of the Holy Spirit, preached the gospel to save men; to open their eyes, turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, and thus by the power, or influence of the Holy Spirit, turned thousands to God. All the ministers sent of God in our time, preach the gospel to convert and save men, and all those converted and saved by the gospel, are converted and *saved by the Holy Spirit*, who spoke through the apostles. Nor is there one scrap of authority for any man to preach, that man can be turned to the Lord, or to try to turn man to the Lord, without the gospel. To allege that he who believes and teaches that the Spirit of God operates through the gospel, and through the ministry, in conversion and sanctification, denies the influence of the Spirit, is as wicked as it is illogical and untrue. Such manifest misrepresentations may serve to prejudice, mislead and darken the minds of those whom a good ministry of Jesus Christ should enlighten and save, but will involve him who practices it in an awful predicament to stand the decision of the Judge who knows what is in man.

Dr. Rice says, "Indeed, if the doctrine of Mr. Campbell be true, prayers for the conversion of sinners, and the sanctification

instrumentalities. Dr. Rice has been challenged for twenty years past, and so have all who believe with him, to produce an instance where the Holy Spirit has converted and sanctified one person without the word, or in the absence of the gospel, declared by Paul to be "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes;" but an instance of the kind neither he nor any other man has or can produce. But numerous instances are recorded on the Sacred pages, where men were converted by the power, or influence of the Spirit of God, put forth through the gospel. The Holy Spirit now puts forth his power through the gospel and the ministry, he divinely chooses means, or instrumentalities, and converts, sanctifies and saves men and women. This work Dr. Rice repudiates, opposes, ridicules and calls it, contemptuously, *Campbellism*, and asserts something else to be the influence of the Holy Spirit! In this, he opposes that which is unquestionably the influence of the Holy Spirit, and maintains that something is his influence which is not. In full view now of all this, Dr. Rice comes forth, writes a Tract, the Presbyterian Board publish it and Presbyterians circulate it; and a main item in this tract is, the representation, that those who believe that the Holy Spirit *operates upon men through the word*, or through the gospel, *deny the influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification!* - Would that Dr.

Rice had been under the influence of the Holy Spirit when he wrote his tract. He would certainly have produced a very different document. The apostles, under the infallible influence of the Holy Spirit, preached the gospel to save men; to open their eyes, turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, and thus by the power, or influence of the Holy Spirit, turned thousands to God. All the ministers sent of God in our time, preach the gospel to convert and save men, and all those converted and saved by the gospel, are converted and *saved by the Holy Spirit*, who spoke through the apostles. Nor is there one scrap of authority for any man to preach, that man can be turned to the Lord, or to try to turn man to the Lord, without the gospel. To allege that he who believes and teaches that the Spirit of God operates through the gospel, and through the ministry, in conversion and sanctification, denies the influence of the Spirit, is as wicked as it is illogical and untrue. Such manifest misrepresentations may serve to prejudice, mislead and darken the minds of those whom a good ministry of Jesus Christ should enlighten and save, but will involve him who practices it in an awful predicament to stand the decision of the Judge who knows what is in man.

Dr. Rice says, "Indeed, if the doctrine of Mr. Campbell be true, prayers for the conversion of sinners, and the sanctification

of believers, are wholly unavailing and useless. Are they not solemn mockery?" That which is here called "the doctrine of Mr. Campbell," is the doctrine of the New Testament, that the Holy Spirit converts sinners and sanctifies believers through the word, or through the truth. David says, "The law of the Lord is perfect, *converting the soul.*" Here, Doctor, follows the Lord's account of the seed sown by the Holy Spirit, from which springs or results the new birth, or regeneration. The holy apostle, under the infallible influence of the Holy Spirit, says, "Being begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which lives and abides forever." 1. Pet. i: 23. Here is the seed which the Spirit of God sows in the heart, from which results the new creation, the new birth, or regeneration. All born of this incorruptible seed, the *word of God*, are born of the Spirit, just as much as if they were born of God without the seed, the word of God. In the parable of the sower, Matt. xiii, the Lord explains the seed of the kingdom to be "the word of God." This is the seed from which comes faith, the new birth, new creation, or regeneration. When the devil would prevent conversion, or regeneration, the Lord says, "then straightway comes the devil and catches away the word out of his heart lest he should believe and be saved." The prophet enters a complaint against the Jews,

in the following words: "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." In this same parable, the Lord explains the good ground to be the man who received the word of God into a good and honest heart, understands it and obeys it. Now, will Dr. Rice face these holy and unerring instructions and declare that he will not henceforth pray for the conversion of sinners, because the law of the Lord is perfect *converting* the soul, and the Spirit of God itself, speaking through the holy apostle, declares that we are "begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," and "the seed is the word of God?" Will he refuse to pray for the conversion of sinners, and call it mockery thus to pray, simply because the Spirit has seen fit to make the word of God the seed of the kingdom, of regeneration, or the new birth, or because he regenerates or converts men through the word of God, and not without it? As well might he refuse to pray for his daily bread, because the Lord does not give it to him by an abstract operation of the Spirit, without the tedious process of tilling the ground.

But there is something still a little more serious for the Dr. and all like him to reflect on here. If sanctification of believ-

ers is through the word, as Mr. Campbell teaches, the Dr. asks, "Is not prayer solemn mockery?" All the disciples of Christ answer, no; for our Lord and Master prayed the Father, for believers, "Sanctify them *through the truth; thy Word is truth.*" Dr. Rice, do you call that prayer "solemn mockery?" No, sir, you know it is not. Then take back that rash and unchristian expression, and join with our gracious Lord in most solemn and fervent prayer to the Almighty Father, to sanctify believers, not through a direct, or an immediate influence of the Spirit, without the truth; but to sanctify them *through the truth.* It is sanctification of the Spirit, when it is *through the truth*, as much as if it were *without the truth.* Come, Dr., take back all that rashness, and remember that the whole work is of the Spirit, both in regeneration and sanctification, and precisely as important that we should pray for it, if the Spirit does it through the truth, as if he does it separate from, or without the truth.

The philosophy of Dr. Rice appears to be about this: If God does not convert sinners and sanctify believers, by a direct influence of the Spirit, separate from, or without the truth, *he can not see how he does it*, and because he can not see how he does it, he thinks God can not do it at all, and, therefore, it is "solemn mockery" for him to pray for it! Does he limit the Almighty to a direct influence of the Spirit,

as the only way in which he can convert a sinner or sanctify a believer? Is not the conversion of sinners, as well as the sanctification of believers, from God, and by the Spirit, when it is through the truth, as much as if it were without the truth? And if the Lord prayed for sanctification *through the truth*, why may we not pray for sanctification in the same way? Not only so, but if Dr. Rice can not see how sinners can be converted through the truth, and believers sanctified, how can he see how they can be converted and sanctified by a direct influence of the Spirit? What does he know about a direct influence of the Spirit? Certainly nothing. How silly, absurd and presumptuous, then, for him to limit the Lord's operation, in converting sinners and sanctifying believers to his unintelligible, undefinable and mystical theory of an abstract, direct or immediate influence of the Spirit, and then assume that if the Lord does not operate in *that way*, he *can not operate in any way*, and consequently that prayer is "solemn mockery!" Especially is this astonishing, with the example of Jesus before him, praying for the sanctification *through the truth*.

The question is not whether the Lord *can* convert men and sanctify believers by a direct influence of the Spirit without the truth, but whether *he does*. We know of no proof that *he does*, and Dr. Rice has certainly produced none. The question is

not whether the Lord *can* convert sinners and sanctify believers through the truth, but whether *he does*. We have referred to the Scriptures showing that *he does*, and that he prayed himself to his Father to sanctify believers *through the truth*. Here, then, is something clear, tangible and intelligible. Men are begotten by the incorruptible seed, the word of God. This we are taught in the Scriptures in so many words. Why, then, can not Christians pray, as the Lord did for them who should "believe *through their word*," and that believers may be sanctified *through the truth*? We see nothing to hinder any man from thus praying, if he is a believer; or, in other words, if he is not a sceptic. Why should any man think it "solemn mockery" thus to pray? Why should any one limit the Almighty to a poor, weak human philosophy, an idle theory, and conclude that if he does not answer prayer in accordance with that philosophy, or theory, he can not answer it at all, and therefore decide that it is "solemn mockery" to pray? Is it not as credible to believe that God *can* and that he *will* answer prayer according to his teaching, as that he will answer in some other way. Is it not as likely that God will make believers according to his teaching and the prayer of Jesus—"through their word"—as that he will make believers in some way not mentioned in the Bible? Is it not as likely that the Lord will sanc-

tify believers according to the prayer of Jesus, "through the truth," as that he will sanctify them in some other way not mentioned in the Bible? Or, is Dr. Rice so bound down under the idle theory, that the Lord gives faith, converts sinners, and sanctifies believers, *through a direct influence of the Spirit*, that he holds it to be impossible for the Almighty to give faith, convert sinners and sanctify believers any other way? *He* may be limited, circumscribed and bound by the philosophy, theory, or empty speculation, that the Lord gives faith, converts sinners and sanctifies believers, through a direct or immediate influence of the Spirit, so that he can conceive of no other way in which it can be done, but the Lord is not. The Lord is not bound by this miserable pet theory of this generation, or any other theory of this or any other generation. He makes believers according to *his own will*. He does all things after the counsel of his own will. He says, "the Gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one who believes to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"—that "the preaching of the cross is to them who perish, foolishness; but to them who are saved, the wisdom of God and the power of God"—that "these things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you might have life through his name"—that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"—that "we

are begotten not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God"—that our Lord prayed for them who should believe on him, through the word of the apostles, and that the apostles should be sanctified through the truth. These Scriptures show how the Lord gives faith and sanctifies believers. Why can not a man of faith pray for the Lord to do this, in the way set forth by himself, as well as in some other way? We see no reason why the Lord may not give faith, convert sinners and sanctify believers, or why we should not pray that he may do this, *through the truth*, unless we have an idle philosophy in our minds, or rather a scepticism in our hearts, amounting to a disbelief, that the Lord can do this according to his own teaching, *through the truth*. The man who does not believe the Lord can give faith, convert sinners and sanctify believers *through the truth*, might readily declare that prayer for this to be done is solemn mockery.

CHAPTER XII.

Since the Dr. is in search of difficulties, in the way of prayer, we feel inclined to call his attention to one. If the Lord, before the world was made, unchangably ordained whatever comes to pass; if the number of the elect is so definite that it can

neither be increased nor diminished, how can any man pray for the conversion of the world? It may be said that prayer is ordained as a means for saving the elect. But what shall we say about the non-elect? If the Lord reprobated them to condemnation before the world, and if the number thus reprobated is so definite that it cannot be increased or diminished, we cannot pray for their conversion without praying for that to come to pass which God has decreed shall never occur! Still, it is the will of God that we should pray for all men! Still, according to the Confession, the reprobates never can be saved! Is it not "solemn mockery" to pray for them, if they never can be saved? if they were predestinated to everlasting death? How can they pray themselves? If they are reprobates, God will never hear them, never answer them, and they can never be saved. They may stand on their knees three hours per day, cry to the Lord till their tears fall to the ground, till the day of their death, and die calling on the name of the Lord, but can never be saved! This is not the worst still. No unconverted man can tell whether he is of the elect or not. Even the non-elect, we are taught, may have some "common operations of the Spirit." These may baffle many poor souls, and induce them to think that they are elect persons, and the elect may think they are non-elect, and none of them can know whether their

prayers will ever be answered. This throws all their prayers into doubts and uncertainty. They can never pray in faith. It is not generally claimed that it can be determined in this world who the elect are. This leaves all in doubt, not only in reference to their prayers, but their salvation, both living and dying.

If men never pray till they see *how* the Lord will answer, they will never pray. They cannot see *how* the Lord causes the globe to revolve on its axis, *how* he causes the blood to circulate in their veins, or *how* he causes water to slake their thirst. They cannot see *how* he created a man and a woman, or *how* he will raise all men from the dead. Shall doubts and unbelief arise in their hearts, in regard to these matters, because they cannot see *how* the Almighty causes them? Shall man, a worm of the dust, refuse to pray, and declare it "solemn mockery" because *he cannot see how* the Infinite One can answer if his theory, empty philosophy and unsupported speculation, of an immediate or direct influence of the Spirit, is set aside! Indeed! and can he see how the Lord can answer prayer by a direct influence of the Spirit? It is easy to say that the Lord answers prayer by a direct influence of the Spirit; but ask the man *how he does it!* He is at the end of his profound knowledge. He can tell you nothing about it. The Lord is not dependent on any man's theory to answer the

entreaties of the children of God. He who formed the eye, adapted the light to it; he who formed the ear, adapted the sound to it; he who created man and commanded him always to pray and not to faint, *can* and, blessed be his name, *will* answer prayer, whether we can see how he can do it or not, or whether he operates on man, in conversion and sanctification, by a direct influence of the Spirit or not. It is *faith* that man needs to enable him to pray, and not *theories* about the influence of the Spirit. We must have confidence in God that he *can* and that he *will* answer the supplications of his people, whether they can see how he does it or not. The Almighty is not limited by the theories of men, and men are not free who are limited by them.

CHAPTER XIII.

1. Why did Dr. Rice favor the world with the tract in question? The cause of this tract, no doubt, was his mortification, arising from so many people being converted from sectarianism, in reading the Lexington Debate. He has wisely come to the conclusion, that his productions, touching the Presbyterians and Christians, in a tract, circulated among his brethren, without Mr. Campbell's replies, will prove more effec-

tual. In this, we have no doubt, he will find very many who will agree with him. His efforts, side by side with those of Mr. Campbell, appear to great disadvantage. The contrast is very great and striking. No doubt that even *he* saw and felt it. His efforts appear to much better advantage in a little tract by themselves.

2. Many Presbyterians, Dr. Rice is well aware, will hear the Disciples preach, become awakened, and exchange their birth-right membership, conferred, or imposed on them without their choice or knowledge, in their infancy, for the membership proposed by the Savior, into which *they decide for themselves* to enter, in their own personal confession and submission to the Lord.— This annoys Dr. Rice exceedingly, and this he hoped to avert, in some degree, by sending out a tract, prejudicial to the Disciples, to be circulated and read privately by his brethren. The Lord commended the wisdom of the unjust steward, and, on the same principle, we may commend the wisdom of Dr. Rice, though we cannot commend his goodness in this matter.

3. Dr. Rice knows that a large number in the Presbyterian church, when they entered, did not *decide for themselves* to become members, *yield themselves* to become Presbyterians, or choose the Presbyterian doctrine, church or creed, or know anything about it, when inducted into the church; and that when the consciences of honest

persons of this description become awakened by the plain preaching of Christ among the Disciples, they are liable to *act for themselves*, choose, decide or determine the course they will take, yield to the authority of the Scriptures, and become Disciples of Christ. This he aimed to prevent in some degree, by prejudicing the minds of his brethren, so that they would not hear the Disciples.

4. The Doctor knows that a large majority in the Presbyterian church, well-meaning and honest-hearted as any in this world, have no baptism but an unmeaning ceremony imposed on them in their infancy, and that they did not, of course, *choose this for themselves*, but *somebody else chose it for them*; decided that they should have it, and imposed it on them, not only without their consent or knowledge, but before they could consent or refuse. Many of these, when they come to mature years, hear for themselves, see that baptism is an act of obedience, which requires *the person's own will, consent, heart and action*, will decide to *yield to the Lord a personal and voluntary obedience*, in being immersed into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. This the Doctor also desired to counteract.

5. Dr. Rice knows that a large majority of his brethren, as honest and well-meaning as any they have, without their choice, consent or knowledge, and before they were

capable of choice, consent or knowledge, in their infancy, had sprinkling imposed on them for baptism; and that when they become capable of thinking and *deciding for themselves* what the Lord requires them to do, if they hear the Disciples preach, at the same time insisting on all to read the Scriptures and decide for themselves what is right, referring them to those portions of the Scriptures where we read of their "baptizing in Jordan," "in Enon near Salem, because there was much water there," going "down into the water," being "buried with him in baptism," "buried with him by baptism," "going up out of the water," "having their bodies washed," etc., etc., and find no account of any sprinkling for baptism in the Scriptures, many will conclude that their sprinkling, in which they had no choice, consent or heart, cannot be obedience to God, and decide to be immersed, thus carrying out the convictions of their own consciences. This is a great trouble to Dr. Rice, and this he aims to prevent, by keeping his brethren from hearing and thinking for themselves. He fully appreciates that his only hope is in keeping them in the dark.

6. Dr. Rice knows that his church is governed by a human creed, which all the preachers are sworn to believe and defend, and which the members must believe or be excluded. Yet this creed declares that "the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary

to salvation," and these Scriptures themselves declare that "he (Christ) has given us all things necessary to life and godliness"—are "able to make us wise unto salvation"—to "perfect the man of God for every good work"—that they "are for doctrine," and that many of the best members of his church, on hearing these things, prefer these Holy Scriptures to the Confession of Faith, as the man of their counsel and guide to a better world, and decide to go with the people of God, in a grand effort to restore the authority of the Bible. This mortifies Dr. Rice, and this his pamphlet is aimed to prevent. He has, therefore, made this last effort for a sinking cause.

7. Dr. Rice knows that many in the Presbyterian church are separated, by sectarianism, from their nearest and dearest friends on earth, partition walls running between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, neighbor and neighbor, etc., and that the most pious, pure in heart and devoted to the Lord have all the time prayed that the time might come when all these unhappy and distressing divisions should cease, and all who love God see eye to eye, and join hand in hand, united in the high and holy bond of Christian love. He knows that the Disciples come preaching peace by Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all, urging his holy prayer, that *all who believe may be one, as he and his Father are one*—pressing the holy exhortation and entreaty of the

apostle, "that you all speak the same thing, be of the same mind and of the same judgment, and that *there be no divisions among you*:" and constantly reminding them that the Lord said, "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd;" that "all are baptized into one body," where there is "one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father of all, through all and in all," and all are endeavoring to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." He certainly knows that this union can never be brought about among the pious, the good, the pure in heart, those who love God and his people, the only ones who desire it, under any other rule of faith but the law of God. He knows that this is just what the Disciples are urging, and that many of the better portions of his brethren will see this if they hear for themselves;—hence his effort to keep them from hearing. Why does he not exhort his brethren to go, with their Bible in hand, and hear for themselves what unscriptural doctrine the Disciples are preaching? Because he knows that all their prejudice would soon vanish away, and they would see the only true ground, and the only ground on which it is possible for the pure in heart, the only true Israel of God, ever to unite, and many would take their stand on it. He therefore prefers giving them garbled extracts, which he knows do not fairly and fully exhibit the minds of those who wrote them.

8. Dr. Rice knows, when trying to prejudice the minds of his brethren against the Disciples on baptism, that his dear Calvin and his Confession of Faith give us the very doctrine he is battling, stated in more unfavorable terms than in his garbled quotations, as the reader of the extracts we have made in previous chapters will readily see.

9. Dr. Rice knows that he does not hold, or even know a truth, of all that God has revealed to man, not believed, sacredly held, maintained and defended by the Disciples. We trust the day is dawning when the Lord, who is lifted up to draw all men to him, will be honored, regarded and followed; and when men not having the spirit of Christ, but actuated by the spirit of schism and party, shall cease to control those who desire to do the will of our Father in heaven. The Lord hasten that day.

CHAPTER XIV.

Did it ever occur to Dr. Rice, that on all the principal points at issue between the Disciples and Presbyterians, the Disciples are on the *safe* side, and the Presbyterians are on the *dangerous* side? This is certainly the case, whether it ever occurred to him or not. The Presbyterians have the side of doubt and uncertainty. They run all the risk, involve all the danger and

uncertainty, as we shall now proceed to show:

I. The very name, *Presbyterian*, as a religious designation, is a novelty, a new thing, not known in the history of the Church before the time of Calvin. There is not a trace of a Presbyterian church or a Presbyterian for the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. The Church of Christ, and Christians, or Disciples of Christ, were in existence more than fifteen hundred years before a Presbyterian church or a Presbyterian. This is simply a plain matter of undeniable fact. The Church of Christ and the Presbyterian church are not the same then, and a Christian and a Presbyterian are not the same, or the Church of Christ and the Christian could not have existed fifteen hundred years before a Presbyterian church or a Presbyterian. Persons can be Christians and not be Presbyterians, and millions were Christians hundreds of years before there were any Presbyterians. It requires something additional to the Christian, or different in some way to constitute a Presbyterian. It is something more, less, or different, to be a Presbyterian. It is not safe to add any thing to the Christian, or to be any thing more, religiously, than a Christian. It is not safe to take any thing from a Christian, or to be any thing less, or short of a Christian. It is not safe to be any thing different from a Christian. It is infallibly safe to be a

Christian—simply a Christian—no more, no less. It is not infallibly safe to be a Presbyterian—simply a Presbyterian—no more, no less. It is infallibly safe to be simply a Christian, and not a Presbyterian. It is not infallibly safe to be simply a Presbyterian and not a Christian. Dr. Rice may argue that a man may be a Christian and a Presbyterian, both at the same time, as a man may be a Christian and a Mason at the same time. No matter if that be granted, still it is admitted that the man who is simply a Christian, is infallibly safe, without being a Presbyterian or a Mason. Does the Dr. say, "The name is nothing?" Well, if even that, absurd though it be, were true, then the name, *Christian*, is as good as any other, and infallibly safe.—That worthy name, by which the people of God are called, for which they suffer, and which the Lord commends them for holding fast—the name *Christian*—is infallibly safe, while the modern name, from a peculiar form of church government—the name *Presbyterian*—is not safe.

• II. The Dr.'s own creed, the Confession of Faith, says, "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation. So that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may not be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man. This endorses the ground of the Disciples. That which is contained in the Holy Scriptures is the length and breadth of their faith and prac-

fice. That is all that is required of any man. It is infallibly safe to receive that—the whole of it—no more, no less; the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It existed more than fifteen hundred years before the Confession of faith was born, and good people received it and were saved by it. It is, then, infallibly safe. The Confession is a modern invention, unsafe and doubtful. If it contains more than the Bible, it is objectionable and unsafe, because it contains too much. If it contains less than the Bible, it is objectionable and unsafe, because it contains too little. If it differs from the Bible, it is objectionable and unsafe, because it differs from the Bible. It is, therefore, objectionable, doubtful and unsafe, in any view we can take of it, while the Bible is infallibly safe. There is no fear and no doubt about it. The Confession contains no truth not found in the Bible, and he, therefore, who receives the Bible, receives all the truth contained in the Confession, and is infallibly safe. The Confession contains some things not contained in the Bible, additions to the Bible, errors, and he who receives it, receives these things not contained in the Bible, additions to the Bible, errors, and it is, therefore, unsafe.

If it is true, as Chillingworth said that “the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants,” then it is infallibly safe to take the Bible, and the Bible alone, not *in*

word, but in deed, as our rule of faith and practice. If it is true, as stated in the Confession, that "the holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation," then those who take the Holy Scriptures have "all things necessary to salvation." Before the Confession existed, full fifteen hundred years, the holy apostle said, "He," (the Lord,) "has given us all things that pertain to life and godliness," and another apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. When the Lord has thus perfected the man of God, and thoroughly furnished him for every good work, it is infallibly safe to take the Scripture for doctrine which thus perfects the man of God, and thoroughly furnishes him for every good work.

We also have the fact, that the first Church had no creed, but the law of the Lord—the perfect law of liberty, for the first three centuries of its existence, during which time there never was a general division in it, and it prospered as it never has done from that time till the present. It is infallibly safe to occupy the same position. It is unsafe, unwise and dangerous to adopt a Confession not in existence for the first fifteen hundred years of the history of the Church, made by uninspired men, and man-

ifestly an addition to the law of God, which has no popularity, is not believed nor adopted by a single religious community in the world, except one little party, the Presbyterian party, when we can adopt the law of God, which is the common ground, *acknowledged by all to be right*. Here we find Dr. Rice standing on the *doubtful ground and opposing the safe ground!*

III. The Presbyterian church holds that justification is by faith alone, or as advocated by Dr. Rice, that as soon as a man believes, he is justified, before he can be baptized or do anything else. Suppose this all to be true? What then? why nothing, only that we were actually justified a little sooner than we supposed. We were justified as soon as we believed; whereas, we supposed that we were not justified till we believed, repented, and were immersed.— But suppose the Doctor is mistaken, in maintaining that justification is by faith alone. Then he has deceived many “well-meaning people,” induced them to think they were pardoned when they were not, and consequently to neglect the steps necessary to be taken in order to obtain pardon. When a man takes *all the steps* in the Divine plan, we know he is safe. He has the unfailing promise of the ever-blessed God. When a man only takes a part of the steps in the Divine plan, or stops short of *all the steps*, he stops short of the promise, in a doubtful position, and on unsafe ground.

Here is the Presbyterian ground. But the man who has the faith of the New Testament, the repentance, the confession and baptism, calling on the name of the Lord, or takes all the steps in the process, *is infallibly safe.*

IV. The Presbyterian church retains infant baptism, or what that church considers baptism. This is not mentioned in Scripture, nor in any book written in the first two centuries of the Christian era. It has been held in doubt ever since its introduction, by many of as pious, learned and great men as have ever lived. The baptism of believers is mentioned and approved in Scripture, is not, and has not been held in doubt by any religious body, or even individuals, in the world, of any note. Here, too, the Doctor stands on the doubtful, disputed and uncertain ground, while we stand on ground that has never been questioned. Why do Presbyterians prefer the doubtful, disputed and uncertain practice of infant baptism to the Scriptural, indisputable and unquestionable practice of baptizing believers? Why not confine our practice to that which *never was in dispute, the baptism of believers?*

V. The Presbyterian church retains infant church-membership, though it is not mentioned in the New Testament, nor in any book written in the first two centuries, has been held in doubt, dispute and uncertainty ever since it existed by many of as

pious, learned and great as any who have lived in the Christian dispensation. On the other hand, the membership of believers has never been held in doubt, dispute or uncertainty, in any church in the world.— Not a man in the world can find an account of any one being received into the church in the time of the apostles, *known not to be a believer*. Infants are not believers, known not to be believers, and every one received into church membership is known to be received without faith. It is very mild to speak of this as a doubtful practice, disputable and unsafe. But there is no doubt about the membership of believers. All admit it to be right. It never was in dispute. Why not, then, confine the membership to believers, and invariably practice that which never was in doubt? We only ask the Doctor to give up his doubtful, disputed and questionable infant membership, not mentioned in the New Covenant at all—always in debate—and practice invariably that which never was in debate, believers' membership, which is *infallibly safe, and avoid the doubtful and dangerous*.

VI. The Presbyterian church practices almost invariably sprinkling for baptism.— Yet John Calvin admitted that immersion was the primitive practice. Luther admitted the same. So did Wesley, and nearly, if not all the distinguished reformers. None of the distinguished men of our own time deny or doubt that immersion is baptism,

No man of any note has ever denied that a penitent believer, immersed into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, is baptized. The controversy is not about immersion, but about sprinkling and pouring. Immersion has never been in doubt, dispute and uncertainty.—Sprinkling and pouring, for baptism, have been in doubt, dispute and uncertainty ever since their introduction. Hence, we invariably practice that which is safe, never was in doubt or dispute, and Presbyterians practice that which had no existence in the primitive church, has been in doubt and dispute ever since it existed—is unsafe and uncertain. Why make the unsafe and doubtful the almost invariable practice, and abandon that which never was in doubt, or unsafe?

VII. The Presbyterian church is on the unsafe and uncertain side in regard to the influence of the Spirit. There is no question but the words spoken by the apostles were the words of the Holy Spirit, the law of the Spirit, or the gospel preached by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into—the power of God for salvation to every one who believes. The power, or influence put forth through this gospel, we know, is the power or influence of the Spirit, for salvation. We know that this power, or influence, was put forth in the time of the apostles, and that men were turned to God by

it. This is infallibly safe. But that the Spirit puts forth influence or power, directly, or immediately, and converts men without the word, or separate from the word, is not asserted in Scripture, known ever to have occurred, and is, therefore, an unsafe and idle theory. Men may deceive themselves into the belief that preaching such theories is preaching the gospel, or is proof that they are spiritual men, and that they have a very spiritual system. But their theorizing proves a very different proposition from this, to a man who understands the matter. It proves that they are turned aside from the power of the Spirit of God, to a mere carnal and human theory, a philosophy, a mere idle speculation, which only tends to confuse, bewilder and mistify the minds of the people, and prevents them from yielding to the power, or influence of the Spirit of God, put forth in the gospel of Christ. Such men will find themselves wonderfully mistaken, when the vail shall be lifted from their eyes, and they shall see that they have been turned aside to fables, to strong delusions, empty theories, and idle speculations, about *abstract influences*, in which there is not a practical idea for one soul of our race, and opposing the power, or influence of the Spirit, put forth in the gospel of the Son of God.

VIII. The Presbyterian church holds the Calvinistic theory, that God unchangeably foreordains whatever comes to pass—

that the number elected and predestinated is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished. Many have been the labored efforts to prove and explain this theory. Who is on the safe side on this question? If this theory could prove true, we are just as safe as Presbyterians, or even Dr. Rice himself; for if we are of the elect, we cannot be lost ourselves, or be the means of anybody else being lost, and if we are reprobates, we cannot be saved, even if we would believe the decrees as set forth in the Confession of Faith, join the Presbyterian Church, and do everything they should require of us. Dr. Rice himself being judge, we are as safe as he is for this world and that which is to come. He has not an advantage in the world.

CHAPTER XV.

Is there any safe ground? Is there any infallibly safe ground that a man can occupy? There certainly is, or we must live and die in doubt. We shall, therefore, close this Tract with an effort to show what is the safe ground.

I. *What must a man believe to be a Christian?* He need not believe Calvinism, for Calvinists themselves admit that he can be a Christian and not believe Calvinism. You need not believe Presbyterianism, for Pres-

byterians themselves admit that you can be a Christian and not believe Presbyterianism. Still, there is something that he must believe, or he cannot be a Christian. He who comes to God *must believe*. He who believes not shall be condemned. Without faith it is impossible to please God. What then must a man believe? Let the infallible Scriptures of truth tell: "He who believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." A man must then, believe the Son of God. This is the same as believing the gospel. The Lord commanded the apostles to preach the gospel to every creature, adding that, "he who believes and is immersed shall be saved;" that is, he who believes *the gospel*; and "he who believes not shall be damned;" that is, he who believes not *the gospel*. What is the gospel? It is, that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Preaching Christ, is preaching the gospel, and believing on Christ is believing the gospel. Let us ask the apostle John what a man must believe. His answer is, that "Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." What does Paul say, a man must confess? His answer is, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Let us take a New Testament case. We see a preacher

of Christ preaching Jesus to an officer and the officer says, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be immersed?" The preacher replies, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." The officer responded, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." On this belief the preacher received him, on this belief all men can be received to the kingdom of God.

II. *What must a believer do to become a Christian?* Peter said to three thousand believers on Pentecost, "Repent and be immersed every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." What was the result from this commandment? The historian says, "As many as gladly received his word were immersed, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." This procedure, we know, is infallibly safe. No man can gainsay it.

III. *How do you know they are immersed?* Because Paul says, "we are buried with him in baptism," and this cannot be done without immersion. We know that immersion is baptism, because they "baptized in the Jordan," "in Enon near Salem because there was *much water* there," they "went down into the water," their "bodies were washed" and they "went up straightway out of the water," and because Luther, Calvin, Wesley and a hundred others admit that immersion was the ancient practice,

and because no one for the first thirteen hundred years denied that immersion was the practice of the first Christians.

IV. *What church did the first Christians belong to?* They belonged to what Jesus called, "my church," "the church of God," "the body of Christ," the "building of God," the "temple of God," the "one fold" and had "one shepherd." It is infallibly safe to belong to the same church now. Dr. Rice belongs to another.

V. *How did they know, after they were members of this one fold and under the one shepherd that they were safe?* They know it by such Scriptures as the following: "We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren." "We know we love the brethren when we love God and keep his commandments." "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love to one another." "Not every one who says, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven." "He who hears these sayings of mine and does them, I will liken him to a wise man." * * * "He who hears these sayings of mine and does them not, I will liken him to a foolish man." "They who do his commandments shall enter by the gates into the city and have a right to the tree of life." Christ is the "author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him." Here is something reliable. No man doubts

that he who believes the Scriptures and keeps the commandments of God shall enter by the gates into the city and have a right to the tree of life.

VI. It is infallibly safe, when the gospel is preached to sinners, as it was by the apostles, and they inquire what they shall do to be saved, or to obtain pardon, to give the apostolic answer. This Dr. Rice dare not give. This he cannot give.—Nor can any other Presbyterian preacher, and remain a minister in good standing in the Presbyterian church. He cannot follow Peter, on Pentecost; preach precisely what Peter preached, no more, no less, nor anything different, and when sinners inquire what they shall do, give precisely the answer given by Peter; maintain that it is right and defend it. He knows that he dare not do this. He would be summoned before a Synod, or an Assembly before a year would pass over his head. Not a Presbyterian preacher in the land dare take the last commission and set forth and maintain the obvious meaning of it; then go to the apostles, acting under that commission, and follow them through Acts of Apostles; preach what they preached, and when sinners inquire what they shall do, give them the same answer the apostles did. If any one of them should do this, he would lose his reputation, as an orthodox preacher, forthwith. What would be said of Dr. N. L. Rice, and what would be done with him,

if he should preach such a discourse as Peter did on Pentecost, and the people should inquire of him, as they did of Peter, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" and he should answer, as Peter did, "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?" He would be charged with the odious doctrine he has spent so much time and labor in opposing. Neither Dr. Rice nor any Presbyterian preacher dare follow the apostles, maintain and defend their preaching and practice. We dare. We stand where we can believe, preach and practice as the apostles did; where we can maintain, defend and perpetuate the apostolic preaching and practice, beginning where they did and ending where they did. Their preaching and practice is the length and breadth of our preaching and practice. We know it is safe—infallibly safe—for the sinner to hear the same gospel preached by the apostles. We know it is safe—infallibly safe—for the sinner, when he inquires what he shall do to be saved, to hear the apostolic directions to persons making the same inquiries. We know it is safe—infallibly safe—for those in Christ, Christians to follow the directions of the apostles, found in their epistles, directed to the churches. He who follows their holy and infallible teaching, we know, is safe—infallibly safe, living, dying, for time and eternity.







