BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

AND

WRITINGS

OF

Elder Benjamin Franklin.

VOL. I.

NINTH EDITION

DAYTON, O.:

PUBLISHED BY DANIEL SOMERS,
1889.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1880, by

G. W. RICE,
In the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of Ohio.

Stereotyped by
CAMPBELL & CO.
Cincinnati.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
DEDICATION,	vi
INTRODUCTION,	vii
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH,	9
OUR POSITION, No. 1,	69
SERMON ON THE ETERNAL PURPOSE OF GOD,	74
NEW CATECHISM FOR CALVINISTS,	93
THE MISSION OF INFIDELS, NO. 1,	96
OUR POSITION, No. 2,	101
OUR POSITION, NO. 3,	106
THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY, NO. l,	111
THE MISSION OF INFIDELS, NO. 2,	116
TRINE IMMERSION,	121
OUR POSITION, No. 4,	125
THE KINGDOM OF MESSIAH (BY W. C. ROGERS.)	130
OUR POSITION, NO. 5,	144
THE MISSION OF INFIDELS, NO. 3,	149
OUR POSITION, NO. 6,	154
THE CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED, No. 1,	159
OUR POSITION, No. 7,	178
THE CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED, NO. 2,	183
SECTARIANISM CONFESSEDLY WRONG,	201
THE BEGINNING CORNER (BY J. R. HOWARD),	206
OUR POSITION, NO. 8,	229
OUR POSITION, No. 9,	234
OUR POSITION, No. 10,	240
ADDRESS ON ENDLESS PUNISHMENT,	245
OUR POSITION, No. 11,	263
OUR POSITION, No. 12,	269
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. NO. 1,	275
DIVINE AUTHORITY FOR OBSERVING THE LORD'S DAY (By J. K. HOSHOUR)	282

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, No. 2, 293
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, TO. 3, 299
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, NO. 1, 305
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, No. 4, 312
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, No. 2, 318
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, NO. 5, 325
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, No. 3, 330
CONTROVERSY ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT, 338
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, No. 4. 344
CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE SPIRIT, 351
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, No. 5, 359
SERMON ON THE NECESSITY OF REGENERATION, 366
DIALOGUE OF DEVILS, NO. 6, 385
DISAPPOINTMENT, DELUSION AND DECEPTION, 393
GOD TO BE FOUND IN HIS APPOINTMENTS, 398
FOREKNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN AGENCY, 404
EARNESTLY CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH, 409
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, NO. 2, 414
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, NO. 1, 420
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, No. 3, 427
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, NO. 2, 435
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, NO. 4. 441
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, No. 3, 449
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, NO. 5, 456
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, No. 4, 463
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, NO. 5, 469
DIALOGUE ABOUT THE PREACHER, 475
LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES, NO. 6, 481
ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS, 487
BLINDNESS NOT IN PART, BUT IN FULL, HAPPENED TO SECTARIANS, 493
MIRACLES, 500
MIRACLES–WHERE THEY CEASE 507

DEDICATION.

The Publisher dedicates this Volume to the memory of **Elder Benjamin Franklin,** founder of ***The American Christian Review,***—*also* to all Christians, in every place, whose motto is: "Where and as the Bible speaks, they speak, and where and when the Bible is silent they are silent;" and who, in contending for the "faith once delivered to the saints," hold fast the practice of the Apostles, and the "form of sound words," delivered by the Holy Spirit to them, and by them to the ages past and to come.

"The Spirit and The Bride say come; let him that heareth say come; let him that is athirst Come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."

PUBLISHER.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN a good man dies, we cherish his memory and virtues; and for years afterward his deeds of kindness and humanity are referred to and spoken of with gratitude and thankfulness by the recipients of the same. When such a man has been extensively useful in some particular field of labor, it is wise and just to gather up the evidences of usefulness he may have left behind, putting them in form, that they may be seen and read, and become a Source of instruction to others.

The author of the essays, addresses and articles collected and published in this book, except three, was a man of many eminent virtues of heart and qualities of mind; highly endowed and gifted by nature with a physical endurance that fitted him for the labors of the position he was called by the Head of the Church to occupy. He strove hard to make the most of his time, his talents, his money, and his whole life, that he might to the greatest extent benefit, improve and elevate others; freely receiving, he gave freely, and good to others appeared the one great aim of his life.

Having been associated with him for a period of about twenty-two years, in the publication of the *American Christian Review,* it affords me great pleasure in compiling and giving to the Christian world the most valuable and useful productions of his mind and pen. They are re-produced without any revision, addition, alteration or amendment, that the author might appear before his Christian brethren again in the same language that he used twenty-five years ago. In selecting, I have confined myself to the two volumes of the *Monthly Review,* which was afterwards merged into the Weekly. This has been done because his addresses to the public were at that time freer from the controversies into which his pen was necessarily run in after years; and because they contain his best thoughts upon the different subjects handled. When first published they attracted much attention, and were read with great profit by many outside of the subscribers to the Monthly, which had but a limited circulation. I offer these documents to the Christian brotherhood everywhere, on account of their intrinsic merit and

the valuable information they contain, that in this form they may be preserved from being lost and become a monument to the author's memory. They are better adapted to the minds of the common people than much that was written by more scholarly men. Whoever reads this book will be pleased at the simplicity of the language, and yet the force and power With which the subjects treated upon and presented, stand out prominently and impressively. They were written for *the people,* and for the information and enlightenment of the skeptical and believing alike. In these particulars, we see the characteristics of the author, as in everything he has written. They show a strong conviction of the truthfulness of the Bible as the word of God; and that the Scripture, given by inspiration of God, "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God might be thoroughly furnished unto every good work." They show a large aud comprehensive grasp of the purposes of God in sending his Son into this world, and in seeking, saving and elevating the children of men, through his divine precepts and instructions. The articles show a remarkable acquaintance with many subjects that run parallel with the gospel of the grace of God, and which reflect much light upon it, and in the right understanding of these collateral subjects the reader will have his religious horizon greatly enlarged.

In all these productions, the Divine authority of the Bible in all matters of faith and practice, has been upheld and maintained and impressed upon the heart and understanding. The author's aim ever was, and in these productions that aim stands conspicuously out, " to make all men know that we are simply for the Bible, in its own true import, purpose and intent—for the God of the Bible, in the character ascribed to him in the Bible,—the Messiah of the Bible, with the Divine character and efficiency ascribed to him in the Bible, the Holy Spirit of the Bible, with the office and work ascribed to him in the Bible,—the religion of the Bible, in all its parts, its facts, its commandments and promises, its faith, obedience and hope, its rewards and punishments. The whole of it, neither less nor more."

This book will greatly strengthen the faith and confirm the hope of the reader, besides giving him a large amount of information not to be got elsewhere without great labor and research.

G. W. RICE.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OF

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

"'The fame that a man himself wins is best;
That he may call his own ; honors put on him
Make him no more a man than his clothes do,
Which are as soon ta'en off; for in the warmth
The heat comes from the body not the weeds;
So man's true fame must strike from his own deeds."

A CELEBRATED French General being asked, on a certain occasion, from what ancestor he had descended, replied, "I am my own ancestor." Here was a man who believed in himself, and trusted more in himself than he believed and trusted in anybody else. That sententious answer is brimful of self-assertion and individuality. Inordinate egotism is likely to degenerate into folly, if not really into vice; but egotism, directed by a high sense of honor, and especially if sanctified by high and holy purposes, is the central iron nerve whose vitalizing power makes the great man. Egotism is a furnace of fire where the sparks of a noble or an Ignoble ambition are kindled, which sparks, as the fire increases in intensity, electrify and vitalize all the latent forces of a good or a bad man. A man of positive qualities is essentially and by moral necessity an egotist. All the forces of his nature are propelled by the internal fire of self-reliance and self-direction. Hence, if the powers of a great man are misdirected, he becomes an instrument of untold and incalculable evil; but if directed in that channel where God intended

they should be used, he becomes the instrument of untold and incalculable good. Christ himself—the great Teacher, the great Agitator, the great radical Reformer, the great Divine Philosopher, the great Illuminator—was panoplied in the robe of conscious self-assertion and self-possession—a glorious personage, who leaned on no one and borrowed from no one. He was pure individuality. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," was the all-controlling sentiment of hi entire personality. Consequently, whenever there is found in any redeemed and consecrated soul a reproduction of th Divine Teacher, there you will find blazing forth marked individuality. He who would be a follower of Christ, that he may become both good and great, must learn to cut the bridge behind him, and push forward with but one single purpose. No man can carry the cross of Christ without developing all the qualities of a courageous and successful hero He who follows Christ must do so on the principle of entire abandonment in a life-service of self-sacrifice. A vacillating mind accomplishes nothing. Like Christ himself, the successful Christian must be conscious of his own righteousness, and feel. sure that the foundation of truth upon which he stands is as immovable as it is infallible.

It is the man of positive convictions who either settles or unsettles the foundations of society. This is done by will power, which is only another name for egotism, and the language of egotism is, *"I will do it."* A wicked man, like Hannibal, Caesar, Tamerlane, or Napoleon Bonaparte, can say that without the fear of God or the respect of mankind before his eyes; but the godly man, self-poised and self-assured, can say, while believing largely in himself, "By the grace of God I will go on and finish my work." Alexander the Great conquered the known world, but could not subdue his own passions. He undertook to conquer the world of mankind for his own personal glory, as Bonaparte also determined to prostrate the nations of Europe at his own feet, that he might exult in the downfall of kings. Such egotism as this is corrupted by supreme selfishness. But, mark the contrast, and

behold the spectacle of the man who loses his life in the life of another, and who consecrates every drop of his blood and every fiber of his brain to one supreme and absolute purpose, that, if possible, the wicked world may be redeemed from the power of Satan, and that he :nay lay all the trophies of a glorious conquest at the feet of another, and not claim the victory as his own. No sublimer spectacle is witnessed by men and angels than is witnessed when a man, at the call of Christ, leaves the dead to bury the dead, denies himself, takes up his cross, and follows his Lord and Master. He is to all intents and purposes a martyr, whether he dies at the stake in the first flush years of his Christian career, or wears out his life inch by inch and thread by thread, testifying to both small and great the power of the gospel, as illustrated in his own life and in the lives of thousands whom he has led to the feet of the same Savior. There is nothing in the world more grandly dramatic—nothing more rapturously captivating—nothing more delightfully elevating than to witness a man, after having buckled on the armor of truth, take his place in the line of battle, and then, with no expectation of present gain, to plunge in where the combat of light and darkness deepens. When the smiles of the gay world can not win him back, when the gold of the rich can not buy his soul, when the flatteries of the sly sycophant can not seduce him, and when he contemns the frowns and despises the threats of Satan's minions, and by faith in God, undisturbed by the dethronement of earthly kings and the falling of earthly empires, he moves on from victory to victory, and only stoops to conquer at the gates of Death—we behold a scene which can only be appreciated where sin does not reign, and which no earthly pen can describe. A cloud of witnesses, which no man can number, and which are shut out. from earthly vision, look on, and admire, and rejoice, and shout praises, and wave white flags of victory, and scatter garlands at the victor's feet. The toil and the tribulation are here—the reward and the glory are beyond.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, the subject of this memoir, de-

scended from one of the lines of the same remote ancestry from which Dr. Benjamin Franklin, the distinguished Colonial patriot and American philosopher, descended, and is therefore of the same blood. One was as intensely practical as the other. Both of them were eminently utilitarian—they built no air-castles. Both of them wisely made the best of present opportunity, and lived little in dream-land. The original Franklin family emigrated from England to the -American Colonies in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Joseph Franklin, the father of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, whose life we are sketching, was born in Providence, Rhode Island, in 1783. When Joseph was eighteen years of age, his father, Wilson Franklin (who fought under General Stark, at the memorable battle of Bennington), emigrated to Eastern Ohio, and located opposite Wheeling, Virginia. Ten years subsequent to the period of this settlement in Ohio, when Joseph had attained the age of twenty-eight years, he married Isabella Devold, a lady about ten years younger than himself. On the first day of February, 1812, a son was born to them, whom they named BENJAMIN. At that time the young family lived in what is now called Belmont County. A short time after the birth of BENJAMIN, the family moved into that region of the State which is now known as Noble County, and settled on a stream called Salt Run, where they remained till 1833. Here were born into the family seven children—one daughter and six sons—the order of whose births runs as follows: Elizabeth, Josiah, Daniel, Joseph, Wilson, Washington, and David. Only three of these survive, viz: Daniel, Washington and David. These brothers—one of whom, Daniel, a successful minister of the gospel—are characterized by more than ordinary intellect.

The early years of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN were spent on the farm with his father, both of whom engaged in a variety. of labors, such as are incident to the settlement of a new country. They could turn their hands to almost anything, and were experts in the use of rough tools. In those days the boys had rollicking times, when, without the restraints

of conventionalities, and without being burdened with the demands of polished society, they could engage in all sorts of athletic exercises, such as roaming the woods in search of game, fishing along the streams, shooting at targets, wrestling and jumping, besides indulging in all sorts of backwoods fun and frolic and general hilarity. Their animal spirits were always in the ascendant, and the boys and girls of those times thought little about literature, and less about the fashions and the pride of wealth. But, nevertheless, the hours and the days passed happily enough. BENJAMIN was a recognized leader in all the sports of the neighborhood, and, by means of his trusty rifle, he not only secured the biggest pile of wild game, but he bore away the largest share of awards from the shooting-match. Such was the vigor and vitality of his muscle, and such the buoyancy of his animal spirits, that he could leap over a stick held as high as his head. At "log-rollings," and at house and barn raisings, his tough muscle was always called into requisition. He could lift by the side of the best, and then, as in after-life, when the energies of his mind were directed in another channel, he never failed to hold up his "end" of the log. It was by such out-door exercises as these, and by living much in the open air, that he gathered the strength, which, for thirty five years after he entered public life, enabled him to endure the labor of two ordinary men, and to accomplish twice aa much in the same length of time. The society in which BENJAMIN was raised was extremely rude, but not of a criminal character, and his opportunities for religious training were poor indeed.

In May, 1833, Joseph Franklin moved his family and worldly effects into Henry County, Indiana, where he entered a tract of land, near where Middletown now stands. The country was new and unpromising, and the population as yet very sparse. Here Joseph Franklin and his sons erected saw-mills and flouring-mills, and this business they conducted for a considerable length of time, according to varying circumstances. A turning-lathe was set up on the

farm, a vat for tanning sole-leather was built, and the father made his own shoes and drove his own pegs.

BENJAMIN had preceded his father one year, having accompanied his uncle, Calvin Franklin, into Henry County in 1832. During the summer and autumn, BENJAMIN employed himself at whatever he could find to do. When winter came he worked a few months on the National Road, which was in course of construction across the State. The condition of the weather having caused a suspension of the work, he returned to the settlement on Deer Creek, bearing with him a new ax, which he received as payment on his labor. When twenty-one years of age, he bought eighty acres of land, which he immediately began to improve. On this farm, with his own hands, he built his own log-house, which, after a lapse of forty-five years, still stands, good and sound, as a memorial of the brave man who designed it, and of the honest hands that constructed his own forest home.. While working on his farm, and while rearing his log mansion, he married Miss Mary Personett (his senior by two years and a half), the daughter of James and Elizabeth Personett; which event took place December 15, 1833.* "She went with him through all his long career, bore him eleven children, and cared for them with a mother's patient and tender care through many long years of privation and sorrow, keeping up courage and hope when many a woman Would have sunk under the heavy burden." BENJAMIN FRANKLIN worked on his farm in the midst of many disappointments and vexations, and with indifferent success till the year 1837, when he traded his land for an interest in a grist-mill on Deer Creek, in which enterprise his uncle, Calvin Franklin, was a partner. This venture proving a failure in consequence of the general financial distress of the country', the mill property was sold in 1840.

"Up to this period, the subject of this sketch was practically an atheist, having lived all these years, apparently, without the

*Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, p 9.

fear of God before his eyes, caring nothing for religion, and, to all outward appearance, giving it no thought whatever. Fun and frolic, and the crude amusements of the age, seemed to occupy, all his time, much to the distress of his more orderly and thoughtful wife. But the religious period of his life soon began to dawn. His parents, who were deeply devout and strictly religious, and whose temperance principles were of a high order, (entirely abstaining from the use of tobacco and all intoxicating drinks,) produced a salutary effect upon the mind of their son. If, as has been asserted by some, the religions element is the last thing developed in the nature of man, certainly the religious element in our friend was of slow development. But at the first contact of religion he developed into doubt rather than into the pleasing life of faith. His associations, at this time, were among those who were taught to believe in the irreversible decrees of Calvin, a set of unreasonable dogmas which staggered him at the very first contact. He revolted at the idea of "total hereditary depravity," and soon discovered that such a doctrine not only destroyed man's free moral agency, but that it was actually subversive of the very foundation of faith. It shocked his moral sensibilities to hear that man, "in all the faculties and parts, both of the soul and of the body," was so totally depraved, that he could neither think a good thought nor perform a good deed. Though, at this time, his views of the divine plan of salvation were quite superficial, yet he was unable to reconcile the doctrines of Calvin with the scope of the Bible. How one of God's elect, chosen from before the foundation of the world, could be saved first and finally by the "irresistible grace " of God, while at the same time the rest of mankind, without a speck of reason for the procedure, were to he irrevocably reprobated and finally and eternally lost, was a doctrine so supremely revolting to his feelings, that, had not the true light poured into his understanding, and illuminated for him the path of duty, certainly he, like thousands of others, would have drifted away from the Bible, and sought refuge in the

mists of skepticism. Another popular form of belief perplexed him—which then had begun to supersede Calvinism —which was to the effect that the sinner could resist the wooings of the Holy Spirit until the Spirit would mysteriously depart, or that he could solicit the Spirit's presence, and be converted by its direct and immediate energy. Dispensing with the Word of God as the medium of conversion, the Arminian taught that the converting power comes only through the direct agency of the Spirit; that the Spirit is personally present, operating directly on the faculties of man, saving him through the direct gift of faith, and purifying the soul from the inherited and inherent tendency to sin. Here he found that the one system was just as long as the other was short. By these doctrines, he discovered that if the soul is saved at all, it must be saved by the "foreordination" of God, or by the direct agency of the Spirit, and that, too, without the mediation of the revealed truth.

Nearly half a century ago, when BENJAMIN FRANKLIN began to meditate on religious subjects, and when his religious faith was in the transition state, the war against creeds and catechisms and human dogmas was raging with the fury and impetuosity of a prairie fire. Alexander Campbell was in the zenith of his intellectual glory, and wherever he moved with stately step sectarianism crouched in fear before him. Ecclesiastical disintegration was everywhere manifest, and the utter rout of denominationalism was imminent. Campbell, with his illustrious compeers, while unsparingly denouncing all forms of sectarianism—which he regarded as one of the over towering sins of the age—and while exposing all the moral deformities of the clergy, as traditionists and false leaders of the people, he, at the same time, with the energy of a giant, was rescuing the Bible from the shades of obscurity, where it had been stowed away as useless lumber, calling the people to the perusal of its inspired pages, as did the royal-hearted Luther in the sixteenth century, and teaching all classes, by the common rules of interpretation, how to become acquainted with the contents of the Bible, and

how to understand the scheme of salvation. He showed the people the difference between fact and opinion, between faith and knowledge, between revealed truth and mysticism, between divine testimony and dreamy speculation. As might have been expected, FRANKLIN became intensely interested in these discussions. He soon learned that there is a wide difference between the Church of Christ as the one body, and Synods, Conferences, Presbyteries, Convocations, Associations, General Assemblies, etc. His mind was soon opened to the fact that the Bible knows nothing about Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, etc. As he followed the teachings of the "Reformers," (as they were then called,) with an open Bible, and made his comparisons as he proceeded in his investigations, his mind became more clear, his purpose more fixed, and his convictions of the truth more certain and satisfactory, until finally he yielded to the pressing power of the Gospel, and took his stand, with the people of God. This was in the year 1834. It was in that year that Samuel Rogers moved into Henry County, Indiana, and settled near where Joseph Franklin, Sr., resided. Rogers soon began to hold meetings in the neighborhood, and as a result an unusual religious interest was awakened among the people. These meetings attracted the attention of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, who, up to this time, had bestowed little of his time in the examination of the claims of Christianity. Indeed, he was rather inclined to skepticism than to a religious life, a state of mind produced by the contradictions anal clashings of rival sects rather than by a lack of faith in the testimony of the Scriptures, in the defense of which he subsequently became the great champion; though he was not reared in his father's family without the benefits of religious instruction, both his parents being devout members of the Methodist Protestant Church. It was during this meeting that the father of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN and another man became greatly excited over the preaching of the great evangelist, Samuel Rogers. BENJAMIN was drawn into the whirl of the excitement. The preacher held the doctrine that "bap-

tism is essential to salvation," an heretical tenet that the two excited men could not endorse. During the conversation, BENJAMIN ventured to ask the question, "Is not baptism a command of Jesus Christ?" They both admitted that it is. "Well, then," he responded, "is it not essential to obey the commands of Christ?" This was a center shot, from the effects of which they did not recover. They made no response, but went away carrying the barbed arrow of truth with them.

Early in December of the same year the preaching of Rogers began to produce visible results. BENJAMIN and his brother Daniel (the latter still living and preaching) submitted to the authority of Jesus the Christ, and were baptized for the remission of sins on a confession of faith. A week later, the wife of BENJAMIN and his brother Josiah were baptized into the one body. In a few days some thirty or forty persons became obedient to the faith. Among these were Joseph Franklin, another brother of BENJAMIN, and John I. Rogers, a son of Samuel Rogers. It was not long until several churches were formed in the community. Joseph Franklin, Sr., and his wife became members of one of these young churches. For the space of two years these meetings were kept up in the private house of this godly family. John I. Rogers, on hearing of the death of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, in a memorial article furnished for the *Apostolic Times*, thus alludes to the early Christian life of the subject of this sketch: "From the day that Brother BENJAMIN FRANKLIN confessed Christ, he began to exhort sinners and to speak in defense of truth, both in public and private. He carried his Testament with him everywhere, and having a ready recollection, he soon treasured up its contents. His zeal for his Master's cause knew no bounds. On one occasion he attended a Methodist camp meeting, and greatly annoyed the preachers by taking notes of their discourses, and looking, now and then, into his New Testament to see if they had not misquoted Scripture. This, I think, was the summer after his conversion. About the same time he was challenged to

debate some question, which I have forgotten, and I can not now recall any of the circumstances, except that he had me to represent his adversary a few days before the debate was to take place—his brothers, Daniel and Joseph, being our moderators. I distinctly recollect, however, that I came off second best. In company with his brothers, I often visited him, when it was our invariable custom to read the Scriptures, sing some stirring songs of praise, and offer prayers to God. Religion was his theme, morning, noon and night. Sometimes he retired to the deep forest to find hours for undisturbed prayer.

"His first written production was a contribution to the *Heretic Detector,* a periodical edited by the lamented Arthur Crichfield, then of Middleburg, Ohio. I read it with much interest. As well as I can remember, it was an earnest exhortation to sinners to turn to God, by all the motives of heaven and the terrors of hell. This article must have been written about two months [eighteen months] after he united with the Church. During the summer (1837), I accompanied him to his first appointment, which was at a private house. His text was Luke xi, 35: 'This is my beloved Son: hear ye him.' How prophetic was his subject that day of what was to be his theme during the remaining forty years of his Christian ministry!"

Joseph Franklin, in his *Life of Benjamin Franklin,* thus refers to the opening of his father's ministry: "People sometimes solemnly and ceremoniously dedicate a house to the worship of Almighty God, and then in a few years unceremoniously *desecrate* the same building to a store, a shop, or a stable for cattle, because they want a finer one. So men are sometimes solemnly and ceremoniously 'ordained to the work of the ministry'; but in a few years, finding a great deal of hard work and deprivation, with but small pecuniary reward, they unceremoniously set aside the solemn 'ordination,' and go into law, medicine, or anything that promises to pay them better. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN had a 'consecration to the ministry' that could not be set aside. It was an ordination

involving the principle that 'the righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel from faith in order, to faith,' or as elsewhere stated by the same Apostle, that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.' He believed the Gospel, and as a believer, felt an over-powering impulse to tell the truth to any who would hear him, that they also might believe. And, as already mentioned, he at once began to preach, and he never stopped for anything but serious sickness of himself or family. At first it was only an effort to 'exhort' a little at the regular meetings of the Church, or after some one else had preached. Then an appointment to preach somewhere at night, in some schoolhouse, or in some private dwelling, was ventured upon. To these appointments he would often walk, three, four, or five miles, after a hard day's work. Two or three of the young preachers generally met together and united in the exercises of the meeting: And thus, gradually, he directed the forces of" his mind and body to the work, until he lost his interest in all other employments. Four years after his obedience to the Gospel, he sold out the mill property, and was never afterwards engaged in any regular secular business. For one or two seasons, he farmed in a small way upon rented ground."

The literary as well as the ministerial life of FRANKLIN was not very promising at the start, for on one occasion, as related by John Longley, he repeated the expression, "*My dear Friends and Brethren"* one hundred and fifty times in one sermon, Elder Longley keeping count by sticking a pin in a piece of paper. But this amusing rebuke did not disconcert the young evangelist, who was destined to be one of the most successful reformers of modern times. In regard to his defective education, his son Joseph says *(Life of Benjamin Franklin, p.* 62,): "He regarded it as a difficulty that could be overcome, and with all the forces of his strong will he set to work to learn at twenty-seven what most children now-a-days learn at school ere they are fifteen years of age. Copies of Kirkhan's Grammar, Olney's Geography, and Talbot's Arithmetic, bearing the thumb-marks of studious use,

remained in his small but steadily growing library late enough "for his older children to remember them well. Indeed his eldest (son) can now recall him as he sat, day after day, pouring over the then mysterious volumes." But like many others who have waded through similar trials and difficulties, he improved his lost opportunities by listening to the best speakers, and by reading the works of the best authors, such as Campbell, Scott, Crichfield and others. Though he was never critically accurate as a speaker and writer, yet such was the force and simplicity of his style—such his plainness of speech—such his power of familiar illustration—such his overflow of sympathy—and such the transparent outlining of his thoughts, that, the defects of his diction being lost in the glowing fire of his theme, the "the common people heard him gladly;" and, being captivated by the naturalness of the man, who never knew, experimentally, the meaning of the word affectation, thousands heard, believed, and turned to the Lord, while at the same time many of his educated ministerial brethren utterly failed to reach the People. But though himself deprived of an "education," according to the schools, to his honor be it said, he was always a strong advocate of an educated ministry, and, so far as his means would allow, he extended every possible advantage to his own children.

In 1840, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN sold his mill property, in which he had invested the proceeds of his farm, and measurably broke away from all secular employments.'" Six weeks after he left the mill," says his faithful biographer, '" his wife gave birth to twins. He now had a family of six children to support. Out of business, burdened by a debt which was fearful for the time, unable to hire as a carpenter, or even as wood-chopper or grubber, having no team or tools to work with if he had rented a farm, and no salary for a young preacher to lean upon, the prospect was gloomy enough to make a strong man tremble. The only relief tinder the circumstances was in the habits of the pioneers, as all articles essential to the subsistence of a family were

exceedingly cheap. * * * How they came through this dreadful crisis of their lives neither he nor his surviving companion cared to recount He worked whenever he could get employment, and received occasionally small donations as a preacher. The family lived, as families can when necessity is upon them, without any luxuries, and upon a meager supply of the comforts of life."

The first public debate FRANKLIN ever held was with Eaton Davis, a United Brethren preacher. The debate was held in a grove, not far distant from where he lived. From the very beginning of his ministry, he relied more on the Bible for the support of his propositions than on outside *"helps."* The Bible was his magazine of power. He labored assiduously to master its contents, and, consequently, with out the aid of commentaries, lexicons, and exegetical works, on which so many of the learned rely, he was able to meet and confute the most stalwart of the sectarian champions. The sword of the Spirit was his aggressive weapon, and with this he slew many an Ajax. His fondness for evangelizing soon made itself manifest in the fact that he would seize every opportunity to send out appointments. On his visit to his home in Ohio, where he was born, sending appointments in advance, he managed to preach once a day while on his journey.

In the spring of 1842, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN located in New Lisbon, Henry Count), Indiana, a village ten miles south-east of New Castle, where he remained almost two years, preaching regularly for the church in New Lisbon, and visiting other points occasionally. While residing here, he engaged in a public discussion with George W. McCune, a Universalist preacher. It is needless to say that victory perched on his banner. His next place of residence was at a point twelve miles north of Richmond, Indiana, where the village of Bethel now stands. While he made his home at Bethel, he made incursions into the western borders of Ohio, where he performed valuable services. In the autumn of

1844, he moved his family to Centerville, then the county-seat of Wayne County, Indiana.

He began his editorial career January, 1845, when he launched upon the sea of adventure a monthly paper, which he named *The Reformer*. For the year 1845, he had three hundred cash subscribers, and for 1846, about four hundred. During these two years, he had about thirteen hundred delinquent subscribers. His average receipts were about $600 annually. At this time he had seven children, and yet he managed so prudently and economically that he was able to sustain his family, keep out of debt, pay his printing bills, and have a little left to apply on a piece of land he had purchased. For the first year, the *Reformer* was printed, by Samuel C. Meredith, who owned a small country printing establishment in Centerville. In the spring of 1846, FRANKLIN bought a small stock of printing material, employed a printer, and opened an office in his own hired house. He and his correspondents wrote with vigor and intensity of feeling on such distinctive subjects as secret societies, innocent amusements, temperance, co-operation of churches, evidences of Christianity, relation of human governments to the Divine government, support of preachers, etc. The *Reformer* for May, 1845, gives an interesting account of a union meeting, which originated, as might be supposed, with FRANKLIN, an extract of which is here presented:

"The meeting commenced at the time announced in *The Reformer*. No. 3, and was opened by an interesting discourse from Brother Woods. (of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church,) in presence of a respectable audience from all parties, which increased with the interest of the meeting, until Lord's day, when the Presbyterians' meeting-house was crowded to overflowing. The meeting lasted six days, during which fourteen discourses were delivered—three by Brother Woods, three by Brother Stewart, a Presbyterian minister of Connersville, two by Brother Miller, a Christian minister of Fairview, and six by the Editor. It was mutually agreed by Brother Woods and myself, that on Monday night I should give an invitation at our meeting-house, and that he should give an invitation on Tuesday night at the Presbyterian meeting-house, which he did. The result was three confessions on Monday night; and the

three who confessed, and one more, were immersed on Wednesday after the union meeting closed."

We see by this union effort the early bent of FRANKLIN'S mind toward Christian union, an element of character which, in all his subsequent life, was made very prominent in his preaching and. writing. About this time the Editor of The *Reformer* gave evidence of despondency in regard to the "prospects" of the cause. His expression was, "We have almost come to a dead halt." He attributed the causes of the "dead halt" to great political excitement, the Second Advent mania, the fact that many Disciples had never learned to walk by faith, that many good preachers had abandoned the field, and to the fact that the preaching was not characterized by the same zeal, Scripture knowledge and argument as attached to the preaching of former times. In view of this sad state of things, he made a pressing and characteristic appeal to the Disciples of Christ to lift up their cries in "prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, night and day." He concluded his ardent appeal in these glowing words of faith: "Let us, then, brethren, make one mighty effort to save the Church from corruption, lukewarmness, speculation, and sin of every kind, that it may be finally presented to the Lord, 'a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing,' and ascribe all the glory and honor to God and the Lamb for ever and ever."

During his stay at Centerville, he made two lengthy evangelistic journeys—one southward into Kentucky, and one northward into Southern Michigan. Nothing important transpired on these visits. In July, 1845, he was stricken down with congestive fever, but under the treatment of Dr. Peck, he recovered in two weeks. On the 13th of October, 1845, his father died, an event which deeply saddened his heart. On November 18th, 1845, his brother, Joseph Franklin, Jr., died, while visiting at the home of BENJAMIN. Joseph was twenty-six years of age at the time of his death, having been an ardent disciple of Christ for nearly ten years, and a

preacher five or six years. All these thickening sorrows had a saddening and subduing effect on the religious nature of the afflicted BENJAMIN. To him it was sanctified affliction, which drew him closer to the Father of mercies, in whose counsels alone he found hope and consolation.

After conducting *The Reformer* nearly two years, he finally resolved to enlarge its capacity to sixty-four pages, to give increased facilities to his increasing correspondents, and accordingly in November, 1846, he issued the first number, the price being fixed at one dollar a year. His biographer, in his *Life of Benjamin Franklin*, says: "He was greatly aided in publishing so cheap a paper by employing his own family in the work upon it. He was his own book-keeper, proof-reader and mailer. His eldest son set the type and superintended the press-work. His second son was 'roller-boy' to the old-fashioned hand-press on which it was printed, and filled the position called by printers ever since the days of Fault 'the devil.' His daughter folded, stitched and covered the pamphlets. The office was kept in one of the rooms of the house in which he lived." All the time that he was publishing *The Reformer,* he continued to preach, pay or no pay, and his sonorous voice was frequently heard in school-houses, court-houses, barns, groves, shops, town-halls, and in private dwellings, and wherever he could find all open door. In the course of a few months, he gave his paper the name of *The Western Reformer*. for the reason that he received his chief patronage from the Western States. In the winter of 1847, he changed his residence from Centerville to Milton, Wayne County. In October, 1847, he held a discussion in Milton with Erasmus Munford, a Universalist of some note, and Editor of *The Western Universalist:* Ths usual propositions were discussed., The debate lasted four days. It was agreed that both disputants should write out their speeches, with the understanding that no arguments Should be introduced but such as were incorporated in the oral debate. It made a volume of three hundred and sixty-eight pages, and was the first debate published by BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

His second public discussion was with a Universalist preach er by the name of Craven, who has long since passed into obscurity, and the event of the debate is no longer in the minds of the people.

When the Mexican War broke out, which raised a difference of opinion among the Disciples of Christ as to whether Christians should participate in war under any circumstances, *The Reformer* advocated the principle of non-resistance, as. did the *American Christian Review* in the Civil War of 1861-5. FRANKLIN was charged with standing in opposition to the Administration, which was not true in fact. He was a "peace man" from principle, which, among other things, he set forth in the following clearly-cut words: "We feel it incumbent on us further to state, that the present war has nothing to do in inducing us to write on this question, and most solemnly to avow that we are not actuated by any party political feeling. Some men are *peace men* because of their political partyism in opposition to the present war; but for such peace men as these we have no sympathy, as we have no fellowship with such peace principles. The great question is whether *all war* is not at variance with the teachings of Jesus Christ."

Alexander Hall, the author of *Universalism vs. Itself,* and a man of wonderful intellectual abilities, but in spirituality of life very weak, during the years of 1848 and 1849 published a monthly periodical in Loydsville, Belmont County, Ohio, called the *Gospel Proclamation.* At the expiration of this time, the Editor of the *Western Reformer* and Alexander Hall, after consultation and agreement, united the two papers, under the new name of *The Proclamation and Reformer,* which event took place January, 1850, Alexander Hall and William Pinkerton being announced as co-Editors. This paper was also published at Milton, the subscribers of the *Gospel Proclamation* having been transferred to FRANKLIN. This union did not prove advantageous to FRANKLIN, the detailed reasons of which the reader would not be interested in. Suffice it to say, that Hall was a very careless man in

his business and a poor manager of financial affairs. At the end of six months, he severed his connection with the new editorial arrangement. In may, 1848, FRANKLIN made a tour into Ohio, making Cincinnati his objective point. While in Ohio, he held a public debate with Samuel Williams, an anti-means Baptist, on "the conditionality of eternal salvation." The debate was held in the town of Lebanon. During this tour of two weeks, he '" delivered some eighteen discourses, made ten speeches in the debate, and' traveled more than two hundred miles."

About the year 1848, periodicals and editors began to increase with a rank growth. In this year, Walter Scott moved the *Protestant Unionist,* which he had been publishing in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, for several years, to Cincinnati. Here the *Protestant Unionist* was merged into the *Christian Age,* the Editors of which were Dr. Gatchell and T.J. Melish. During the same year, Dr. Gatchell sold his interest in the concern to George Campbell, and Melish sold his to D. S. Burnet. In the spring of 1850, George Campbell sold his interest to BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, when a co-partnership was entered into between the latter and D. S. Burnet. Both papers, for nearly two years, were published from the same office. The *Christian Age* was a weekly periodical, and the *Proclamation and Reformer* a monthly journal. Burnet and FRANKLIN were joint owners in both papers, and were equal as editors. This enterprise did not prove to be very lucrative. The proprietors having incurred an actual monetary loss, FRANKLIN in particular became anxious to be relieved of his burden. *The Christian Age Monthly,* which was made up from standard articles, selected from both journals, and the *Proclamation and Reformer* were abandoned, while the, *Weekly Christian Age* was sold to Jethro Jackson, who, with. B.F. Hall as Editor, conducted it in Cincinnati during the year 1852.

In July, 1851, FRANKLIN stereotyped and published a "Sermon on Predestination and the Foreknowledge of God," which, because of the importance of the subject, and because

of the rare ability with which it was handled, elicited much commendation, and met with an extensive circulation. The publication of this Sermon provoked a lengthy correspondence between FRANKLIN and James Matthews, a Presbyterian minister of Carlisle, which resulted in a public debate between the parties named, which took place in Carlisle in May, 1852. The debate was presided over by ex-Governor Metcalf, Dr. McMillan and Esquire Sharpe. About this time (1851) the "Rochester Knockings," or "Spirit Rappings," began to excite considerable interest throughout the country, and to agitate a few restless spirits in the ranks of the Disciples. FRANKLIN, as Editor of the *Christian Age*, became at once a pronounced and uncompromising opponent of this new delusion. Jesse B. Ferguson, a minister of the Church of Christ in Nashville, Tennessee, a young man of some distinction, and with graceful manner, and a popular style of oratory, by his writings through the columns of his *Christian Magazine,* gave the Disciples of Christ no little trouble by becoming an advocate of this dangerous heresy. FRANKLIN, in his usual characteristic courage, assaulted and exposed the fatal error of Ferguson, which was virtually the modern doctrine of Restorationism. Alexander Campbell, through the *Millennial Harbinger,* and by a visit to Nashville, was also instrumental in not only exposing the delusion of spirit communications, but in saving the Nashville church from utter ruin. It was not liberty of speech and private opinions that were proscribed by Campbell and FRANKLIN, but his effort to make the new dogma a disturbing element in the Church of Christ, and which was purely an "untaught question." Here for the first time, for attempting to preserve the purity of the Church, FRANKLIN, as well as Campbell, was stigmatized as a proscriptionist. Ferguson, soon after this conflict, "went out from us because he was not of us."

In May, 1853, the *Christian Age* became the property of the "American Christian Publication Society," with the announcement of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN as its reputed Editor,

Alexander Hall in the meantime having retired; but this new arrangement not working to the pleasing of FRANKLIN, and too independent to suffer dictation, in 1854 he resigned his position, binding himself not to publish a periodical for a specified time. His obligation having expired, he began the publication of a monthly magazine entitled the *American Christian Review.* Between the years 1850 and 1855, he was regularly employed as preacher by the church on Clinton Street, Cincinnati, and the church in Covington, Kentucky. He removed from Hygeia, a suburban village of Cincinnati, to the city itself, and after laboring for the Clinton Street church a short time, which prospered moderately under his labors, and from which he received an inadequate support, he resigned his place. Soon after this event, he began his remarkable career as traveling evangelist, his services being in constant demand from every part of the country. In 1845 "The American Christian Bible Society" was organized in Cincinnati. Soon after this a Sunday-School and Tract Society was formed in the same city. In the latter part of 1851. the name of this Society was changed to that of "The American Christian Publication Society."

On the first of January, 1856, the first number of the *American Christian Review* (monthly) was issued. This was the beginning of a new era of journalism in America. The title of this periodical indicates the broad horizon of investigation it was destined to encompass. It was a bold venture—a broad sweep—from one who had just recently emerged from comparative obscurity—for one who, against poverty, without the pecuniary aid of wealthy friends, and without the prestige of scholarly education, surveyed with the comprehensiveness of a far-seeing philosopher the inflowing tide of contending elements, the clashing of warring principles, and the antagonisms of master minds. Providence seems to have guided the steps of the illustrious founder of the *American Christian Review,* guided by the genius of its founder through the wild waves of the Civil War between the North and the South, and piloted over a surging sea of conflicting

sentiment between brothers of the same faith, it became the great balance-wheel of the entire Brotherhood. It at once became the medium of communication for the foremost thinkers of the Reformation, in the prolific columns of which journal all the controverted questions of the age were freely discussed, and such matters of expediency as affected the unity and stability of the Brotherhood were thoroughly ventilated. From the time of the establishment of the *American Christian Review,* its Editor, rapidly growing into public favor, and eagerly sought after as the recognized leader of a great reformatory party, was called off in every direction to hold meetings and to conduct public debates. He traveled as far east as the New England States and Prince Edwards Island, as far west as Missouri, as far north as the Dominion of Canada, and as far south as North Carolina and Tennessee, and holding meetings in all the Middle States. Within the space of thirty years, he engaged in more than thirty formal oral discussions, six of which were published in book-form, and which have been sold by thousands and read by tens of thousands. His most celebrated debate was with Bishop Merrill, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He debated twice with this champion of Methodism, and afterward published the debate, which met with an extensive sale. His opponent, however, was not a Bishop at the time of the discussion. Merrill was the most wily and ingenious antagonist FRANKLIN ever encountered. Well-educated, aristocratic in his feelings, pampered and petted by a large and wealthy constituency, and priding himself in the learning of the schools, which FRANKLIN did not possess, Merrill sought, in a supercilious manner, to contemptuously frown down his antagonist, and to treat him derisively; but it was found, after the debate was thoroughly sifted, so far as Bible knowledge, keen logic, critical analysis, and broad generalization of truth were involved, FRANKLIN gained the mastery. Merrill had the oratory and the rhetorical finish: FRANKLIN the argument and the evidence. *Suaviter in modo* applied to Merril: *fortiter in re* to FRANKLIN.

Some ten years before his death, FRANKLIN received a "formal invitation to visit England, and to spend several months as an evangelist in that country, the home of his ancestors. As he was privileged to take a traveling companion with him, he had selected the writer of this sketch to accompany him in his journey, but in consequence of some derangement in the order, or because of some providential interference, which remained unexplained, the enterprise miscarried. But he continued his travels in the United States, frequently preaching twice a day, baptizing and writing "between times,", besides visiting and keeping up his correspondence. During his ministry he baptized with his own hands over eight thousand persons. In the last years of his life, he wrote and published, in the midst of the labors just mentioned, two volumes of Sermons, containing forty-one discourses. The first volume, which was published several years in advance of the second volume, had reached the sale of fourteen thousand copies, and sells as rapidly now as ever. Those who purchased the first volume were just as eager to secure the second. Every few days a letter is received at the *Review* office from some one, stating that the reading of FRANKLIN'S Sermons had opened his eyes to the broad scope of Christianity and the plan of salvation, and forever dispelled the delusion of sectarianism, and rejoicing that the truth had made him free. Hundreds of preachers have read these volumes, as well as thousands in the Church and out of the Church. They have become a mighty power in the land, and are now standard works among the Disciples of Christ.

The purpose and animus of the Editor of the *Christian Review*, after he had projected that journal, which, as long as he lived, was the idol of his heart, may be judged by reading the following words, which were to become his guiding star in his subsequent career:

"We trust we are now in a safe, reliable, and permanent business, and that our way will be clear for an extended system of operations, and by the Divine blessing, we hope to achieve great good. We have passed

through some transmutations, and much of the perplexities incident to an imperfect state, but we have found the cause of Christ the same, and our attachment to it only becomes more ardent as we grow older and see more of the world, and realize more of the necessity of a gracious system for the children of men. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In entering the editorial field again, we wish the friendship, the fellow-stab, and the co-operation of all those great and good brethren of the same calling. We enter the list, not as a competitor or rival of any of them, but a co-operator with them in the same great work, and we wish them all possible success. There is not the least danger of our circulating too many publications, any more than our sending out too man), preachers : the more preachers and papers the better, if they are the *right kind.* Our Magazine, then, enters the list as the advocate of the Bible, of Christianity, of righteousness, peace and good will among men."

Joseph Franklin, in his *Life and Times of Elder Benjamin Franklin* (pp. 269-71,) remarks: "At the time of starting the *Review,* the leaven which had so thoroughly leavened the whole lump of the Reformation was at work, and its presence was most distinctly recognized by the Editor. But he was not the only one who saw tribulation and disaster around him and before him. The periodical literature of that day was filled with articles entitled 'The Decline of Churches,' 'Causes of our Failure,' Signs of the Times,' 'Cure for Our Downward Tendency,' etc.

* * * *

On the first of August, (1855) MR. FRANKLIN, having read many of the articles on the state of the cause above referred to, determined to ask leave of absence from his preaching-places (Cincinnati and Covington), that he might 'look out through the country and see the shape of things.' The request was granted aud he traveled nearly three months, returning home in good time to make the necessary preparations for starting the *American Christian Review*. The parting with the Covington church was as tender and affecting as if it had been final. In his account of the matter in the *Review,* MR. FRANKLIN said: 'By the request of the elders, the brethren sang a parting hymn, during which the members extended to us the parting hand, expressive of their kind regard for us and anxiety for our success in turning

men to God. We owe our brethren in Covington, and many other brethren, a large debt of gratitude, not only for their usual kindness and liberality, but for their free-will offering in our behalf during forty days while our family was kept in awe and affliction with that loathsome disease called small *pox.* In the place of stopping our support when we could no longer fill our place, as had been the case in some instances when preaching-brethren have failed through affliction to fill engagements, those brethren contributed our regular support, and added an extra contribution of forty dollars."

The *American Christian Review* was started about the time two parties sprung up in the Reformation, who were known respectively as the advocates of "Liberalism" and "Conservatism." In regard to this condition of things, Joseph Franklin, in the biography of his father (pp. 273, 4), pertinently puts it thus:

"In the present contest between 'liberalism' and 'conservatism' there has been a tendency to extremes always. When the Disciples fell into disagreement on the subject of the ministry, this tendency was constantly manifested. Liberalists, (or 'progressives,' as they were generally called,) held that 'the spirit of the age' demanded a more cultivated ministry. But this 'culture' did not refer so much to the knowledge of the Bible and of human nature, which were the great essentials of success in the ministry, as to the knowledge of letters. It often happened that, in their anxiety for literary culture, the more important parts of the minister's training were not noted with sufficient care. Older preachers, who by years of success in the ministry had demonstrated their ability, were elbowed to make room for young men of whom nothing was known but that they had more literary, and social polish. Young ministers were often flattered and caressed until their heads were turned with self-conceit, and they could never thereafter be profited by their experiences. This extreme brought the 'progressives' into contempt as a worldly-minded class of people, who were indifferent to soundness in the faith.

"The conservatives, on the other hand, (often sneeringly called 'old fogies,') sometimes made such a defense of the uneducated ministers as implied an entire indifference to the matter of literary culture. They seemed, at times, to fear the soundness in the faith of any man, and especially *young* men, who was above the average in literary culture. It is safe to say that neither party fairly represented the other, and yet

that each gave the other some ground for the misrepresentation. And it is true, also, as before stated in these papers, that the line of Separation between the parties was never very clearly marked. Local surroundings and prejudices modified the contest in most of the churches."

About the period of 1856, the "pastorate" began to be discussed. This meant, by its special advocates, that "educated pastors" must take the oversight of the churches. A "peace" having been "conquered," the churches were all to be reconstructed. There had been "too much war," said the advocates of the "pastorate," and the time for "developing the resources of the churches had come." The advocacy of this "peace measure" had the effect of curtailing the work of the evangelist. The mind of the brotherhood had been diverted from the evangelical field—which has ever been the *forte* of the Disciples of Christ—by the cry for an "educated ministry" and "settled pastors." The old pioneer evangelists at once took the alarm; for they saw in the new movement the portending fact that they must take a secondary position. Seeing so great a demand for an "educated ministry," there came a strife among the colleges as to which should secure the most accomplished teachers, and as to which should provide the largest number of educated pastors for the churches. Colleges sprung up in every direction; teachers, by scores, rushed to the colleges; in a short time hundreds of pastors, without age or experience, find some without any previous religious education, were seen rushing" (with diploma in hand) for the most inviting churches, the majority of which had been built up by the now slighted evangelists. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was the last man to oppose the edification of the churches, or to lay an embargo on {he development of their resources, or in any way undertake to suppress their life and growth; but he ever maintained that the efficiency and government of the individual churches belongs to the Scriptural eldership, and not to "the pastor," an officer raised above the elder, and unknown in the New Testament. FRANKLIN early foresaw that the introduction of an officer unknown in the Word of God would foment

agitation, if indeed it would not cause an open rupture. Alarmed at the direction things were taking, he thus, in the February number of the *Review* for 1856, spoke:

"If we are not sadly mistaken, here is where the attention of the brotherhood needs directing now. It is no matter how many schemes the brethren engage in, nor how good their object, if they neglect evangelizing, the cause will fail. In every city, town, village and neighborhood where evangelical labors are not enjoyed, the cause is languishing and suffering. The attention of the evangelists has been divided and distracted by unavailing and useless schemes, to the neglect of the great evangelical work. Schemes of organization have been commented on, until the brethren have become sickened, and they turn from the subject at the first sight of the caption of an article treating on it, feeling conscious that it will not afford relief. Long theories upon officers and their qualification, and fine descriptions of the details of the *pastorate* appear in the prints; but the churches fall soundly asleep under their fine theories. If we intend to save the cause, we, as evangelists of Christ, have something more to do than to seek good places and earthly comfort. The Lord did not intend evangelists to open an office, and sit down in it and wait for sinners to come to them to be converted. But he intended the living preacher to go to sinners, and with the living voice preach the word of the living God. The command is to go; *go, and keep going,* while God shall give us life; *go,* believing in God, with a strong faith—trusting in the Lord for a support now, and eternal glory in the world to come.

"A little preaching on the Lord's day will not do the work, The Word should be preached every day and every night, as far as possible. We cannot confine our labors to cities, towns and villages, expecting preaching to be brought to us, as work to a tailor, hatter, or shoemaker; but we must *go out* into the country among the people, and be one *of them,* as messengers sent from God to take them to heaven. We are not to confine ourselves to the fine meeting-houses; but, when we can do no better, go to the court-house, the town or city hall, the old seminary, the school-house, or the private dwelling, and preach to the people. We must not wait for the large assembly, but preach to the few, the small, humble and unpromising congregations. We must not *merely pretend* to preach, while we are only complaining of them and telling how bad they are, whining over them and murmuring, showing contempt for them and for all their arrangements, but preach to them in the name of the Lord, remembering that in every, form we see there is a living spirit, upon which Jesus looked when he died, and which is worth more than the great globe on which he walks. No matter how lowly, how humble,

how poor and uncomely all their temporal arrangements, you will find on acquaintance some who will love the Lord, turn from their sins, and become jewels in the Lord's, and also in the preacher's, crown of rejoicing."

We have thus quoted at length to show how, by such simple words of teaching, and by always keeping himself on a level with the humblest capacity, he not only inculcated Scriptural doctrine, but how he won the affections of the "common people," and held their confidence to the end, while at the same time he commanded the respect of leading minds.

In 1856, he published his Tract, which bears the significant title, "Sincerity Seeking the Way to Heaven," to which reference is made in another part of this sketch. The tract originated in the fact that while living in Cincinnati, an enquiring young man sought the counsel of the distinguished writer, that he might be directed in the infallible way. With the exception of a few incidents, added by way of illustration, the narrative is literally true, and not founded on fiction.

The first number of the weekly *American Christian Review* was issued January 5, 1858, being a consolidation of the monthly *Review* and the *Christian Age.* Moses E. Lard, C. L. Loos, John Rogers, Isaac Errett, and Elijah Goodwin, were announced at the head of the new paper as "regular contributors." Having prospered in the publication of the monthly *Review,* and having gained much moral momentum among the brotherhood, FRANKLIN began the publication of the weekly with high hopes. In the *Life and Times Of Benjamin Franklin* (p. 295), we find the following facts concerning the connection of G. W. Rice with the *American Christian Review:*

"George W. Rice came into the office as an assistant, and after acquiring a complete knowledge of the affairs of the *Review,* took a partnership interest of one-half of the concern. From this time the business was done in the name of 'Franklin & Rice,' and included not only the publication of the periodical, but also of sundry books, tracts, etc., and especially those of which MR. FRANKLIN was the author. Mr. Rice had been a Disciple (of Christ) for many years, and

understood the history of the Reformation from the beginning. He was overseer in the Clinton Street Church during its existence, and afterwards of the Sixth Street Church; and, until the labors of the *Review* office became so great as to forbid any preparation, preached in these churches, or in some one of the suburban churches or mission-stations, almost every Sunday. For some time he was assistant Editor, and the heading announced that the paper was 'Edited and Published by Franklin & Rice.' The Selections and arrangement of all the matter of the paper, except the editorial and correspondence, were always left to him. The communications of well known contributors he inserted at once, but anything of doubtful propriety had to be inspected by the senior Editor. MR. FRANKLIN had absolute control of the editorial management to the day of his death; but, on the failure of his health, sold out his pecuniary interest in the office to Mr. Rice, and thereafter received only a salary for his services as Editor, and for the books which he wrote. For some years a 'Missouri Department' in the paper was edited by J. A. Headington, and after its abandonment he became assistant Editor. John F. Rowe was also for several years assistant Editor, but there was an interruption of two years in his relation to the paper.— MR. FRANKLIN'S eldest son was likewise for a time announced as assistant Editor."

From the establishment of the weekly *American Christian Review, we* trace the name of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, as Editor and publisher, back through *The Christian Age, Proclamation and Reformer, The Western Reformer,* and *The Reformer.* Surely, here is an editorial history worthy of recording. As the standard articles which follow ,this sketch, and which are chiefly selected from the columns of the *Review,* indicate the tone and character of the paper for a long series of years, we shall have but little further to say in regard to its contents.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was a strong advocate for a revision of the Scriptures. On the 10th of June, 1850, the friends of revision met in New York City and organized the "American Bible Union," which movement resulted from the fact that the American and Foreign Bible Society utterly refused to revise the scriptures, notwithstanding the fact that the intelligent portion of the religions world were pressing flat-duty upon the Society. No one was more urgent in advoc-

*After the death of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, John F. Rowe became Editor, with G.. W. Rice as co-Editor, of the *Review.*

caring the necessity of a revised version of the Scriptures than the Editor of the *American Christian Review*. The Disciples of Christ as a body favored the enterprise, and for a time gave freely of their means and influence to make it a success. They felt that a revision of the Scriptures was a concurrent work of the Reformation, and that all possible aid should be extended toward an enterprise so laudable in its object. So well pleased were the Disciples with the design of the Bible Union, that they abandoned their own Society, the "American Christian Bible Society," and at once directed all their energies toward the other. But, finally, the Baptists, having secured the complete control of the Society, and having manipulated the new version to correspond with Baptist theology, the Disciples, out of self-respect, and in the interests of the truth, withdrew from its support.

The American Christian Missionary Society was organized in Cincinnati in 1850, with Alexander Campbell as its first President—into which position, we have good reasons to believe, he was forced in opposition to his own convictions, as, up to this time, he opposed all organizations outside of the churches. FRANKLIN was from the first suspicious of the design of the Society, although for a time he seemed willing to co-operate with it. The ostensible purpose of this Society was that of assisting in evangelizing the world; but when FRANKLIN saw that the real purpose was that of placing certain men in the fore-front of the Reformation as representative men, that the centralization of denominational power was sought after by these would-be representative men, and that a "visible organic unit)," of the churches was contemplated, and even advocated, he soon raised his clarion voice in opposition. Co-ordinate societies soon sprung up in different localities, some of the objects of which were: to' hear any case which might be laid before it, to discipline any one who should " teach things tending to the injury of the churches and the cause which we plead"; to "take into consideration the subject of education, both general and ministerial"; and to consider and act upon the plans for Bible

distribution, missionary objects, tract distribution, Sunday-schools, and upon whatever else "may tend to the welfare of the cause of our Divine Master." To all such movements, FRANKLIN urged objections such as the following:

"1. A meeting for such a purpose as this is wholly unknown to the New Testament.

"2. This meeting calls into existence a new set of officers, wholly unknown to the New Testament.

"3. The New Testament knows nothing of meeting annually or semi-annually, in the 'Central Christian Union.' This is wholly a new order of things, and throws wide the gate for all kinds of mischief."

He frequently wrote after the following style: "God has constituted the Church the pillar and support of the truth, and it is the duty of the Church, the whole Church, in every place, as the only organization having any authority from God, to act for itself, and to do its own business. No officer in the Kingdom of God, has any authority over the churches or preachers, except the officers of the individual congregations. The New Testament knows no jurisdiction of ans, office beyond the individual congregation, except where an evangelist is building up and establishing new congregations."

He at first favored the "Louisville Plan," so called from the fact that the Society :net there, at its regular anniversary, to perfect a plan for "church co-operation," which virtually resulted in the dissolution of the "American Christian Missionary Society." The new Society was to be known as the — General Christian Missionary Convention." Its ostensible purpose was to represent the churches in all missionary efforts. The funds contributed by the churches were to be paid over to the districts, to the States, and to the general work, in the ratio of a certain percentage. Although FRANKLIN was appointed a member of the Committee of Twenty to perfect the "Plan," he was not present at their deliberations. For a while he gave the Society his silent support, and raised no opposition. But, finally, when he discovered that the Society was accomplishing nothing, and that, instead

of putting evangelists in the field, it was developing into a large centralization of ministerial power, having chiefly for its object the support of a certain class of officers, highly salaried, he began an open opposition to it, and continued his opposition until the time of his death. This excited a vast amount of hostility against him, and he was literally assailed on every hand, more particularly by the officers of the various societies, and by a certain class of "pastors," who were looking to this grand "centralization" for recommendation and. appointments, very much as the preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church look to the Annual Conference for appointments and a "fixed salary." Hard and bitter things were said against him, and every possible effort was made by his persecutors to crush him and the *Review* at one and the same time; but the *Review* survived, and the "Plan" failed for the want of funds. In opposition to these organizations, he stood upon the same ground as that held by Alexander Campbell, who, in 1824, maintained that "an individual church or congregation of Christ's disciples is the only ecclesiastical body recognized in the New Testament. Such a society is 'the highest court of Christ' on earth." Many years after this, in the decline of his mental powers, Campbell partially receded from this position, but it was because he yielded—against his own judgment—to a powerful outside influence.

Contemporaneous with the discussion of the Society question, there sprung up a heated, if not an acrimonious discussion of the organ question and a "higher order of literature." The plea was rung out, "we must keep a-breast of the times." This plea came chiefly from college-bred gentlemen, and was echoed by the *elite* of the churches. FRANKLIN was bitterly opposed to the use of the organ in churches, and persistently refused to preach where it was made a part of the divine worship. He regarded the introduction of the organ as an "innovation," and stoutly maintained that it savored of " carnality," and that its use in the house of God was subversive of the divine order of worship. He held, and not without good reason, that the presence of instru-

mental music in the house of the Lord indicated the absence of humility and genuine piety. By taking this position, his paper lost the patronage of the city churches, as well as gained the disfavor of the "pastors."

Although the *Review* for many years was made the medium of communication for the best writers in the Reformation, yet, because of his opposition to instrumental music in the churches, and because he exposed the pretense that there is such an office as the "pastorate" in the church distinct from and above the eldership, he was represented as being opposed to "a higher order of literature." This opposition, however, be it understood, did not come from our best thinkers and most highly educated men, but chiefly from literary upstarts, *quasi-critics*, and from such as were better versed in heathen classics than in the knowledge of the Bible. Though FRANKLIN himself was not educated according to the standard of the schools, yet no man appreciated the benefits of an education more than he, which was made evident by the fact that he did everything within his power to educate his own sons and daughters, and that he encouraged educational enterprises and contributed of his spare means toward their support. But he ever contended that, to make a man a worthy and efficient minister of the Gospel; more than mere "literary culture" was demanded. He never indulged in theological "terminologies," nor in what is termed "sciolism" and "scholasticism," nor in such stilting language as "teleology" and "eschatology" — in which literary pretenders loved to make themselves conspicuous — but he wrote and preached in a language so plain and simple, that the most illiterate could follow him and understand what he had to say. Here was his superior power, and it was this kind of superiority that captivated and carried the masses; and we might add, that it was this superiority that provoked the envy and elicited the sarcasm of the advocates of "a higher order of literature." While they were spending their time in criticism and fault-finding, and playing the dalliance with "accomplished ladies," he was out in the field, and far from the

endearments of home, preaching and converting sinners to God by scores and hundreds. While his merciless critics were engaged in discussing the "inner consciousness," the "divinity within," "inner-lightism," the "mediate" and "immediate influence of the Spirit," and much mystic matter of that character, he was engaged, both by pen and tongue, in elucidating the Scriptures, unfolding the plan of salvation, explaining the rules of Bible interpretation, and showing-sinners the way to heaven. Dr. R. Richardson and H. T. Anderson were the recognized champions of the new philosophy, which was intended to antagonize the philosophy of Locke. Richardson, in 1856, wrote a series of articles for the *Millennial Harbinger* to combat Locke's idea that "the mind knows not things immediately, but only by the intervention of the ideas it has of them"; that is, that the mind is only operated upon and influenced as impressions are made upon it from objects without—from external revelations. This, too, was Alexander Campbell's position. Such men as Russell, Carman and Melish followed in the wake of Richardson and Anderson. We here give a specimen of FRANKLIN'S replies to the new philosophy:

"After preaching the plain Gospel of Christ, as the Disciples have done for more than thirty years, gathering some three hundred thousand souls into the fold of Christ, many of them from the contending parties around us, and uniting them in the bond of peace and union, thus making ourselves felt as no other people have done in this country, a brother perceives where a slight mistake may have\occurred. He becomes alarmed, looks upon all that has been done as nothing, and declares that nothing great and good will be accomplished till the evil is corrected. He just now perceives that there is danger of men resting their faith in *the Word*, and not in the divine and glorious *person* revealed through the Word. He thinks many are deceived in relying simply upon the *Word* instead of relying upon *Him* who gave the Word. He now perceives the secret of there not being devotion, piety and zeal. It is found in the stupid mistake of believing *the truth*, in the place of believing in *Him* who is revealed through the truth. * * * Can a man confide in Jesus and not confide in his word? or confide in his word and not confide in him? Can a man confide in the Holy Spirit and not confide in his word?" or confide in his word and not confide in him? Can a man receive the

word of Jesus and not receive Jesus ? Can any person believe the word of the Holy Spirit and not receive the Holy Spirit? Can any man obey the word and not obey Him who uttered the word ? Can a man follow the word spoken by the Spirit and not be led by the Spirit ? Can a man be led by the word spoken by the Spirit and not be led by the Spirit? Are not all those led by the teaching of the Spirit, inscribed upon the pages of the Bible, led by the Spirit ?"

Again, in reply to these gentlemen, he says: "If the nice distinctions our brethren are trying to make had been necessary, it is strange the Apostles did not stop and explain to their hearers and readers, that not their words nor their ideas constituted what was to be received, but *the things* revealed through them! Has anybody among us been so stupid as to feast, or try to feast, upon the *words, or ideas,* and not receive *the things* of the Spirit?" FRANKLIN treated these men very cavalierly, as was evidenced by the fact that, afterward, when Anderson got out his translation of the New Testament, FRANKLIN advocated the enterprise and gave Anderson more prominence through the *Review* than any other paper. He thus spoke in extenuation of the conduct of Dr. Richardson, who had been a Professor in Bethany College for a long term of years: "The circumstance that Brother Richardson had used a few of the mystic expressions of an unsound philosophy, and a few young men, graduates of Bethany College, have thought they were getting a little wiser in resuscitating an exploded philosophy, is no evidence that Bethany College is not sound. There is no sounder college on this earth than Bethany College, nor are there any sounder men than its Professors."

The inflexible and uncompromising course pursued by the Editor of the *Review* excited and exasperated a certain class of young men, including secretaries of societies and "settled pastors," who soon began to raise the cry of "tyranny of opinion," "fogy," "unwritten creeds," "iron bedsteads," "prince of wails," etc. They waxed bold, and began to advocate the necessity of "reforming the Reformation," and, if possible, rescue the Reformation from the molding

and directing power of the *Review*. This movement was christened the "New Interest," aud those who engaged in it were called "Progressives." The "New Interest" now demanded an "organ " to represent the "advance wing" of the Reformation. After repeated attempts to start a journal that would meet their expectations, the *Christian Standard* was created, by the establishment of a stock company with a capital of $18,000. Isaac Errett was appointed Editor-in-chief. The Editor of the *Standard* made no concealment of the fact that, with the assistance of his co-adjutors, he intended to crush the *Review,* or at least neutralize, if possible, its influence. By means of plenty of money,* donated by wealthy brethren, and through the influence of city pastors and city churches, and by means of premiums offered to subscribers, to say nothing of the special and continuous efforts made by the friends of the Missionary Societies, the *Standard* soon shot ahead of the *Review,* in the way of obtaining a large list of subscribers. The *Standard* immediately became the pronounced organ of the "progressive element," and all such in the churches who loved the dance and the theater, and thought there is "no harm in innocent amusements," such as 'card-playing and chess, and all the anti-temperance element—such as opposed organized temperance movements—became the ardent supporters of the new journal. It must be confessed that it became a great power among the churches. Because the *Review* radically and strenuously opposed all these evidences of a weak Christian morality, it received from its admirers the *soubriquet* of "The Old Reliable," which it holds to this day. The strife between the two journals was very bitter. The *Standard,* in effect, held that the Revie*w* was coarse and vulgar in its. utterances, and aimed to block the wheels of a progressive Christianity; that the *Review* was too severe in its criticisms of the brethren, too censorious of the churches, and entirely

*By its own confession, the *Standard* sunk $50,000 of the people's money before it was permanently established, while the *Review* all the time was made self-supporting, and sunk nobody's money.

too personal and hostile in its attacks upon good and truthful men; while at the same time the *Review* insisted that the *Standard* was wishy-washy, non-committal on great questions, and was seeking popularity at the expense of Gospel integrity, and that it was unreliable in its advocacy of the "distinctive plea" of the Disciples; also, that it inclined to compromise with the sects. FRANKLIN conscientiously, and with increasing intensity, stood in open opposition to the course of the *Standard* until the time that death palsied his tongue and compelled him to lay down his powerful pen.

As already intimated, the "General Christian Missionary Convention" was organized in Louisville, in 1869. At first, FRANKLIN tacitly gave his adhesion to it, as a good compromise measure, which he did in the hope of producing peace and a good understanding. He soon turned against it, because he became dissatisfied with its "management;" and because he severely criticized the management, as well as the men who managed it, he was stigmatized as an "anti-progressionist." He was reviled, and maligned, and caricatured, not by the good men and women, but by a class of adventurers who sought only self-promotion and worldly gain—many of whom soon lapsed, and lost their identity with the Disciples of Christ. He was in favor of all good works, whether carried on by individual enterprise, or by a voluntary association of individuals, or by church co-operation; but his soul revolted at the idea of centralization.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was not a pro-slavery advocate, nor was he, technically speaking, an abolitionist. He ever held that slavery was a political question, and that as the Church was in no way responsible for the introduction and existence of slavery, the question belonged to the State and not to the Church. He held that Christians, by force, had no right to interfere with it. He was in favor of enlightenment and moral suasion, and if by such means the evil could be removed, supported by a free ballot, he was ready to give his influence. He always held himself amenable to the civil law, if its requirements did not stand between

him and duty to God. During the war between the North ern and Southern States, he stood by the flag of his country voted for Union men, and helped to sustain the Government of the United States. He held, in common with Alexander Campbell, that the relation of master and servant (which was the view the South took of the system) was not necessarily sinful; but, nevertheless, when the fact was announced that American slavery was forever abolished, he rejoiced, not so much because the slaves were made free, as because he believed that in every way, in the long run, it would conduce to the welfare of the white people of the South. He would not permit the *Review* to become the medium, between brethren of the same faith, for political agitation, and hence ruled out the discussion of the slavery question and the war question. He did not favor the idea of Christians taking up arms and going into a carnal warfare. He held that there was a moral incompatibility between the spiritual war of the Christian and the carnal war of a worldly man. The advocacy of this principle saved many churches from going to ruin. When he traveled South he Was suspected of being a "Northern Radical," and when he traveled North he was suspected of being a "Rebel sympathizer." In his position of "neutrality," as it was called, he did not by any means stand alone, as the fact stands recorded that the Bible Society deprecated the agitation of slavery as a religious question, and deplored it as an "unprofitable controversy," which had only served to divide many " benevolent institutions into North and South." And the General Missionary Society occupied the same ground for the space of ten years, the Society only having one object in views — to disseminate the Gospel in this and other lands," which was in harmony with the second article of its constitution. The Corresponding Secretary, in response to an applicant in Kansas who sought aid from the Society, and whom the Secretary knew to be an anti-slavery agitator, replied as follows: "The second article of the constitution of this Society says that 'the object of this Society is to disseminate the Gospel in this and

other lands.' This is its only object. The preachers employed by her are employed to preach the Gospel, to baptize believers, and to teach the baptized their Christian duties as rulers, subjects, husbands, wives, parents, children, masters, servants, etc., that they may learn, by obedience to Christ's commands, to lay hold on eternal life. All this is legitimately embraced in 'disseminating the Gospel.'" Subsequent developments proved the wisdom of this course. The Church cannot meddle with politics and escape unpolluted. Her garments of beauty will be smirched in spite of all her pretensions.

The last time the writer of this sketch saw the beloved BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was at Flat Rock, Bourbon County, Kentucky, where John S. Sweeney and C. W. Miller, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, were engaged in a public discussion. This was in July, 1878. The mercury indicated, during the discussion, about one hundred degrees of heat, and the air was stifling in the extreme. FRANKLIN, the champion of more than thirty public debates, was present at every session. He suffered dreadfully, being extremely weak in body, but he bore up like a soldier, intently absorbed in the investigation of the several propositions. We ventured to say at the time, having associated with him during the debate, and hearing what the brethren had to say about his extreme weakness—which gave them fearful forebodings—that, unless he grew better soon, he would not live more than six months. He lived about three months after the debate. And, notwithstanding the debilitated condition of his system, he went home and reproduced upon the pages of the *Review, from memory*, the consecutive arguments, with all their points of contact, of both the distinguished disputants —a mental feat that not one writer in a thousand can perform.

Had he remained at home the last two years of his life. and abstained from traveling and preaching, and been content to use his pen only, he might have survived ten years longer. But the zeal of the Lord's house consumed him. It was evident to his friends for some years before his earthly

career ended that his physical energies were gradually giving way, but he continued to work away against their earnest protestation, determined to fall with his armor on, and only to yield, at the last moment. The last "yearly meeting" be ever attended was at Oxford, Ohio, in the month of September, 1878, one month before he died. So feeble was he that very few of the vast concourse of people were able to hear him; but if they could not hear him, many had flocked there to *see* the mighty man, many of whom saw him for the first and the last time. One brother who had never seen him before made the remark that it was worth his "journey of thirty miles to hear him pray." He returned home in a very prostrated condition, from which he partially rallied, after resting a few days. He lived to see every member of his large family, including his sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, enter the Church of Christ. It was the privilege of the writer of this sketch to baptize his youngest child, his son Alexander.

Candor and regard for the truth impel us to say, that many things written by BENJAMIN FRANKLIN in the last years of his life, never would have been written in the form in which they appeared, if he had not been over-persuaded by interested parties to do so. At times he was overwhelmed with letters from persons who did not fully comprehend the situation, pressing him to strike his severest blows at certain apparent and existing evils, the language of which blows would have been measurably modified and differently tempered if he had been left to follow the dictates of his own judgment. Not that he would for the world have yielded a principle, or compromised his honor, out that he might have saved himself from many unjust criticisms, by having toned down his words, and by having made concessions in which no principle was involved. Such was the impressibility of his nature—such his confidence in his friends—that when in the company of those who spoke encouragingly of the cause, he felt equally encouraged and stimulated; and that when in the company of those who

spoke discouragingly, and pleaded that the cause was going to the bad, he was made to share their fears, and to feel correspondingly despondent. It is to this latter class that we have made reference. They were a great annoyance to him.

On the very day of his demise, as it proved to be, he was getting ready to attend the exercises of a general meeting at Ben Davis Creek Church, which journey was to embrace a visit to his two sons in Indianapolis, and to one of his daughters at Glenwood, Rush County, Indiana. He died in Anderson, Indiana, where his family resided the last eighteen years of his life. Referring to his last contemplated visit, Joseph Franklin, his son, thus pathetically and graphically describes his last mortal hours:

"As the time to start upon the visit drew near, his spirits became more buoyant. So encouraging were the symptoms that his family thought he was really improving. He ate regularly and slept well, and his writing was done with great ease. In the morning of the 22d of October, 1878, he took a long walk upon his farm. Returning about nine o'clock, he said to his wife: 'Mother, I feel very much better to-day, and I hope I shall get well.' He then seated himself at the table and wrote some two or three hours. When called to dinner he ate heartily, and still talked of how well he felt. After dinner he lay down for his customary sleep. He slept somewhat longer than usual and attracted attention by his labored breathing. At two o'clock he awakened and sat up in his chair, but seemed very dull, as if he were hardly awake. After a time he began to show symptoms of distress, and complained of heaviness, 'as if a fifty-pound weight lay on his heart.' His wife was the only person in the room at the time. She soon saw that something very unusual was the matter, and called their daughter from another part of the house. When she came to him he was gasping for breath. She made an attempt to rub his side with a view to restore the circulation, but he said, 'Don't trouble me; my time has come.' She now became seriously alarmed, and summoning her husband [Brother FRANKLIN was at this

time boarding with his daughter Martha and her husband, Mr. James M. Plummer], a messenger was dispatched to call a physician, and to. notify the other members of the family resident in Anderson.. The physician came within one hour, but MR. FRANKLIN was too far gone to swallow, and nothing could be done for him.

"His last words were spoken to his wife: 'Mother, I am sorry to have to leave you.' Leaning back in the arm-chair in which he had been sitting from the time he arose after his sleep, and with his eyes fixed on the companion who had shared all his joys and his sorrows for forty-nine years, his breathing grew shorter and shorter, until it could not be observed that he breathed at all.

"About five o'clock in the afternoon of October 22, 1878, it became evident to the loving eyes fixed upon him, but nearly blinded by their tears, that *Benjamin Franklin was dead!*

"'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, for they shall rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.'

"The telegraph carried the news to the morning papers of Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis, and summoned his children to the burial. All his children were present, and all their companions save one. His brothers, Daniel and David Franklin, were present. The day following his death, after brief religious devotions at the residence, conducted by W. W. Witmer, who was preaching for the church at Anderson, his body was laid away in the Anderson Cemetery to await the resurrection of the just."

On October 23d, the General Christian Missionary Society convened in Cincinnati. Early on the morning of that day, while the delegates were arriving from every train, the sad news of the death of "Brother FRANKLIN" flew like the wings of the wind through the city, and many countenances fell while the telegraph dispatch was being read by anxious minds from the morning dailies. His death was the common theme of talk among the members of the Convention, and

tears unbidden started from many eyes on the recital of the sad story. Brother G. W. Rice, his steadfast friend and counsellor for twenty years, who never was absent from his post of duty, except in cases of sickness, and who was ever the ardent admirer of "Brother FRANKLIN," seemed, for the moment, to stagger at the sudden and unexpected news. Mr. Edwin Alden, one of the proprietors of the *Review,* and who Was also a great admirer of the departed Editor, and who was held in high esteem by Brother FRANKLIN, ordered that the sign at the front entrance, which bore the firm-name of "Franklin & Rice," be draped in mourning. It was our sad office to assist in wrapping the sign with the sorrowful emblems of death, and on the black drapery we pinned these words: "BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, EDITOR OF THE; REVIEW, IS DEAD. DIED OCTOBER 22, 1878."

The next issue of the *Review* was draped in deep mourning, and in honor to the memory of the fallen hero, the name of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, as Editor of the *Review,* was kept standing at the head of the paper for two weeks, The following detailed account of his death, and beautiful tribute of respect, was sent to the office by Brother W. W. Witmer, then evangelist of the Anderson Church of Christ, and published in the *Review:*

"IN MEMORIAM.

"ANDERSON, Indiana, October 25, 1878.

"DEAR BROTHER RICE:—Elder BENJAMIN FRANKLIN is dead. Like a thunderclap from a clear sky came the news Tuesday evening, October 22d, that BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, the Senior Editor of the *American Christian Review,* was dead. The tongue and pen of *BENJAMIN* FRANKLIN are silent forever. Perhaps the telegraph wires have not for years conveyed sadder news to the friends of our Lord Jesus Christ, than they did on the night of October 22, when they announced that BENJAMIN FRANKLIN had been called home by the Master. Brother FRANKLIN died at the residence of his son-in-law, Brother James Plummer, near Anderson, Indiana, Tuesday evening, October 22, 1878, about five o'clock. Lord's day, October 20, Brother FRANKLIN preached here in Anderson for the church, as I was absent. I am told by those who heard him, that be spoke unusually well, his voice stronger, and his

delivery more fluent than usual. His words of admonition and good cheer were spoken of by all as especially appropriate and encouraging on that occasion. Brother FRANKLIN was requested to preach again at night, but remarked, "I wish to reserve nay strength for my *journey,"* referring to a contemplated visit into Rush County, Indiana. On the next day after his death, he intended to take dinner with his son in Indianapolis, on his way into Rush Count,, but, in place of this, he finished his *journey* and sat down with Abraham, Isaac. and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven above. On Tuesday, the day of his contemplated visit, he seemed unusually jovial and pleasant, and remarked that he was feeling better than common. He had been writing in the afternoon his editorials for the *Review,* but after dinner he commenced to complain of a heavy, oppressive load on his stomach and bowels, and of pain about the region of the heart. His daughter, Sister Plummer, and his Wife, Sister Franklin, proposed to lay him on the bed, but he said he could not lie down. His suffering increased, and daughter and wife did all they could, but whenever they would attempt to do anything, he would put out his hand and say, 'Don't touch me; my time has come.' Becoming alarmed, a physician was sent for, but he was helpless to do anything to stay the cold hand of Death. Brother FRANKLIN remained sitting in his chair, and all that could be done could not alleviate his sufferings, and about four o'clock, P. M., he became unconscious, and at five o'clock the spirit of BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, that great, good man, took its flight to the God who gave it.

"A mighty man has fallen. The labors done, and work accomplished, and the results of these labors, only the recording angel in heaven has kept an account. I hope some pen will give us a synopsis, for a synopsis it only can be, of his labors and toils in the Master's vineyard. Thursday, October 24, at three o'clock, P. M., assisted by Brother M. T. Hough, of Muncie, Indiana, I conducted the funeral exercises at the house. We could not go to the church on account of Sister Franklin, who is now aged and very feeble. A large concourse of weeping friends met at the house of Brother Plummer to pay the last tribute of respect to the dead. After singing "Asleep in Jesus," the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians was read, in connection with a portion of the fourth chapter of 2 Timothy, after which a prayer was offered, and remarks made by the writer, from the seventh and eighth verses of the fourth chapter of 2 Timothy. Brother Hough also offered some very appropriate remarks. We then followed the coffin, as it was taken to the cemetery, near Anderson, and there, amidst the awful silence, and in the presence of perhaps the largest concourse of people that ever assembled in that cemetery, we laid Brother FRANKLIN to rest until the resurrection of the just. Brother FRANKLIN was aged sixty-six years, eight months and

twenty-one days at the time of his death. The church here is in mourning. There is crape on the church door.

"W. W. WITMER."

The following TWELVE PROPOSITIONS—grand generalizations of the Gospel—written shortly before his death, were kept standing in the *Review* for several weeks, and which his successor to the editorship of the *Review* adopted as his guiding star in the future management of the journal:

"1. It is our purpose to advocate the one *book* for all the world and for all time—the Bible—as the *one book of God*, containing the only, the full and final revelation from God to man ; the supreme, the absolute and only standard in all matters of religion.

"2. To advocate the *one religion* set forth in the Bible, and precisely *as set forth in the Bible*, as the only true religion—the only religion from God.

"3. To advocate *the Church set forth* in the Bible as the only true Church, or the only Church from God.

"4. To advocate the faith set forth in the Bible as the only true faith—the only faith from God.

"5. To advocate the way of salvation as set forth by the Apostles and the first evangelists in their preaching ; the way in which all came to the Savior in the time of the Apostles, and obtained the salvation of their souls, as the only and file infallible way of salvation from God.

"6. To advocate the worship prescribed in Scripture—the whole of it ; no more, no less—as the only true and acceptable worship of God in the New Institution.

"7. To advocate the purity and holiness of life—the observance of all things whatever Jesus commanded the Apostles to teach—as set forth in the teachings of Christ and the Apostles.

"8. To advocate the administration of discipline in all the congregations of the Lord, and the maintenance of order; marking those who cause divisions, and putting away the insubordinate and unruly.

"9. To advocate *the way* of evangelizing practiced by the Apostles and the first Christians, and *no other way*. But, then, we mean in this, as we have practiced ever since we came into the new and living way—*evangelizing*, and not a mere *pretense at it*. We mean *evangelizing, in deed and in truth; spreading the Gospel; turning sinners to the Lord;* building up and setting congregations in order.

"10. Not to advocate the building up of a new or older order of *clergy*, as a class, distinct from other members of the Church; nor any clerical conventions, confederations, alliances, or associations for their

own government, the government of the Church, or any other purpose not taught in Scripture, or for which we have no clear precept or example in Scripture.

"11. To advocate the authority of the congregations, with their overseers and deacons, to conduct the worship, administer discipline, receive or exclude members according to Scripture, and transact all the matters of the kingdom in their limits, recognizing no jurisdiction from abroad.

"12. In one word, to sum all up, we mean a complete return in all things to the original—to that which came from the Lord, and the repudiation of what did not come from the Lord."

The following is a copy of a letter he addressed to his successor just two days before he died, and which, if not the last, was one of the last he ever penned:

"ANDERSON, INDIANA, *October 20, 187*8.

"Brother Rowe:

"DEAR SIR:—Your very welcome letter is to hand, and contents carefully noted. It gives me as much joy as any letter I ever received from any one. I knew I had been a life-long friend to you, without a waver or a single infraction, and that I had considered you true to the Savior, or, as you expressed it, to the 'old landmarks,' and had confidence in you as I had *in no other man;* and the bare thought that you were becoming alienated, or in any degree estranged from me, at such a time as the present, when I consider *all is at stake*, was more than I could bear. But your kind letter came, manifesting the same kind spirit, good and noble heart, as received in times past ; and giving me assurance of your settled purpose, fixed principles, and devotion to the work of the Lord. There never has been a time in our day when there was a greater demand for straight and reformatory work, determined advocacy of Reformation principles, and a thorough showing up of all crafty schemes of designing men, trying to draw many disciples after them, than the present.

"I have written you plainly and freely, but in love and affection, not only as a *personal kindness*, but in view of the work before us. You have a powerful pen, and there are but few if any who can excel you in writing; and it has been my desire for years that you shall become fully master of the situation. I have tried in every way in my power to turn everything favorable to you. * * * * Let me hear from you frequently. As ever, yours,

"BENJ. FRANKLIN.

"P. S.—I preached this morning with ease and comfort, and am feel-

ing finely this evening. Address me, Glenwood, Rush County, Indiana, where I expect to be for over two weeks to come. B.F."

But, alas, he never lived to fill *that* engagement!

As a conversationalist in the private circle, he had few equals. He could converse with any one in any rank of life, and he was as entertaining to the scholar as he was to the uncultured. He would drop his pen at any moment at the approach of a visitor, and, without thinking it an encroachment upon his time, he would talk on for an hour at a time, answering questions and imparting information, interspersing his conversation with lively anecdotes, in which he excelled, and pleasing his company with lively wit and wisdom. He was a good listener, and when addressed by any one he listened with close attention, and deferentially weighed every word spoken to him. There seemed to be no bottom to his magazine of anecdotes, with which, without dropping a profane or an unchaste word, he would enliven his company; and his recollection of incidents which came under his own observation, and with which he illustrated all phases of life, was marvelous. He was always himself; he put on no airs; he despised affectation; he never assumed to be what he was not; he manifested an utter contempt for all disguises. Such was his insight into human nature that he could unmask a hypocrite in a moment, and a pretender received little mercy at his hands. But, on the other hand, such was his childlike simplicity of manners, that he was as ready to accommodate and please the humblest disciple of Christ, or to confer a favor on the poorest man, as he was ready to entertain a school of philosophers or to discuss the great theme of salvation before the listening multitude.

His mind always seemed to be in equipoise. Such was the breadth of his thoughts, and such his knowledge of the wants and objects of life—which to him was always real and always earnest—and such the flexibility of his reasoning powers, that he could reach down with as much facility as he could reach up; and, by this accommodation of his mental organization he would place the humblest mind on the same

level with the finest intellect. He made all men feel that they were equal before God. He showed that God placed the same estimate on one soul that he did upon another. His constant theme, without distinction of person, was the royalty and the grandeur of the redeemed soul. He was no trifler; he played no pranks; he indulged in no rhetorical kite-flying; he asked no "vacation" from labor; his soul being rooted and established in the truth, he ever sought the elevation and the dignity of man. His impartiality was a predominant trait in his character. He kept no men-pets; he would neither buy nor sell a man in order to subserve a selfish end.. He asked no man to serve as his tool or as his puppet. He was very cautious, and kept his own counsel. He had but few confidential advisers, to whom he would make known the secrets of his heart. He was, however, easily influenced by men in whom he had implicit confidence; and to this apparent weakness, or undue confidence, may be attributed some of the mistakes of his life. Sometimes, in the management of the *Review*, he was induced, through the persistent importunities of correspondents, to take positions on matters of expediency which he afterwards regretted. The ,same was true of Alexander Campbell in the latter days of his life. If a man once deceived BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, it was difficult ever after that for him to have confidence in the same person. And yet I never knew a man who was more forgiving in his disposition than he. He seemed to lose all confidence in the preacher who seemed to lose confidence in the power of the Gospel which he proposed to preach. He would not associate with a man who once betrayed Jesus Christ. Such was his knowledge of human nature, that be was hardly ever mistaken in his estimate of men. I have known him to predict the fall of certain men long before the event transpired.

The subject of this sketch was exceedingly sensitive to slights and insults, but he nursed the pain which they occasioned without the knowledge of his most intimate friends. Nothing imparted to him such anguish of soul as the fact

that, after having brought men into notice by means of his pen, and having given them a conspicuity which otherwise they never could have enjoyed, they should ungratefully turn upon him, and treat him with contempt and indifference, because, perchance, he administered to them a slight rebuke, which he was wont to do if he thought he saw in them the least departure from the faith. His extreme jealousy in guarding the purity of the Gospel, and in defending the Constitution of the Church—which he did in the *role* of the "Great Commoner" of the Restoration—and his characteristic vigilance in fending off" all despoilers of the temple of truth, gave him the appearance of a bigot; and he even suffered the most incisive criticism at the hands of some of his own brethren, because of his unyielding disposition, lie was scathingly criticized by these same brethren, because, during the Southern Rebellion, he would not surrender the columns of the *American Christian Review* to the discussion of war measures, and allow brethren on opposite sides to argue questions of politics, and to pronounce on the merits and demerits of a conflict for which they were in no wise responsible, and the magnitude of which they could not comprehend. The wisdom of this course was demonstrated in the fact that, wherever the *Review* circulated, either North or South, the churches were held together and saved from dissolution. And yet, as a citizen of the United States, FRANKLIN was a Union man throughout the cruel conflict, and voted and labored as a loyal citizen to preserve the Union. When he met the brethren in the South, he met them *as Christians;* and when he met them in the North, he met them as brethren in the same family of God. Wherever he went preaching, he ruled out politics as an element in the Gospel.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was a man of unwavering faith. Here is where he shone out with greatest luster. His faith rose to the dignity of noble and exalted heroism. He put not his "trust in princes," but he confidingly and affectionately trusted in the words of the Heavenly Father. It was his abiding faith in God that assured him such emi-

nent success in all his labors of love. He saw many dark days—encountered poverty and persecution—but, like Abraham, he went out at the call of duty, not knowing whither the Lord would lead his way-worn feet. While he distrusted men, he never for a moment distrusted God. He ever seemed impressed with the same spirit which impressed Paul, "Woe to me if I preach not the Gospel of Christ." "Christ and him crucified " was ever his theme, whether he was magnifying the name of God by his pen, or describing the glories of heaven by his tongue. The zeal of the Lord's house con-stoned all his energies. Precious little of his time and influence were wasted on the frivolities and fashions of this world. He never lost hope in the final triumph of the truth, and yet I have often known his heart to be bowed in grief because of the vacillations of his ministerial brethren, and because of the manifest tendency of the churches to conform to the popular demand of the age. In the early days of his ministry, when poverty was the fate of most preachers, and when, at times, he left his wife and little ones with scarcely the common comforts of life, he would leave home in a happy and hopeful mood, saying, "The Lord will provide." His noble and self-sacrificing wife—a woman of superior qualities of heart and mind—in a cheerful spirit assumed all the responsibilities of the domestic circle, in the absence of her liege-lord, for whom she ever manifested the highest respect, and willingly shared with him all the bitter tears and all the lively hopes and joys that belong to a pioneer preacher's life.

He frequently surprised strangers, as well as his friends. by his displays of practical wisdom. I have heard him talk intelligently on all questions of practical utility, whether perraining to religion or political economy, or to mechanical or agricultural affairs, or to educational or industrial matters. He made no pretensions to the learning of the schools, although, by persistent industry and application, he attained to such a knowledge of men and letters, that he was everywhere ranked among scholars; and even professional schol-

ars stood in awe of his logical acumen, were delighted with his powers of analysis, and wondered whence this man had so much wisdom. He was but little acquainted with ancient and modern classics—was versed in no dead language, save a little knowledge of the Greek Testament—and yet I have known some of our most accomplished linguists—some of our aspiring leaders—to criticise his scholarship and manifest an envious spirit, because he outstripped them all in winning the affections of the people, and in educating the public mind. They even went so far as to stigmatise him as a "demagogue," because he rose to merited fame, while they fell into obscurity. He was not a literary man, in the con-mon acceptation of the term; nor was he posted in the literature of the drama, and he knew less of the opera and of the sportsman's column; but such was his keen observation of passing events—such his knowledge of the ways of the world—and such the grasp and tenacity of his memory, that it almost seemed as if he obtained his information by intuition. What he once heard he seldom forgot. While others were blundering to grasp a thought, he had it already in his mind, and was assimilating it as his own mental food.

He was not what might be called an ornate preacher, nor did he use a great variety of words. His language was extremely simple, and he was careful never to use a word that the commonest mind could not understand. He carefully defined the terms of any proposition he was about to discuss. His reasoning was of the inductive method; that is, after announcing his proposition, he would proceed to fortify it by quoting many passages of Scripture bearing upon the same subject. By quoting parallel passages he made the Scriptures explain themselves, and when he arrived at his conclusions, so irresistible were the convictions of truth that he left none of his hearers in doubt. They must either admit his conclusions, or deny his premises entirely. He concentrated the rays of truth upon the heart of the sinner, and sent conviction direct to the soul, as you would converge the beams of the sun with a sun-glass upon a combustible sub-

stance, and hold fast the instrument until the object begins to blaze from the effects of the collected heat. He who listened honestly could not escape conviction. Hence his great success as an evangelist, having baptized with his own hands, during his ministerial life, over eight thousand people, besides thousands baptized subsequently by other hands who were induced to obey the Gospel by first having heard his resistless appeals, and whose convincing proofs they could not' shake off'. In 1869, he held a meeting in Akron, Ohio, and while there was a guest in my family. In a few days the whole city was roused up by his preaching. Not only did the various denominations flock to hear him, but lawyers and doctors, and avowed infidels, eagerly pressed out every night to listen to his arguments and powerful words of conviction.

I remember hearing the best minds of the city say that they had never seen such displays of logical power, and that they had never heard a man who could preach with such convincing force. If they would not believe his doctrine, they admitted his power of analysis, and were subdued by the earnestness of him who lost himself in the profundity of his own theme. A telegram from home, stating that his wife was dangerously sick, cut his work short in the midst of a great meeting. Up to the time of his departure sixteen persons had obeyed the Gospel, but there is no telling what would have been the result could he have remained an indefinite length of time.

The very moment FRANKLIN stood up in the pulpit, he commanded respectful attention. All eyes gazed upon him intently as though they expected to hear the words of an oracle. He always appeared before the people with a smile upon his face, and when he began to speak, such was the familiarity of his style, that each person listened as if he or she was personally and directly addressed by the preacher: as much as to say, "Do you mean me?" He always preferred doing his own praying in the pulpit. He claimed that every preacher should "sharpen his own sword." He was powerful in prayer, because his words were few and well chosen, "like

apples of gold in pictures of silver." His prayers were simple and comparatively short, nor did he vary much in the form and words of his prayers; but it was the *soul-power* of his prayers—the prayers of faith—that lifted every heart to God, and that transformed earthly affections into heavenly thoughts. When he emerged from his prayer, as from a cloud of incense, his face bore the image of one who was strong to run a race. When his countenance was lighted up with truth divine, and his eyes were sparkling the animation of his soul, and he was directing every hungry heart to the fountain of life, while bathing his own heart in the love of God, and when his entire being seemed to be thoroughly thrilled with the pathos of his theme, the listener would be inclined to exclaim,—

"A combination, and a form, indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man."

If FRANKLIN was powerful as a preacher, he was still more powerful as a writer. He was an incessant writer, and he loved to put his thoughts upon record. He wrote as by inspiration. He never seemed happier than when guiding his pen. A man whose editorial career continued uninterruptedly thirty-five years—a period of time overlapping more than the average age of mankind—certainly was a writer of more than ordinary ability. He loved to write, not because he was seeking fame as an author, but because he loved to dip his pen in the Spirit of Truth, and to follow the lines of Christian love and liberty upon the white and passive page before him.. He performed his writing mostly in the morning, no matter whether at home or away from home in the midst of his protracted-meetings. As he was always thinking, he was always ready and prepared to write. He used but few books of reference while at home, and when abroad, with no books of reference accessible, he was obliged to depend on his memory, which scarcely ever failed him. He usually began to write immediately after breakfast, and continued till about eleven o'clock, at the expiration of which time he was ready

to enter into conversation, or "*go* out to dinner" on invitation: though he never cared much for visiting, but responded to invitations as a matter of duty and accommodation. He usually attended to his correspondence after dinner, and, if not pressed too much by company—to whom he always was very deferential—he spent an hour or two more on his manuscript in the afternoon, he was exceedingly fond of taking a walk, after breakfast, to some remoter place, beyond the din and bustle of society, where he could commune silently with nature and nature's God; and some of the pleasantest hours the writer of these pages ever spent, were spent in these morning rambles in his company.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was known far and near as a writer, and not only were his writings sought after by the whole brotherhood especially before so many periodicals came into existence, as representing our people—but many persons outside of our brotherhood eagerly sought after them, though it must be confessed that it was frequently with fear and trembling that they did so, not, however, because they feared the man, but because they feared the truth he advocated. His career as a writer or editor dates from the first of January, 1843, at which time he began the publication of the *Reformer*, a monthly of sixteen pages, published from Centerville, Indiana. This he continued to publish for about seven years; the last three from Milton, Indiana. After this he removed to Cincinnati, and there formed a partnership with D. S. Burner, by which arrangement they published jointly, for one year, the *Reformer* and *Christian Age*. These two periodicals were afterward consolidated, FRANKLIN having been employed as Editor; which position he held for nearly three years. During the next two years, he published, as a monthly, the *American Christian Review*. Having come into possession of the *Christian Age*, he dropped the name of that paper, and at once began the publication of the *Review* as a weekly, and which he conducted up to the day of his death. The *Review* was conducted under the firm name of Franklin & Rice.

During the first year's existence of the *Review,* it had an extensive circulation, and many of the most gifted writers of the Reformation were regular contributors to its pages.

In the latter years of his life, FRANKLIN produced two volumes, containing forty-one Sermons." Over twelve thousand copies of the first volume have been sold, and the sale of the two volumes continues without abatement. The first volume is confessedly one of the ablest religious works ever produced, not, however, because of its brilliancy and rhetorical finish—of which it does not make the least pretension—but because of the Bible truth it contains. It not only demolishes all forms of sectarianism beyond recovery, and exposes the utter worthlessness of creedism and denominationalism; but it presents file Gospel plan of salvation with such clearness and distinctness, harmonizes the truths of the Divine system in such simplicity of speech, and points out the only certain and infallible way in the path of duty with such certainty, and leads the honest heart to such a safe anchorage in the promises of God, that it leaves the sincere seeker after truth, in search of the right way of the Lord, utterly without an excuse for continuing in disobedience. Soon after the first volume was issued, Brother Henslar, of Tonawanda, New York. purchased twelve copies, and sent them out, with the remark. *"These are my twelve evangelists: go preach the Gospel."* We frequently meet with men, and hear from others, who testify that it was by reading this volume of twenty Sermons their eyes were first opened to the plainness of the truth, so that they were enabled to see Christianity in all its harmonious grandeur, and to discern the glorious scheme of salvation.

The subject of this sketch immortalized himself by the production of a Tract, of less than a hundred pages, entitled *Sincerity Seeking the Way to Heaven,* the sales of which have exceeded that of any work ever published by the Disciples of Christ. Fifteen thousand copies up to this date have been sold, and hundreds have been converted to pure, Apostolic Christianity by the perusal of this little evangel of

truth, which has gone on missions of light and love to the ends of the earth. There is as much genius displayed in the composition of this tract as in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.

FRANKLIN excelled as a public debater. He was an honest and candid debater, which can not be said of every man. He depended wholly on the power of the truth. He never resorted to tricks and artifices, though he was a master hand in exposing the sophistries and fallacies of his antagonist. His *great forte* was in the clear statements of the terms of his propositions, in the cumulation of evidence, and in the force of his arguments. Some seven years before his death, the writer of these pages accompanied him to Fairmount, West Virginia, where he held a debate with Professor Solomon, a member of the Baptist Church, and a teacher in a Baptist college of that State. The proposition discussed was on the design of baptism, or to prove that baptism was one of the conditions of salvation, a proposition his opponent denied. The first speech of FRANKLIN, which was an hour in length, crushed Solomon beyond recovery. Solomon never recovered from the first onslaught; indeed it was evident to all the people that Solomon *felt himself* crushed. FRANKLIN'S speech was a grand generalization of the entire system of redemption. He showed the relation which one element of the Gospel sustains to every other element in the Divine arrangement with such consummate skill, that, when he concluded his speech, a murmur of approval pervaded the entire assembly, and all seemed to realize that Solomon was annihilated. *The proposition was proved.* I never shall forget that scene. The giant stood before the people master of the situation. His argument was dove-tailed with the wedges of truth throughout. By his inductive method of reasoning, in which *role* he always distinguished himself, he made one passage of Scripture prove and fortify another; he showed that one term of the proposition always implied every other term; that a Bible proposition may mean *more* than it expresses; that is, there may be some things understood, but that it can not possibly mean *less* than what it expresses.

This was FRANKLIN'S uniform mode of reasoning in all his debates, and was predominant in most of his pulpit preaching.

His habits of life were very simple. He preferred to live on plain food, and cared nothing for delicacies. He abhorred mutton, and many were the tricks, attempted to deceive him by calling mutton by some other name; but he could detect the obnoxious meat with as keen a scent as that which characterizes a setter in discovering game. He neither used tobacco in any form, nor indulged in any sort of intoxicating drinks. He was from principle a teetotaler in everything that, within itself, is injurious to the human system, and was "temperate in all things" that are intended for the good of man. He never criticized anything set before him, but ate his food thankfully, asking no question for conscience sake. He was an enemy of "big dinners," and many were the disappointments of the good house-wives who drained their conservatories in order to prepare a feast of fat things, not one of which "Old Ben" would touch. He appreciated the goodness of the dear sisters, but doubted the propriety of bringing the whole domain of nature under contribution, only to gratify fastidious and artificial tastes, to say nothing of the foolishness of culinary display. He never played croquet, or any other "innocent amusement," after he arrived at the years of full developed manhood. Even if he had the disposition to indulge, he never found the time, so wholly absorbed was he in his Master's work, Imagine, if you please, BEN FRANKLIN, the great lion-hearted soldier of the Cross, playing croquet or chess! That will do for small men, who love the society of genteel ladies more than they love to court companionship with prophets and Apostles:

It has been said that FRANKLIN was as rough in manners as he was coarse in feeling. The writer knew him well and intimately during the last fifteen years of his eventful life. The charge is as unkind as it is false. He had what, to the *polite* world, would appear to be a rough exterior, his toilette absorbing the least of his time; and when he was exposing error among the sects, and rebuking his brethren for palpable

faults, they would turn on him, and because they could not meet him with argument, they would stigmatise him as impolite and boorish. He was a man who *always* sympathized with the poor and needy, which was the first indication of a tender heart. He could not resist an appeal to his generosity, although he was careful to discriminate between a worthy person and an impostor. I know, and his friends all know, that he had the tenderness of a woman, and the feelings of a philanthropist, blended with the courage of a Luther, and the martyr-spirit of an Apostle. His strong affection for the wife of his youth, and his deep and abiding solicitude for the welfare of his children, all go to disprove such unwarranted and unkind charges. He was always ready with his purse, and ever evinced a genuine missionary spirit. A man who would spend three-fourths of his time away from all the endearments of home, in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation to his fellow-men, *pay or no pay*, not only gave the best evidence in the world that he exemplified in his acts the missionary spirit in its loftiest sense, but gave proof positive that his great soul was comparatively free from the contaminating influences of hatred, malice, roughness and hardness.

His loyalty to truth was his predominating virtue. His loyalty to Jesus Christ shone out conspicuously in all his sermons and in all his writings. He never speculated on the word of God, but preached purely by authority of Jesus the Christ. He never for a moment doubted the promises of the Heavenly Father, nor questioned the efficacy of the Gospel as the regenerating power of God. He yeas a man of prayer, and believed in the power and influence of prayer. He ever manifested a consciousness of the Divine presence. He graciously acknowledged his dependence on the arm of Omnipotence. In all places, and under all circumstances, he felt secure in the panoply of God's truth. He feared no evil, for he realized that the great Shepherd of the sheep, who never sleeps nor slumbers, was with him. In a word, let it be said that modern times have produced few men of such faith and fidelity.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, in person, was about six feet high. He had strong, bold features, large gray eyes, a prominent mouth, with the projecting upper jaw of the orator; well-developed chest and lungs, and weighed, when in the full vigor of manhood, about one hundred and ninety pounds. His entire physical and mental organization indicated that he was capable of an immense amount of work.

No. I—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

The position we have assumed as a religious community before the world has been under most rigid and searching investigation for the last thirty years. It has been repeatedly tried in public oral discussions, in the most able and searching written investigations, and in the unfair and one-sided pulpit attacks of its enemies, where its friends had no liberty to reply; but it has stood the test, and is still standing it, in defiance of all assaults. It has never had a fair contest where it did not gain a victory. It has grown with a regular and rapid growth, extended its borders, and planted itself down in vast regions of this country, and now presents a most invulnerable front before the numerous hosts who stand opposed to it. In large districts, where we have traveled in this country, it has wider influence, greater command, and more power, than all opposing systems combined. Indeed, there is no place where this cause has been fairly presented, and not betrayed nor deserted by its professed friends, where it has not permanently planted itself, gained and honorable position, and erected the ancient worship of the living and true God.

Though some men have fought this cause through the main vigor of a lifetime, many died in the heat of war against it, and hosts of new champions have appeared, willing to distinguish themselves in doing battle against it, while it not only stands, but makes its regular onward march, regardless of all opposition; still the virulence of sectarian strife and

party leaders appear no nearer abating than they did twenty years ago. Nor do we expect sectarian partisans ever to be conciliated to it, or a haughty clergy ever to look with complacency upon it. Such a thing is a natural impossibility. It ignores all clerical assumptions, haughty and pompous titles, and acknowledges no man master. It looks upon all that distinguished class of men called the "clergy," as mere *men.* —nothing but men—two-legged mortals, as other men, and sets at naught all their authority to teach and enforce anything save the pure and holy doctrine of the Lord Jesus, as unfolded upon the pages of Scripture—the only Gospel of the grace of God. It also ignores all human names as religious designations, human creeds, and human authorities of every description, as rivals to the divinely authorized designations of the people of God, with the only unerring and infallible law for the Government of the Church and comfort of saints the Divine Scriptures. It openly impeaches the neglect and perversions of the most solemn ordinances, with all their departures from the simplicity of the ancient faith, and uncompromisingly maintains that nothing" will please God, or gain the approbation of the great Head of the Church, short of a full and unreserved return to the faith and practice of the primitive Church.

To such a position as this, men of sense never expect a proud and haughty clergy to become reconciled, nor the sectarian parties they guide. Parties that intend, at all hazards, to maintain their human names, their human creeds, with all their present customs and peculiarities, whether Scriptural or not, that never intend to review their position, to see how far they have departed from the Lord's name, the ancient faith, and ancient practice, but intend to go blindly on, as they are, no man of sense need expect them ever to become reconciled to such a position as we occupy. They will hate it, and oppose it, as long as they are parties, because the elements of which they are composed are naturally and inherently in eternal hostility to each other. That we are right in maintaining the law of God as laid down in the Scrip-

tures as the only law, the only authority, the only creed, and that everything else, as a law, or rule of faith, is not only a redundancy but treasonable, and subversive of the law and government of God, we can never doubt while we have our senses. That the man who believes the Gospel of the grace of God, as set forth in the New Testament, receives it in a good and honest heart, conforms his life piously and devotedly to the law of God as laid down in the Bible, has the approbation of his God now, and will be saved in the world to come, is not doubted by any man who believes the Bible contains a revelation from God; and if such a one is not safe, there is no safe road to travel in this world of tears and sorrows. But of the safety of such a position, we, who have so long occupied it, can have no more doubt than we have of the existence of the Deity, of which we are as certain as that we exist. This position we can never yield, and until we do yield it, we can never become partizans—we can never countenance any law but the law of God.

Here is an issue—an issue which it is no use to try to disguise. "We maintain that the law of Christ is the only law that man can enforce upon the Church, without losing the approbation of Heaven. Our opposers maintain that they can, not only innocently but profitably, name, enforce, and govern the Church by another law. They appear determined not to give up this other law; and we are equally determined not to regard it. This is a palpable issue, such as can not be slurred over—can not be compromised, nor ever settled, unless one or the other of the parties yields. Either we must yield our position, that the Church of the living God should be Governed by the law of God alone, that it is subversive of the law of God to introduce any other law to Govern his Church, that it is treasonable, and a bold attempt to set aside and defy the authority of the Almighty, to acknowledge any other law than his—or those who maintain the authority of human creeds, their utility and necessity, must relinquish them, and disavow all allegiance to them. That we shall never yield our position on this point, that we

can not yield without openly disrespecting the law of the great King, despising his authority, and defying the majesty of God, no one can fail to see, who, with half discernment, will look over the ground. And that the sectarian parties of these times will hold on to their creeds, defend and maintain them in one form or other, that they will hear to no reason against them, admit none of their pernicious tendencies, but continue to bind them upon as many as can be found weak enough to bow the neck to the yoke, we see no reason to doubt. The issue, then, between human creeds and the law of God will continue, and the controversy must go on.

The friends of the Bible, the friends of the law of God, those who wish God to Govern, those who desire the Lord to reign, those who would see the Lord's authority exalted above all authority, those who would be his subjects, who would serve him and honor him as the only rightful Lawgiver, the only Potentate, the King of kings and the Lord of lords, as the Supreme Governor in the universe, the Head over all to the Church, blessed forever and ever, may then gird on the armor, prepare themselves for the conflict, and rush on to the issue. It is nothing short of a plain and most palpable conflict between light and darkness, the law of God and the law of man, the authority of God and the authority of man, whether Jesus shall rule or man, whether Christ or man shall give laws to the people of God, whether God or man shall have the throne. Shall the Almighty Maker of heaven and earth rule? Shall his law set aside everything else? Those who are in favor of the Lord's ruling, of Jehovah maintaining the throne and reigning, and his law prevailing throughout the whole kingdom of God, may prepare themselves for the conflict and hasten to the issue. If the contest must continue, let us continue it with energy. Let us make out and file our plea for the law of the Lord. Let us not he silent by day nor by night, but urge, with all possible earnestness, the superiority of the claims of the law of the Lord, its exalted character and supreme authority, and the simple reason why all men should submit implicitly to it.

We know we are in the right. We can not be wrong here. If it is wiser to obey God than man, if an infallible law is better than a fallible, if a perfect law is better than an imperfect one, if a Divine law is better than a human, if the authority of God is better than the authority of man, if the word of the living God is better than a human creed, if the infallible teachings of inspiration are better than uninspired human creeds, if the teachings of the Holy Spirit of God are a safer guide to heaven than the teachings of erring men, if God should govern in preference to man, we are right and our opposers wrong on this transcendent point, and it is our duty to God and our fellow-creatures that we maintain with manly zeal and fortitude that which is so manifestly and self-evidently the will of God. We never can falter. We have no ground to doubt or fear; but if we shrink or hesitate, it must be manifest indifference. While we hope, then, for the blessing of God upon us, and call upon God for his mercy, let us remember our fealty to him, and maintain our integrity to the day of his coming.

A SERMON:—ON THE ETERNAL PURPOSE OF GOD.

TEXT.—Be not thou, therefore, ashamed of the testimony of our Lord. nor of me, his prisoner; but be thou a partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel, according to the power of God ; who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began. 2 Tim. i. 9, 11.

BELOVED BRETHREN AND FRIENDS,—By your permission, I invite your attention to the investigation of the Purpose of God. In the universe there is one eye that looks down through the long cycles of all the ages, and sees the end from the beginning. There is but one Being who can say, "I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done; saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." (Isa. xlvi. 9, 10.) He who uttered this, and he alone, "worketh all things after the council of his own will." (Eph. i. 2.) He had a purpose, as mentioned in our text, before the world began, and it is according to this purpose we are saved and called with a holy calling. Hence, at the close of that beautiful expression, (Eph. iii. 1-10) where the Apostle sets forth the object of the apostolic mission and of the Church, he says it is "according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Also, speaking of the inheritance which the Apostles and prophets had obtained, and to which they were predestinated, he alarms that it was "according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Many speculations have obtained touching this, the highest, holiest, and most benevolent of all the purposes revealed to mortals in the flesh, which we shall not mention in this discourse; but the following conclusions are inevitable:

I. This purpose was before all things. Hence, it is said to have been "before the world began," and called the "eternal purpose." The Infinite One had a purpose before he created man—created him for that purpose; had a purpose when he sent the Lord into the world—sent him for that purpose; had a purpose when he gave the Christian revelation, and gave it for that purpose. This great purpose of the Infinite Mind runs through the whole revelation of God to man; and indeed, the dealings of the Almighty with his intelligent creatures, as set forth in the Volume of God, are but a series of developments of this purpose, which was before all things; but this we shall see more fully as we proceed.

2. This purpose is connected with Christ. Both the purpose and grace, the Apostle says, were given us "in Christ," or by him, and he says that the eternal purpose was "purposed *in Christ Jesus* our Lord." The eternal purpose looks down from before the creation of man, four thousand years this side of his creation, to the revelation of Christ, to the period when it should be developed through him. No one need, therefore, look for this purpose outside of, or separate from him.

3. Man is included in this purpose. It does not relate to angels nor any other beings, but to man. This will appear fully as we proceed.

4. It has in view the saving of man and calling him with a holy calling.

We, therefore, proceed to enquire into the object of man's creation. There is more importance in the first question of the Shorter Catechism than some would at first think. That question is this: "What is the chief end of man?" Nor is the answer less to the point; it is as follows: "Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy him forever." To the same effect, how beautifully the sweet Psalmist of Israel sang, as follows? "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightst still the enemy and the avenger. When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars,

which thou hast ordained: what is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? for thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor; thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou has put all things under his feet." (Ps. viii. 2-6.) The Apostle Paul, however, more fully and clearly sets forth the object of man's creation, in his address in the Athenian court, immediately after introducing to that benighted people God who made the world, in the following words: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us." (Acts xvii. 26, 27.)

Now, as man's salvation is according to God's eternal purpose and grace, or what is purposed in Christ before the world began, and as the Lord made man that he might seek the Lord and find him, the Almighty must have anticipated the fall, or man's apostasy. Hence, the purpose contained the Savior, man, salvation, and the idea of man's returning and seeking his God. We do not know of any other solution of these passages, and do not believe there is any. If any inquire why he created, knowing that man would sin and fall, we respond that it was better to create than not to create. If it is inquired how we know this, we answer that the fact that the Lord did create is an infallible evidence that it was the best that could be done. What the Infinite One does is the best that can be done in all cases. It is a fact that man was created; the Creator does the best that can be done: it was, therefore, the best that could be done to create. Not only so, but his design in creating man—" that he might have dominion," "that he might seek God, and find him," "be crowned with glory and honor," and glorify and enjoy God forever"—is the most merciful and benevolent object that ever prompted or instigated any purpose or resolve in the universe. We therefore look upon the purpose of God as

his will, or his resolve, sent forth from his infinite goodness, guided by his infinite wisdom, executed by his infinite power, and developed to man by his Son, the express image of the invisible God, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

Now, we must inquire what Christ came into the world for. In a single verse, the Lord tells us what he did not come into the world for, and what he did come for. We will hear first what he did not come for. He says: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world." (John iii, 17.) The word translated *condemn* is *krino,* which, in some eighty-five instances, is translated *judge, and* evidently should have been so translated here. The Lord affirms in this passage that he came not into the world to *judge the* world, the same as he affirms in John xii, 4-7. In this passage he says: "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." But our object is to inquire especially what he did come into the world for. He says, "That the *world through Him might be saved."* This clearly implies that without God sending his Son into the world, the world could not have been saved. Salvation was not possible to man or it was not in the power of man to be saved, without the mission of Christ into the world. Hence, he came that man "might be saved," or to give man power or ability to be saved. This is a beautiful expression, and clearly expresses the purpose of God in the mission of Christ, viz: to make it possible for men to return to God, or, as Paul expresses it, to seek God and find him.

This leads us legitimately to inquire into another point. What did the Lord give us the holy testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John for? For this John has furnished a direct and most pointed answer, in the following words: "Many other signs truly did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written

that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." (John xx, 30, 31.) This is a full and clear statement of the Divine purpose in publishing these sacred testimonies. That gracious purpose was that man *might* believe, or, in other words, to give him ability to believe.

We have now briefly hinted at and shown the purpose of God in three points: 1st. In man's creation.2d. In the mission of Christ. 3d. In the Divine testimonies. We have shown that his purpose in the first point was that man might *seek God and find him;* in the second, that he *might be saved, and* in the third, that he *might believe.* Now, do these modern developments correspond with more ancient imitations, in reference to this same great purpose of the Almighty Father? The first clear and explicit development in' reference to the eternal purpose found in the ancient records, is in the promise to Abraham. It is contained in the following words: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." (Gen. xxii, 18.) Some one, however, will say, How do you know that this is the same as the purpose of God? To this we respond, that we know that it is a development of the purpose of God, because it contains the same as we have found in the purpose. We have found that the purpose of God contained Christ, salvation, and man, and that those saved through Christ, according to the Gospel, were saved according to the purpose of God. What did this promise to Abraham contain? Paul says, "And the Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Gal., iii. 8.) Now, the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith is nothing more than the Scripture, before setting forth the purpose of God to justify the heathen through faith, and preaching the Gospel to Abraham, was done, in simply communicating to him the purpose of God to justify the heathen through faith in a promise in him to bless all nations. The blessing in this promise was the Gospel, Christianity, or the

salvation it presents to all nations. Abraham is presented with the original purpose of God, which is a blessing for all nations, while Paul comments upon the promise and declares it to be the Gospel. The whole of Christianity is now simply a full development of the eternal purpose of God, or the promise to Abraham.

Let us then proceed to take one look at the benevolence of the eternal purpose of God. The promise to Abraham shows that it reaches to all the nations of the earth. In perfect harmony with the development contained in the promise is the following expression of the prophet: "The Lord hath made bare his holy arm, in the eyes of all nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." (Isa. lii, 10.) To the same amount the prophet deposes again: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." (Isa. xlv, 22.) These are very clear exponents of the Divine purpose, setting forth its expanded benevolence, as wide as the human race. Another development is made by Joel, to the same amount: “And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh." (Joel ii, 28.) Now, that these expressions are developments of the benevolent purpose of God, and that they extend to the whole race of man, we think no one can doubt. But notwithstanding developments so clear to us, the matters contained in them were all hid in God–mysteries—secrets not known to the sons of men—for ages. During this dark and gloomy period, man had not the ability to come to God, and God did not hold him strictly accountable. This will appear more evident as we proceed.

When the Apostle says of John the Baptist, "The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe," (John i, 6-9,) he implies that the means of believing did not exist to the same extent before the light came as since; and that, though lack of ability did exist, since the light had come, it had been removed, and now all men, through him, *might* believe. This shows that the Divine purpose in sending light into the world was to

remove inability, or to give ability to believe; and now all men have the ability, and may believe. The same sentiment is clearly inculcated in another expression, as follows: "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak for their sins." (John xv, 22.) If the Lord had not come and spoken to them, and, as expressed subsequently, "done among them the works which none other man did," they had not been placed under the same responsibility, from the fact that they would not have had the same ability. But the ability now afforded by the coming of the Lord—his works speaking to them, thus extending power to believe—they are left without excuse, or have no cloak for their sins.

Is not the same principle recognized by the Apostle in the following: "But when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly"? (Rom. v, 6.) Now, "without" strength" is without ability, power, or means, to come to God They were all under sin, apostatized from God, and fallen, and consequently without strength to return. While the world was in this condition, all included in unbelief and under sin, God had mercy upon all. It should be carefully noticed, too, that he had mercy on precisely the same *all* that were in unbelief, or under sin. The mercy he has had upon all is to enable them to believe, repent, and be saved from their personal transgressions, in their own actual and personal submission to Jesus Christ, and gives them assurance of a full and complete deliverance from the consequences of the Adamic transgression, in the resurrection of the dead. When it is said that "when we were without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly," it is clearly implied that he died to give us strength. When it is said that "he came into the world that the world through him might be said," it is clearly implied that, without his coming, the world had not ability to be saved; but. this coming gave ability. When John the Baptist "bore witness to the Light, that all men through him might believe," it is clearly implied that without this testimony all men had not the abil-

ity to believe, but with this testimony all men *might* believe. In the same way, when John says "these things were written that ye might believe," he implies that before these testimonies were written or published, man had not the ability to believe, and that his writing was that he might believe, or to enable him to believe. When the Lord says that he had come, and "spoken and done works such as none had ever done before; therefore, you have no cloak for your sins," he shows that his coming, speaking and doing mighty works, has given them ability, and stripped them of excuse.

All this corresponds with that expression in our Lord's intercessory prayer, "I pray for those who shall believe on me *through the*ir word;" also that expression of Paul: "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" or the statement of Peter, that "God made Choice among us, that the Gentiles, by my mouth, should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." What is here called "their words," "the word of God," and "the word of the Gospel," is manifestly all the same, and corresponds precisely to what John the Baptist calls "witness of the light," and what John the Apostle means by "these things are written that you might believe." All this, and much more that might be collected, to the same amount, means the Divine testimonies which God has given to enable man, or give him ability to believe, that he may be left without excuse.

But what is it that is to be believed? What is it that the Divine testimony is designed to prove? It is not a set of metaphysical speculations, men's views, reasonings and opinions about Trinity and Unity, Calvinism and Arminianism, nor any other learned system of doctrines and commandments of modern date, for the following reasons:

1. "They who seek shall find," said the Lord, in referring to what he placed before men to believe. Thousands have sought the Lord through the above-mentioned speculations, and sought him honestly, but never could find him; therefore they are not what we are required to believe.

2. The Gospel of Christ is designed for the people at

large. The people at large can not understand enough about the above-mentioned speculations to be able to say whether they believe them or not. They can not, therefore, be what the Lord required man to believe.

3. It is admitted by all intelligent men, that a man can be a Christian and not believe the above speculations. A man can not be a Christian and not believe that which God requires man to believe. Therefore, these speculations are not what man is required to believe.

4. It is declared by the Lord, that he that believeth not that which he requires man to believe, shall be damned. It is admitted that man may not believe the theories in question, and not be damned. These speculations or theories, then, are not what the Lord requires man to believe.

5. Thousands heard, believed and received what the Lord required men to believe, on healing a single discourse. Thousand could not understand or know enough about the above-mentioned speculations, on hearing only a single discourse, to say whether they believed them or not. Therefore, these speculations are not what man is required to believe.

What, then, is it that man is required to believe? There are three things about this matter, that never should be forgotten: 1. That faith is required of all—of the masses of the people. 2. It is required upon pain of damnation. 3. It is a fact, as before stated, that immense numbers—that thousands —of the people believed that which God requires man to believe, upon hearing a single discourse. It must have been something of the simplest and clearest nature. It must have been something of the most tangible kind. It must have been exceedingly short; otherwise so many of every grade of intelligence, upon the hearing of a *single discourse,* could not have become believers. They had no time to hear, much less to digest, examine and decide upon the merits of lengthy and intricate systems, so as to say whether they believed or not. But they had something presented and were required to believe it on pain of condemnation. Whatever that was,

they believed it; and the power of their faith was so great that it changed the whole course of their after lives. What was it, then, they believed? They believed that great fundamental proposition declared by the Almighty Father of heaven and earth, at the baptism of our Lord: "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." Hence, the Apostle Peter, when the Savior asked him the question, "Who do you say that I am?" responded, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." In view of this great confession, the Lord. pronounced a blessing upon him, adding, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." (Mat. xvi, 16, 17.) In view of this great oracle; the same Apostle, when advanced in years, and about to put off his tabernacle, said: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father, honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is nay beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." (2 Pet. i, 16, 17.)

In declaring Christ to be his Son, the beloved, the Father gave him "honor and glory." To the same amount, Paul mentions "that which God has promised before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and declared the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection l the dead." (Rom. i, 2-4.) No one, we think, can fail to see that these expressions contain the great Christian proposition, in which the whole system centers, or upon which all depends. But some one will inquire, How do you know that this was what God required man to believe? Because John says, "These things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." This passage not only shows what the Divine testimonies were written for, but precisely what it is that is to be believed—that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.* But if any one doubts what it is,

that is to be believed, we will hear Paul inquire about it and give the answer: "What saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach: that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth, the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x, 8, 9.) What is it that he requires man to believe in his heart and confess with the mouth? He is to believe that God raised our Savior from the dead, and confess him with the mouth.

This is a capital point, one in which the souls of all men are concerned, and we must make sure work here. There must be no mistake. We must know precisely what it is that must be believed. What did the Lord command the Apostles to preach? "Go into all the world," said he, "and preach the *Gospel* to every creature." The Gospel, then, is what is to be preached. He then adds: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "He that believeth" what? As a matter of course, he that believeth what is preached—*"the Gospel*. The Gospel, then, is what was preached, and what was believed. What, then, is the Gospel? Paul defines it to be "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." (I Cor. xv, 8.) His Gospel, then, is that which he says must be believed in the heart and confessed with the mouth—that Christ died, and that God raised him from the dead—or, which amounts to the same, confess Christ, that he is God's Son, and then honor him as God has done. But we must know that we are right here. What did the Apostles preach? Let us bear Peter: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was

not possible that he should be holden of it." (Acts ii. 22-24.) Here he embraces the same great proposition concerning Christ, and at verse thirty-three, affirms that "this Jesus, God had raised up," and they were all witnesses of the fact. This is the same that was announced to Saul to believe: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest," said the Lord to him. He believed this announcement, and immediately commenced preaching it to others. (See Acts xxii, 8, 9.) The same was demanded of the Philippian jailor: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," said the preacher, "and thou shalt be saved." (Acts xvi, 13.) Philip, the evangelist, preached Christ to the eunuch. After hearing him preach Christ, he inquires, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" The man of God answered;" "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." He answered: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." (Acts viii, 35-38.)

This is as extended a development as we can at present make of what was preached, what was believed and confessed, to save man. This, you perceive, is a single proposition, embracing the Messiahship of Jesus, and consequently his divine authority. This great fact, that he is the Messiah —the Savior of the world—is the one contained in the eternal purpose of God, in his promise to Abraham, alluded to by so many of the prophets, and evinced to John the Baptist at his baptism, by a voice from heaven, when God conferred upon him glory and honor. If God had not given us this foundation tact of all piety, benevolence and humanity, we never could have had any Christian faith. But having given the fact—the great proposition to be believed and the Divine testimonies that confirm it—he has thus enabled the world to believe. The light now being come, that all men might believe—these things now being written that you might believe—the world is left without excuse, and has no cloak for its sins. God has given ability to all to believe, and the responsibility is theirs if they do not believe.

But the inquiry arises, what advantage is there in faith? the Lord responds, '" And that believing ye might have life

through his name." (John xxi, 31.) Faith brings the believer in reach of life, or where he may obtain life, or gives him power to obtain it. "As many as received him, to them *gave he power* to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) The simple circumstance of believing does not make a son of God, but it gives the believer power to become a son. The question, therefore, is how the believer, who has power to become a son, proceeds, or what he does to become a son? We must look back to the purpose of God in establishing the apostolic mission, and see what it was designed for. We have seen that the purpose contained Christ, the Divine testimonies to enable us to believe in him, and that this belief gives us power to become sons. Is there anything more in the Divine purpose? Let us hear Paul. In the same passage before quoted to show that Jesus was declared the Son of God, the Apostle says: "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name." (Rom. i, 5.) At the close of the same letter, we find the following: "Now, to him who is of power to establish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of the faith." (Rom." xvi, 15, 16.) The revelation of the mystery, or making it manifest, as mentioned here, is the same as unfolding or developing the purpose of God; but it reaches beyond the mere idea of making believers, and introduces another element, viz: the *obedience of faith.* In revealing the eternal purpose, we find no *faith alone* system; but faith that gives power to become sons of God—faith that requires obedience. Having the same element of obedience before his,,mind, the Apostle says of our Lord; that "Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. v. 9.) In the same spirit, he again says: "But God be thanked, that though ye were serv-

ants of sin, you have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. vi. 17, 18.) This passage brings us to another item, viz: “being made free from sin," or pardoned, and shows that it is connected with this obedience found in the eternal purpose of God, and means the same as *saved and* called according to his purpose and his grace.

We might rationally expect to find something to do to become sons, when we hear him say that, to as many as receive him, to them gave he power to become sons. The fact that he gives those who believe power to become sons, strongly implies that they have something to do; otherwise, there would be no use in power. But does not the Scripture say, "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord?" It does; but where would you suppose that passage may be found? Surely not connected with the conversion of any sinner. "But does it not show that the sinner is wholly dead in sins, and that he can not do anything?" By no means; for no sensible being would command one so dead that he could not do anything to "stand still;" for, surely, one so dead that he could not do anything, could not even *stand still.* It requires some ability to obey the command to stand still, as well as some intelligence to understand it. They are not only commanded to stand still, which required some ability, but "to see the salvation of the Lord." Never let a man who contends that a sinner has no ability to understand a command, see salvation, or obey the voice of God, quote this passage; for the fact that God gave them the command to stand still, shows that they could understand a command–the fact that they obeyed showed that they had ability to obey, the fact that he commanded them to see the salvation of the Lord, and that they did as commanded, shows that they could see salvation—shows that they were by no means in such a state of inability as we have mentioned. The passage is found in. Ex. xiv, 19. It is the Lord's account of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian

bondage. The hosts of Israel had reached the Red Sea. On the right band and on the left were impassable mountains. The Egyptian army was in the rear. Fear and dismay spread throughout the whole ranks of Israel. A cry is raised to heaven, what is to be done? Moses cried aloud to the people, "Fear ye not; stand still and see the salvation of the Lord." They stood still, and saw the sea parted before them—saw the salvation of the Lord But they only *saw it,* but did not *get it,* standing still. Presently the Lord spoke unto Moses, and said: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward." Yes, go forward, and obtain the salvation which you only saw while you were standing still. Indeed, this is not all; but we must go forward *in baptism,* if you obtain this salvation, which you only saw while you were standing still. In obedience to the command of the Lord, they went forward, and "were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." The next thing we hear of them is a song of triumph.

As they went forward and were baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, so the first act of the penitent believer, in obedience to his Lord and Master, is to go forward and be baptized into his name, that he too may unite in songs of redemption—not from Egyptian bondage, but from bondage of sin. Here, in the name of the Redeemer, by the blood of the covenant, by the Spirit of our God, by the life of Christ, through faith, he is justified, and his soul is delivered from all past sins, according to the benevolent purpose of God. Here is the object of the apostolic mission. Hear an expression of Paul upon it: "I was made a minister according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power: unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God; who created all things, by Jesus Christ; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly

places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord." (Eph. iii, 7-11)

Here lies the fearful ground of condemnation for the impenitent. They find themselves included in the benevolent purpose of God, in the promise made to Abraham, in the salvation spoken of by the prophets, that should be to the ends of the earth for all people, and the love of God to man. They find that the light of the world was for them that Christ came into the world that they might be saved, that he died for them, shed his blood for them, and opened the way for them to the Father, as much as any human beings. They find that he sent the Gospel to them, with all its Divine testimonies, as much as he did to any saint that ever entered heaven; that it is put completely in their power to come to God. They remember, too, that the Lord says he is not willing that any should perish, but rather that all should come to repentance that he wills that all men be saved—that all the day long he stretches forth his hand to again saying and disobedient people, saying, Whoever will, let him come to the fountains of living water. They further reflect, too, that he cries, Harden not your hearts, as in the bitter provocation, but hear his voice, for now is the acceptable time, now is the day of merciful visitation—that he who comes he will in no wise cast out—that those who seek shall find—that his yoke is easy and his burden light. He can say to the sinful man, in the day of judgment, I included you in my eternal purpose—that you, as much as any of the human family, were the subject of my benevolent promise to my servant Abraham. That very salvation which I said should be to the ends of the earth, was as free for you as for any who have lived upon the earth. My love embraced you as much as any of the whole world. The very object of the mission of nay Son to your world was that you might be Saved. The very object I had in revealing my Son to you Was that you might have confidence in him, and lean your soul upon him and be saved. I authorized his holy

witnesses to write and publish their Divine testimonies for the special purpose that you might believe. I sent the true light, that is for every man who comes into the world, to you that you might believe. My Son spoke to you, and did such works as no man ever did, that you might have no cloak for your sins. I have set before the wages of sin, which is death, and the gift of you God, eternal life. My holy prophets have wept over you. My Apostles have preached to you, wept over you, prayed for you, and suffered martyrdom for your sakes. My Son taught in his own person, prayed over men, wept over them, did miracles among them, was ,condemned by Jews and Romans, nailed to the cross, crowned with thorns, buffeted, spit upon, his side pierced with a spear, his soul made an offering for sin—poured out his soul unto death. The cry has come l heaven to you, "Why will you die?"' Preachers of the Gospel have plead with you, exhorted you, and prayed over you with tears. Many pious fathers have plead, and wept, and grieved. Mothers have mourned, as none but mothers can mourn, over wayward children, followed them, begging, them to turn to God. Wives have struggled with inexpressible anxiety and anguish for husbands, and husbands for wives. Children have, with streaming tears, upon their knees, begged of their parents to hear the voice of warning, and turn to God.

But, in some cases, all this is resisted, and the sinner hardens his heart, and in wild infatuation rushes on till he falls into ruin. He is brought to a stand. He looks round. The work is done! In thunder tones, the words "He who is filthy, let him be filthy still," thrill his polluted soul. He cries aloud, Who has done all this? He answers, not the Almighty, for he included all alike in his benevolent purpose, as well as in his merciful promise, and gave his Son for all. Not our Lord Jesus Christ, for he died for all and commanded salvation to be sent to all. Not the holy Apostles, for they were faithful to preach the Gospel to all, and invite all to receive it. The kind friends we have alluded to

are not to blame for this sad affair. Where, then, lies the blame? Upon his own soul. What an eternal sting upon the souls of the lost, to have to upbraid and reproach themselves for having resisted the wisdom, goodness, mercy and love of God; for having rejected the high and holy counsels of Heaven against their own souls; for having rejected and opposed all that was tender, kind, lovely, endearing and good; for having used the very lips which God made to praise him in cursing; for having used the very strength given him to serve God in barring the way, so that he never could Get to heaven! What an eternal pain to the soul, the consciousness of having wrought his own ruin, of having pulled down eternal ruin upon his own head!

Suppose he does reflect that the Lord was good! So much the worse condemnation for rejecting him. He remembers that God is merciful; but this only adds to his misery to think he could have the hardness of heart to have rejected and despised such mercy. He may remember that the Lord is wise; but this only deepens the pangs of hell to think that he was so perverse as to reject such wisdom. He may think of the New Jerusalem, of the pure and holy there of all ages—of the holy martyrs, apostles, prophets, the ancient worthies, the angels of God, Jesus—the mediator of the new institution–and the Almighty Father of all; that he hears the united chorus rise up, in a shout of blessing, and glory, and honor, and power, and dominion, to him who sits upon the throne, and the Lamb forever and ever—he may imagine he hears the innumerable throng making the heavenly arches ring with "Hallelujah, salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God;" but this, too, would only augment the blame that lay upon his soul, for his unaccountable obstinacy and hardness of heart, in disinheriting himself forever, and plunging himself into ruin.

My hearers, the door of mercy is still open. The invitations are still tendered to poor, fallen man. These invitations are to each one of you personally, full of the goodness and mercy of our God. Let me entreat of you that you act wisely

upon this great question, in seeking the salvation of your souls. What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

May God bless you! May you come to the Lord, and find redemption through the blood of Christ, to whom be praises and honor, forever and ever! Amen.

A NEW CATECHISM FOR CALVINISTS.

[The following epitome of absurdities, involved by Calvinists, is from Matthews and Franklin's Debates, pages 396, 397 and 398. It is a glance at some of the more prominent passages of Scripture that no man can reconcile with Calvinism:]

1. Can a man "fail of the grace of God," unless he was *once in grace?* See Heb. xii, 15.

2. Can a man be "renewed to repentance *again,"* unless he had once repented? Heb. vi, 6.

3. Can a man "destroy a brother for whom Christ died" without destroying one of the elect? Rom. xiv, 15.

4. Are not those whom the "Lord bought" elect persons? and if they bring upon themselves swift destruction is it not bringing swift destruction upon the elect? 2 Pet. ii, 1.

5. Can a man have his part taken out of the book of life, unless he had a part in it? Rev. xxii, 19.

6. Can a man have his name *blotted out of the book of life,* if it was never *in it?* Rev. iii, 9.

7. Can a man "count the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing," and do "despite against the spirit of grace," and not fall from grace? Heb. x, 29.

8. Could Esau have a birthright unless he was one of the elect, and if he was one of the elect could he have lost his birthright? Heb. xii, 16.

9. Could Judas, one of the elect, *fall by transgression,* and be l*ost,* without diminishing the elect? John xvii, 12.

10. Could Paul have "become a castaway" without diminishing the elect? I Cor. ix, 27.

11. If Christ came into the world, that "the world through him *might be saved,"* can it be true that he passed by any

portion of the world without giving the least opportunity to be saved? John iii, 17.

12. Can it be true that "God concluded *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon *all, and* that God passed by *a part of mankind,* without having any mercy upon them? Rom. xi, 32.

13. Can it be true, as the Scriptures say, that "Christ died for all;" that "in Christ all shall be made alive," and yet that Christ only" died for a part? 2 Cor. v, 14-16; I Cor. XV, 21.

14. Did the grace of God appear to *all men, and* yet did God pass by a part of mankind? Tit. ii, 11.

15. Is it the will of God that all men should be saved, but did he nevertheless ordain some to wrath? I Tim. ii, 4.

16. Did "God command men everywhere to repent," when he knew many could not repent? Acts xvii, 30.

17. Did the benevolent Jesus say "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," knowing that many could not repent? Luke xiii, 9.

18. Did the holy Jesus say "He that believeth not shall be damned," knowing that one part of mankind could not believe? Mark xvi, 15.

19. Did Paul tell the Hebrew Christians to "fear, lest a promise being left them of entering into his rest, and of them should seem to come short of it," knowing all the time that they could not come short of it?

20. Is it true, as Peter says, that "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," and that God never granted the privilege of repentance only to a part of mankind? 2 Pet. iii, 6.

21. Is it true that God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, and yet that he unchangeably ordained a portion of mankind to wrath? Ezek. xviii, 23.

22. How can the Gospel be good news of great joy to all people, when it contains not one particle of love, mercy, or salvation, only for a part of the race? Luke ii, 10.

23. How can it be that "God is no respecter of persons,"

as Peter says, and yet that he passed by a part of mankind, without offering to save them? Acts x, 34.

14. How are the holy attributes of Jesus to be sustained, when he says "How often *would I have gathered your children, but ye would not,"* when he knew they were ordained to wrath all the time? Matt. xxiii, 37.

15. How can God judge the world according to the Gospel, when the Gospel never offered one blessing, only to a part of the world? Rom. ii, 16.

26. How can the wicked "despise the riches of the goodness of God," unless God has been good to them? Rom. ii, 4.

When our Calvinistic friends have learned and fully digested this "Shorter Catechism," we may make them a "Larger Catechism."

No. I.—THE MISSION OF INFIDELS.

WHAT is Scepticism or Infidelity? So many references are made to infidelity that one would suppose, at first thought, that it was some system, doctrine, theory, or creed, embodied, carefully digested, and set forth in due form; but such is not the case. It is no system, doctrine, or creed. It affirms nothing, believes nothing, has nothing, is nothing, and promises nothing. It sets forth no law, no organization, no initiation, no principles, and no characteristic requirements; and abounds with all manner of absurdities, incongruities, contradictions, and irreconcilable inconsistencies. It is no fact, no truth; but merely the negation of all facts and all truths. It is not a doctrine, but the negation of all doctrine. It is no law, but the negation of all law. It negates all systems, all testimonies, and all promises. It negates and ignores all authority and all Government. It has no concern for consistency, for morals, for character, or for anything, except to maintain an eternal negation—an eternal denial of all that is true. It is a chaos without form.

The mission of infidels is not to build anything, establish anything, or defend anything. They come not to show a more excellent way—a highway of holiness—but to turn us out of the old way, without guiding our feet into any other way. Their mission is to pull down. They have no mission to elevate, ennoble and organize, but one mighty to deteriorate, degrade and disorganize. They come not to save, but to destroy. The reason why their work is so easily done, is because it is all pulling down, deranging, disorganizing, spoiling, and spreading desolation. The common adage: "Those who live in glass houses should not throw *stones,"* is not applicable to them. They do not live in glass houses, or houses of any other kind. They have no house at all, or

anything else to defend; but their work is simply to stand off and hurl fire-brands at the buildings of others. Their work is simply that of an incendiary, spreading destruction as widely as possible, and then tantalizing the man of God, because they can pull down faster than he can build up; or because they can destroy faster than he can save; or that they can spread contagion more rapidly than he can cure. But there is nothing strange in all this, unless it be that a human being should follow such a calling. It is not strange that the old proverb of the Bible, "One sinner destroyeth much good," should be found literally true in alt things, both temporal and spiritual. One enemy can sow more cheat, cockle, Spanish needles, rag-weeds, thistles, and burrs than a thousand good farmers can weed out; or can sow more tares than a thousand can pull up. One enemy can tear up more railway, burn more bridges, and do more damage than a million can restore.

The mission of infidels is not to build up anything, but to pull down churches, civil laws, Governments, morals, the characters of men and women, peace, happiness, protection of home, property and life. They come with a mission of denials of the truths contained in the Bible—a mission of war upon the Bible, religion, and the friends of purity and mercy. They come not with a mission of peace and good will to man, but a mission of hatred towards the Bible and all it enjoins—a mission to pull down and destroy—to spread desolation among other men's labors and lay their work in ruins, leaving nothing but wrecks and devastation. They come to neutralize, paralize and dishearten all efforts for the amelioration of man's condition—to discourage, enfeeble and ignore all efforts to rise. They come not into our midst with a warm, kind and affectionate appeal to the attentive, thinking and reflective portion—the spiritually-minded; but appeal to the lukewarm, backsliding, or the apostate, who is beginning to stand at a distance, who already is descending upon the retrograde plane—not to rescue him or to prevent his retrograde movement, but to accelerate it. The appeal to

him is not to give him confidence, but to destroy his confidence, in his Bible, in his religion, his brethren, and fill him with doubts and distrusts. It is not to embolden him, but to intimidate him and fill him with fears, and discourage him from all good forever.

The mission of infidels is not to enlighten, civilize and ennoble the nations. They have never enlightened, civilized or elevated a nation or a people since the world was made. They have never organized society, established peace and order in any place on the earth. They have established no civil institutions, no system of morals, no code of laws, no system of education, and no institutions of learning that deserve the name. Even the literature of the country has almost been entirely left to the believers in the Bible. It is an easy work to pull down civil Government, subvert the foundation of organization, condemn the means of enlightenment, and object to them. It is an easy matter to deny everything and prove nothing; to doubt, vacillate and fear. It is an easy matter to distrust, fill others with distrust, destroy confidence, throw everything into confusion and uncertainty. Some men have fallen so fully into this state, that they hardly will venture to say they believe anything, have confidence in anything, or know anything. One man, under the blinding, benumbing and stupefying influence of unbelief, when asked whether he knew that he existed, hesitated to say he did.

What ability, knowledge or learning does it require to deny everything? The most ignorant, illiterate and stupid can deny as stoutly as the most learned, enlightened and talented. It requires no strength of mind to stand and deny—to declare in the most pertinacious manner disbelief, want of confidence, doubts, distrusts and uncertainties in everything. A man who never read the Bible once through in his life, nor ten other books, who has the most corrupt character, can talk of inconsistencies, incongruities, contradictions and absurdities in the Bible, as stoutly as anybody. Any blockhead could leap over the Falls of Niagara, or from the sus-

pension bridge below. In the same way, any man, with or without much mind, learning or talent, can leap into the dark "sea of unbelief, rejecting, contemning, and despising all evidence; but would it not be the part of wisdom and prudence, of wisdom and discretion in such, to look before they leap? It is a fearful experiment they are making. If the step is a mistaken one, it can never be retraced beyond this this life. He who makes the experiment obtains nothing now, only the unbridled privilege of declaring the Bible false—religion priestcraft—that man will never be called to to account; hence all men can do as they list.

"The mission, of the infidel is to risk, and induce all men to risk, the loss of everything, without the possibility of gaining anything, in this world or the world to come. They have no worthy object—they can have no worthy object in opposing the Bible? They have no reason for opposing it, for they do not propose to make the world any better. They have no proposition to make the world more true, kind, affectionate or happy. Indeed, the very, fact of their malignity towards the Bible shows that it is no fable. The land abounds with acknowledged fables; why are they not enraged at these! They are read by the million; but sceptics are no more enraged at them than other men. If they are satisfied the Bible is all fiction, false, or human, why trouble us about it? Why not let it pass? We hear thousands contending about "signs in the moon," but we care nothing about them, and do not even trouble those who believe in them; the reason is we are well and truly satisfied that there is nothing in them. Why do they not let the believer in the Bible pass in the same way? The reason is obvious; they are in doubt, not fully satisfied, and feel that there is uncertainty in their position. They see and are constantly impressed with the fact that if the Christian could be mistaken, that his mission amounts to nothing—that he is as happy now, and has as high assurance in regard to all beyond this life, to say the least of it, as they; and that if the sceptic should be mistaken, his mistake will be an irreparable one. They see

that a mistake on the part of a Christian involves no danger, no serious consequences in this world or the world to come, while a mistake on their part involves eternal consequences. They are constantly impressed, too, with the fact that they are not relying upon that which amounts to anything like certainty, for a large proportion who have occupied their position, before death have repudiated and renounced it—many of them in the immediate expectation of death—and have warned their friends against it. They find on the other hand, that all who believed the Bible when in health, also believed it when approaching death, and that no man who has contended for its truth till he was in the immediate presence of death, has then denied it. They must, then, see that their mission is simply to fill the world with doubts and distrusts, involving all in darkness and uncertainty.

No. II—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

IN our previous article under the above head, we took a kind of General survey mainly of our *Bible alone* position. In our present article, we propose defining the doctrine, if possible, so that all men can understand us. Some of our contemporaries, both in their publications and sermons, have amused themselves, with their readers and hearers, by saying that they did not know where to find us—that they could not tell what we believed—that we set forth no abstract, no epitome, or brief of our doctrines, that they can apply to for information. It is true, however, that at other times they seem to know all about it—to understand it perfectly, and that it is the most dangerous of all errors—the most heterodox of all positions ever occupied by mortal man. This discrepancy, however, is a matter for which we care nothing, and leave it for those concerned to reconcile as they may be able.

That Christianity itself, pure and unmixed Christianity, as it came from heaven, is a definable doctrine, an intelligible, complete and perfect system in itself, no man of any intelligence, we think, could deny. That the doctrine of Christ is a distinct, intelligible and definable doctrine—a complete and perfect system of doctrine in itself—is one of the clearest and most manifest truths ever uttered. And that a man can be a Christian, a disciple of Christ, and nothing else, is equally clear. Indeed, that all that is of any importance is to be a Christian—a Disciple of Christ—must be acknowledged by all candid persons in the end. But still, when a man is asked what he believes, for him simply to say the doctrine of Christ—Christianity—the Christian religion—is thought to be wholly unintelligible—a mere evasion—a kind

of sly Jesuitical dodge; or, if asked what he is, to reply. Christian—a Disciple of Christ is looked upon as a mere pun, a trick, a kind of eelish evasion; so true is it that the clear explicit and intelligible designations both of the doctrine Christ and its adherents are unintelligible to the benighted, blinded and stupefied theologians of these times. Still they are learned, wise and talented as much so, we most solemnly believe, as the priests and rabbis among the Jews in the days of the Redeemer's pilgrimage on earth. But the difficulty is, that they are wise in everything but the things of God. Their eyes are keen, and their discrimination of the finest and most penetrating kind, in perceiving and making the nicest distinctions in all the doctrines and commandments of men Their ears are acute to catch any sectarian designation, either of doctrines or parties. Mention the doctrine of the Trinity, and see how quick you will wake up that man with the white cravat. Mention Unitarianism, Arminianism, Calvinism, etc., and you will find around you learned men in abundance, who know what you are talking about. Mention the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Methodist Discipline, the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, final perseverance, or the five points of Calvinism and you will find plenty of learned doctors who will prick up their ears. They know what all these designations mean. Mention to them Lutheranism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, etc., and it will be perfectly intelligible to them. They know perfectly the meaning of all this. Or, if they meet a man, and he says, I am a Lutheran, a Calvinist, a Methodist, etc., they understand him perfectly, for they are alive to all these terms; or, if a man says to them, I hold the doctrine of the Westminster Confession, the Philadelphia Confession, the Methodist Discipline, etc., his language is perfectly intelligible to them. There is no evasion about it. All these, and a thousand other technicalities of the same category, are perfectly well understood by the learned doctors of these times, because they are awake to all these matters.

But when they find a man who will know nothing but the things of God, who will receive no doctrine but the doctrine of Christ, and who will be nothing but a man of God, they can see no sense in him! He is a perfect evasionist, a quibbler, and they know not where to put their hand on him! Neither would they know our Lord, or his doctrine, if he were here in their midst. If they can not now recognize his doctrine as a distinct, perfect and complete system of doctrine, without prefixing or affixing some of their own human designations, they would not have recognized his doctrine or his person, as the image of the invisible God, and brightness of his glory, if they had met him on the streets of Jerusalem, and heard the gracious words that fell from his lips. He said of his followers, "My sheep hear my voice; but the voice of the stranger they will not hear." It is so to this hour; the Lord's people hear *his* voice, but the voice of a stranger they will not hear. That greatest and most important of all oracles—the only oracle of the New Testament, directly from the lips of the Almighty Father, should not only command the attention of all men, but cause the whole earth to tremble in profound awe: "THIS IS MY SON, THE BELOVED, IN WHOM I AM WELL PLEASED: HEAR HIM." This is Jehovah's own introduction of his Son, the beloved, to the children of men—and his own requirement to "hear him." Studying such human designations, distinctions and discriminations among the doctrines and commandments of men as alluded to above, though it requires much learning and talent to do it successfully, is no adherence to the above great oracle from God—is no submission to it, and not one step toward the kingdom of God. That great oracle introduces the great Lawgiver—the Redeemer and Savior of men—the founder of the faith—and requires all men to hear him. Shall we hear him? Shall we look to him as the Author of the faith—the system, the doctrine? Shall we? Can we? Can all men come to him, receive him and be received by him—lean on him, be taught by him, have his doctrine, and let their everlasting trust be in him? Then there is still hope

for the world. Otherwise we are enshrouded in eternal darkness.

Is there such a thing as Christianity? What is it? There is such a thing, and it is the system set forth by Jesus Christ, upon the pages of the New Testament; else there is no light l God in the world—no revelation from heaven, and the world is lost. All the hope any man has of pardon here, of eternal salvation hereafter, in any system beneath the skies is drawn from Christianity itself, and not from some modern form of it, some man's view of it, or some system extracted l it. From it is derived every ray of divine light and life enjoyed by all nations of the earth. In it is our eternal all, for time and eternity. Let no man, then, scowl his face, or put on an air of derision when we speak of Christianity as a distinct, perfect and complete system in itself; or when we speak of a man being a Christian, or a Disciple of Christ, as a distinct, perfect and complete profession, without being anything else. There is such a profession, and there is such a reality as being a Christian, a Disciple of Christ, and nothing else superadded; and it is the only profession, and the only reality in religion, worth one moment's attention among all the sons of men. If a man believes the doctrine of Christ, or Christianity, whatever more he believes is a redundancy —a dead weight—-which, if it does not neutralize his Christianity,, at the very least, is useless. If a man is a Christian, a disciple of Christ, in the kingdom of God, anything added, religiously, is only an appendage, a trammel, a dead weight, which, if it were possible for it to do no harm, could do no good. C*hristianity* itself is all that is of any value to him, or to one soul of our race. Add Calvinism, Lutheranism, Methodism, or any other ism, and, to say the least of it, you add nothing divine, and nothing that can be of any use.

We will not have a modern *form* of Christianity, some man's views of Christianity, or a system that some man has deduced from Christianity, but C*hristianity itself* as delivered and developed by Christ and his Apostles; the whole of it—nothing more—nothing less. We shall never be satisfied

with anything short of being Christians, Disciples of Christ, in the new Testament import of these terms; and we are determined to add nothing to this. We desire the King of kings and Lord of lords for our Savior, our Redeemer, and our everlasting trust. We desire all the faith, all the hope and all the love he imparts to the children of men. We believe in him, and all he taught; we believe in doing all he Commanded, enjoying all he gives now, and hoping for all he promises, both in this world and in the world to come. In one word, we desire to put ourselves under his guidance, to be wholly controlled by him, to be like him, to imbibe his spirit, die in the faith of him, and dwell with him forever.

No. III—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

WE never could feel that any man who spoke of our position, in taking the Bible as our only rule of faith and practice, as a *dangerous* position, or as an unevangelical position, spoke seriously, or could really or conscientiously believe what he was saying. To speak of a man who receives the whole revelation from God to man, as spread upon the pages of the Bible, and cherishes it as the pure word of God—who will not give up aught of it, but holds on to it all as precious —the man who receives the whole of Christianity, as portrayed in the predictions of the Old Testament prophets, fully revealed and developed in the New Testament—who receives the law of God, the only law the Church of Christ had for the first three hundred years of its existence; and insists upon doing all the great Head of the Church requires in that law, enjoying all its blessings, and looking for a gracious fulfillment of all its rich promises, as occupying *unsafe ground,* has the least appearance of a sincere objection of anything we ever heard. What have those who oppose that position, not contained in it? Have they anything more than what God has revealed to man in the Bible? Have they anything more than Christianity, the whole of Christianity, as God gave it? Are they doing anything more than God commands? If they have something more than God has revealed to man—something more than Christianity—and are doing something more than the law of God requires, that makes them *safe,* or *evangelical,* while those who have nothing more are upon dangerous ground, and not evangelical, we move that they Get out, in a book, precisely what it is that is not in the whole revelation from God to man not in Christianity, nor required in the law of God, that makes them safe and evangelical, that others may avail themselves of the advantage of it!

Or does the revelation from God contain too much? Does Christianity contain too much? Does the law of God extend too far? Are human creeds an abridgement, in which the unessential, and consequently unnecessary, part of the law of God is left out? And is it necessary that a man subscribe to such an abridgement, thus leaving out what wise and learned divines have ascertained not to be essential, in order to stand upon *safe gr*ound, be *orthodox* or *evangelical?* After we have received the Bible, Christianity, the whole law of God and its Glorious Author, and submitted to him from the heart, body, soul and spirit, if we still stand upon dangerous ground, would it make us safe, orthodox or evangelical; to submit to a human creed?" Surely it would, in the estimation of our opposers. From the day we would subscribe to some popular human creed forward, without one particle of any other change of heart or life, we would he safe, orthodox and evangelical. So potent is a human creed, made by uninspired men! But, in the name of common sense, how much safer, or better in any respect, would we be in the eye of God? If it would not make a man safe to believe with all the heart in the God of his existence, in the Redeemer who died for him, in the whole revelation of God to man, in all Christianity, in the whole law of the Lord, and submit himself solemnly to his Creator—is it credible, could the greatest dupe of human and uninspired creeds believe that it would place upon the sure rock to receive a human creed? A grander absurdity never entered into the human brain.

Or is the difficulty that, in order to stand upon safe ground, we should adopt a human creed to explain the Bible, Christianity, or the law of God? Is it so, that the Infinite One, in addressing his intelligent creatures, has failed to come down to their capacities, and that we need a few human creeds, written by uninspired men, to make the revelation of God to man intelligible to the common people? Is it true, that in order to stand upon safe ground, be orthodox or evangelical, we should have a human creed, written by uninspired and fallible men, to explain what the inspiring Spirit of the Liv-

ing God meant when he spake to the children of men? And if we, being uninspired, can not understand what the Holy Spirit of God means, how can uninspired human creed-makers understand it, or set forth its meaning in their creeds? "But they are learned and wise men." Yes, and they, in their different *orthodox* or *evangelical* creeds, have set forth a mass of learned and wise contradictions, absurdities and unintelligible dogmas, which would throw an impenetrable cloud over the last blessed hope of man, if he had to understand them or be lost. But, thanks to God, we do not have to understand them. The merciful Lord does not require an impossibility. It is an impossibility, in the very nature of things, to understand a writer who not only did not understand himself, but whose writings are wholly inexplicable.

But I maintain that all human creeds in the world are founded in a mischievous, wicked, ruinous and false assumption; or rather, we should have said, in two assumptions of this description: 1. It is assumed that the law of the Lord is insufficient for a rule of faith and practice. 2. It is assumed that uninspired and fallible men can make a creed that can accomplish what the law of God, delivered by infallible inspiration, could not do; or, rather, that uninspired and fallible men can supply the deficiencies of the infallible inspiration of the Spirit of God. No man who insists upon having a human creed can avoid, in all his attempts to sustain himself, basing all his arguments on these two assumptions. No argument in favor of a human creed ever was made, or ever can be made, that is not founded in a supposed inadequacy or insufficiency in the law of the Lord, All who admit the law of God to be a sufficient rule for our faith "and practice, have no argument, no reason to offer, and no motive to try to frame any, for another law. The very first dictate of common sense says, if the law of God is sufficient, we need nothing more. But if the law of God is not sufficient, an anxiety may arise to have the deficiency supplied. And what a modest assumption, after assuming a failure on the part of the wisdom of God in making a perfect law, after assuming

that the law of God is insufficient to do the work assigned it, to assume that *man—uninspired man*—can supply the deficiency, by adding a human creed to accomplish what the word of the Lord could not do! How singular, too, that assuming such an incompetency in the law of God—such a deficiency in the Bible, in Christianity, in the divine system God has given, and meekly adding to this the assumption that uninspired creed-makers can supply this defect in the word of God, should make a man *safe*, *orthodox*, or evangelical! According to this view of the subject, all that a man needs, to place him upon safe ground, make him orthodox and evangelical, is to think a little less of the Bible, Christianity, the law of God, and a little more of the works of uninspired men, in their pious efforts in supplying the deficiencies in the law of God; to have a little less confidence in the wisdom and works of God, and a little more confidence in the wisdom and works of men.

But, on this score, we are diverging further from safe ground, orthodoxy or evangelicity every year. Every year's reading and meditation upon the Bible and the history of the Church, gives us more and still more confidence in the perfection of the Bible, its perfect completeness for a rule of faith and practice, just about in the same proportion as our confidence diminishes in the capacity of man to supply deficiencies, if any existed, in the Bible. If any man of reading and thought lacks evidence of the weakness, insufficiency and utter incapability of man—not the common herd, but the most wise and learned; not the most vicious and corrupt, but the best and most pure—to make a creed, a rule of faith, or a law to govern the Church, and thus supply the supposed deficiencies in the law of God, we think the efforts of the last three centuries in making creeds, formulas, rules, laws, disciplines, adapting them to the churches, enforcing them, governing the churches by them, with all their conflicting doctrines, practices, customs and forms of government, should afford a full satisfaction. Look at their Babel language! See their contradictory doctrines! Notice their warring

elements! See the organizations under them splitting asunder! See the new ones springing up and declaring all the old ones wrong! Then talk about a man being safe, orthodox or evangelical, because he has subscribed to a human creed! Which one shall a man adopt? "The one he likes best," says one. Which one does God like best? Does he approve those men who assume that his law is defective, and that they have supplied the defect? Does he approve those creeds which are based upon these assumptions, and those people who adopt them, and disapprove all those who deny these assumptions, and maintain the perfection and capability of the law of the Lord, for the accomplishment of the designs of God? Which one of these human creeds, assuming insufficiency in the "perfect law of liberty," and man's capability to supply this insufficiency, shall an honest man adopt to put him upon safe ground, make him more orthodox or evangelical? We say, and would say it with our last breath, *none of them!* It can only involve a man in error—in inconsistency—induce him to assume the insufficiency of the law of God, and fallible man's ability to supply it—set him in an everlasting antagonism with many as good as the world affords, and diminish in his mind the value of the word of God.

No. I.—THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

The Church of Christ was not made for the preachers, but the preachers of Christ were made for the world and the Church. The Church of Christ does not belong to the preachers of Christ—it is not the*ir* property—but they belong to the Church—are *its* property. The Church is not the servant of the preachers, but preachers of Christ are servants of the Churches. The Church of Christ is not called and sent by preachers, but preachers are called and sent by the Church. Preachers in the kingdom of Christ are no more dignitaries, kings and priests, than any other members. They are the Lord's instruments, put forth through the Church to do his work, and mighty instruments, too, while the Lord is with them, but the poorest, most useless and miserable creatures on this earth when forsaken of God. Or in other words, when they are doing the *Lord's work,* with an eye single to his glory, there are no such instruments for good among men; but when they become Selfish, engage simply in their *own work,* or that which they can turn to their own personal aggrandizement, their usefulness ceases, and they are dead weights upon the cause. Our Lord's own life is the model of all perfection in human character, both public and private. No community need look for any permanent good from any preacher who does not imitate the character of his Lord and Master. He may be much of a gentleman, very fine, pleasant and interesting to worldly-minded persons, and not do anything or say anything that would remind one of the Savior of the world. But to come under the name of a preacher of Christ, a disciple of Christ, and not be like him, not make men think of him, love him, and desire to come to him, is a deception upon the Church and the world.

No saying of our Lord needs enforcing upon us in all its amplitude, at the present period, more than this declaration:

"My kingdom is not of this world." Paul says: "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain." Again, he says: "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." The holy John says, "Love not the world, nor the things of the world;" and again, "If any man loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him." Our Lord says, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." The New Testament abounds with the same sentiment, and no man that reads it can fail to be impressed with its anti-worldly character throughout. But what is the legitimate deduction from all this? Is it not, if the kingdom of God is not of this world, and its subjects not allowed to love the world, but a spiritual kingdom, a Divine institution, that its interests can not be promoted by worldly means and appliances? The kingdom of Christ being a spiritual kingdom, not of the nature of the kingdoms of this world, it can not make conquest by the sword—by the arm of flesh. It is unlike all the kingdoms of this world; is separate and distinct from them, and its subjects may be good citizens and peaceable subjects in any civil government in the world, and indeed are required to be such. But it is as probable that the citizens in the kingdom of Christ could take the sword and with the arm of flesh go forward, build up and propagate his kingdom among men, as that it can be done by resorting to worldly policies, appliances, and appeals to the flesh—to the lusts of the eye and the pride of life. The holy Apostle says, "I came not to you with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God." What reason does he assign for this? His reason follows: "For I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." He did not come among the Corinthians with a flourish of excellency of speech and of wisdom, that might dazzle the eyes, elate the mind, and prevent the cross of Jesus from appearing, but he determined to make known nothing but Christ. and him crucified. His own soul was under the power of the cross of Christ; his Redeemer was uppermost in his

mind, was his all, and he had counted all things but dross that he might win Christ. He believed that the power to attract, convert and save men was in the cross, or in HIM who hung upon the cross, and not in the excellency of his speech, or the wisdom of men's words, and he desired all men to know that the work was of God and not of man.

By calling illiterate men of Galilee to the apostleship, without worldly wisdom and accomplishments, and placing them before the world as the Lord's instruments to speak to man, a full assurance was given that the work was not of man, nor of the wisdom of man, but of the wisdom and power of God. The excellency of their speech, the attraction of their personal appearance, and all that pertained to them merely human, it was manifest to all men, could not have moved the souls of men, and produced such a revolution in the hearts and lives of such vast multitudes. The work done was too great, too opposite to all movements known among men, too little like this world, to be attributed to a human, and therefore must be ascribed to a Divine, cause. The Apostles had no worldly influence upon the masses of society upon whom they operated; they had no worldly attractions; needed none, desired none, and used none. But when they approached men, it was with strong confidence in that prime article of their creed: "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Their confidence was in the grand, transcendently great and stupendous fact 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." They spoke of these great facts as sufficient in magnitude to move heaven and earth, and doing so, spoke of them as they really are. But in speaking of them, they were not contriving how they might round off a pretty period, make an oratorical display, or show their eloquence. The story they had to tell was so vast in itself, so vital to all the best interests of all nations and people, and so perfectly filled their own hearts and absorbed their whole powers, that it only appeared necessary

to them to tell it in the plainest, simplest and most artless manner, which is always the best, most powerful and effectual way of telling any great thing in itself.

Nothing appears more contemptible to one who realizes transcendent glories and majesty of our glorious Redeemer and his Gospel, than to see some poor, feeble worm of the dust, with a few fine words, flowery speeches, and well-rounded periods, trying to paint the Gospel of Christ, to commend it to the children of men. Some flowers are so infinitely exquisite in all the perfections of beauty, attractions and loveliness, that an effort of the finest artist to paint them would only spoil them, obscure their beauty and attractions. The same is true of any attempt to paint the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. A human artist could not appear more ridiculous in attempting to add to the beauties and attractions of the hues and symmetry of the rainbow, than he who would attempt to paint, polish and beautify the Gospel of Christ. Such a man may show himself, may show his fine skill, what a workman he is in his art; and spectators may see him and his fine painting, and admire both, but they will not see the Redeemer, his word, nor his glories, nor will they worship him. All this kind of thing is of the world, and shows that the preacher's own soul is not filled with the glories of his Lord, and the power of his Gospel; that he has no confidence in the attractions of his Lord, who is lifted up to draw all men unto him, and in his Gospel—his power to salvation to the believer. Hence men listen to such efforts and are frequently highly pleased, while their hearts are not in the least touched with the power of the Lord, and their souls are no more moved to cry out, "What must we do to be saved?" than if they had listened to a fine lecture on astronomy or anatomy. The reason is obvious: the Lord is not in it. His cross is hid by the fine painting, flourishing, and display of the mighty man. The Lord is kept back, that the man may appear; the Gospel of Christ is not seen nor felt, but the mere show of a poor mortal that would have served a better purpose at a school exhibition, than to have

strayed into the place of a Gospel preacher, is all that appears. "But do you intend to discourage classical literature, learning, and refined, elevated, liberal attainments?" Not when consecrated to God; but when used for mere worldly show and as a means to bring men into notice ignorant of God, there is no greater injury to the Church. If a man's learning is combined with piety, devotion, and consecrated to Jesus Christ, and he is possessed with the humility and meekness inculcated in Christianity, and his learning enables him to unfold the unsearchable riches of Christ, with the simplicity, sincerity and devotion necessary to commend it to the hearts "and consciences of men, it is of great value. If the Lord dwells in a man, if the great matters of the kingdom of God fill his soul, and if his learning is used in presenting the simple Gospel of Christ in meekness, it may be of great service to him; but it requires much care to keep the Lord in the front of it, so that the bearers will see nothing but him. The more gifted the man, the more learned and powerful, the better if all his powers are engaged in setting forth and honoring the Lord —sanctifying *him* in the eyes of the people. At the same time, he should rely upon no learning, no talent, or power that he possesses, but upon the Lord, upon his Gospel, the power of God unto salvation to every One who believes. He must look to Heaven for the means to move men to repent; he must appeal to God, and keep God and his works before his audience, and in this way show that his confidence is in Christianity itself and the Author of it, and not in himself, not in man. Whether men have what the world calls learning or not, they must know God, and have the love of God in their hearts, if they would induce others to love him and turn to him.

No. II.—THE MISSION OF INFIDELS.

IN our previous article, under the above caption, we fined our observations mainly to the deteriorating tendencies of Infidelity, without attempting any description of its various methods of accomplishing its work. In this article, we propose to enter upon its methods of operation. It is not confined to any one method or form of operation. It proposes no system or plan of action. It is confined to no rules of warfare, has no laws of argumentation, no definite mode of attack, nor laws of honor in conducting the battle. It is perfectly unscrupulous, and will adopt any stratagem that can be invented to oppose and defeat the truth.

The mode of warfare adopted by Paine, Hume, Volney Bolingbroke, Voltaire and their contemporaries, was manly, noble and honorable, compared with many of the methods employed in these times in opposing Divine revelation. They made a direct, fair and palpable issue with believers in the Bible. They openly denied the divinity of the Bible and the Lord Jesus Christ. Even Robert Owen, in his discussion with Mr. Campbell, openly and boldly affirmed that "all religion is founded in ignorance." But it has been discovered in this *inventive* and *progressive age,* that this bold, manly and candid issue with Christianity did not succeed well. It has been found too direct, plain and palpable success, and that something more circuitous, indirect and stealthy would succeed better. Hence, the citadel of truth is now approached almost invariably by a circumlocution, under some kind of a garb, cloak or pretense of faith. The worst attacks upon the Bible, religion, or morality, now made, are under some pretense, form and name of religion. Let us, then, look at some of these wily and insidious methods of attack:

1. The first one of these side-issue schemes that we shall mention, goes under the name of *Universalism.* It is fre-

quenfly called "a system of faith," but we hold it to be a deadly enemy of all faith; inimical to the Bible, to piety, and even morality. But it makes its attacks by a circumlocution, indirectly, all the time professing to believe. It infuses its neutralizing influences so stealthily and insidiously, that many of the unwary mistake it for a system of faith. But we invite men of reason, candor and cool reflection to stop and take one deliberate look at it. When the faith of Christ was preached by the Apostles, it led men to repent of their sins, turn to God, confess Christ, be baptized, unite as disciples in the church organization, meet for prayer, exhortation, celebrating the Lord's death and sufferings; continuing steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, etc. In our own time, when religious men preach the faith of Christ, those who receive it are led to most solemn repentance, abandonment of their sins, united with the Church, regular attendance upon divine ordinances, prayers, exhortations and unremitted attendance upon the worship of God. The preaching of the Gospel led men to inquire, "What must I do to be saved?"

But who is there that does not know that preaching Universalism leads no man to inquire, "What shall I do to be saved?" It leads no man to repent. It has no repentance in it. Indeed, it ignores and subverts the very basis of all repentance. It induces no man to say, as he leaves the preaching, "I intend doing better and being more conformed to the life of Christ." It leads no man to confess Christ. Paul says, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." This is something unknown to the whole scheme of Universalism. Those who collect around him who preaches Universalism, and swallow it, never confessed the Lord Jesus with the lips in their lives, unless they made a profession of the faith of Christ in some other Church, from which they have apostatized. The solemn institution of baptism, to which the Lord himself submitted, which he enjoined in the same commission containing salvation for every creature; which was practiced by the Apostles, and submitted

to by all the first converts, is almost if not entirely ignored and set aside by the artful and evasive scheme to which we refer. All the Bible says on this subject is nothing in the system here spoken of. This insidious scheme subverts all remission of sins, hides and shuns all Divine appointments for that important object. It knows nothing of all Divine influences, all piety and devotion to God. What has it done with the Lord's Supper, that significant and solemn appointment of the Savior to place his sufferings before us and keep him in remembrance? It has set it aside, subverted it, and turned it out of the assemblies. Where are their meetings for prayer? Where are their Sunday-schools? Where are their Church organizations ? Where are their meeting-houses? What have they done with all the solemn and sublime institutions and worship of the meek and lowly Redeemer?

After preaching and debating through the country for thirty years, how many churches have they organized and meeting regularly for worship? They boast of great numbers, numbers equal to some of the most popular parties; but where are their organizations? We all know that large numbers may be found who talk this system in many towns, with wealth and every facility for meeting and worship; and yet they do not meet once in three months. Look at their rallying points, where they have numbers and wealth, and have had for years, such as Knightstown, Dublin, Philomath, Indiana; Oxford, Ohio; Warsaw, Kentucky, etc., where they have been battling orthodoxy for many years, and tell what they have done. They have "strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by *promising him life."* (See Ezek. xiii, 22.) They have opposed and pulled down other men's work; but what have they built up? What have they built up, and what are they building up generally throughout the country? It is manifest as day that they are not building up anything but unbelief. The mission of the doctrine, and of the party, is to weaken faith, weaken obedience, weaken all incentives to repentance,

harden men's hearts, and lead them to laugh over the sins of the world. It leads men to laugh over the most solemn things the Almighty has ever said, and induces them to descend to the lowest sophistries, quibbles and duplicity possible for a human being.

That the obvious tendency of Universalism is irreligious; that it is opposed to holiness, to reformation of life; that it is in eternal hostility to all efforts to make the world better; that it paralizes and neutralizes the efforts of men to serve God, is one of the most manifest impressions upon the mind, both from the theory itself and from the history of its practical workings among men. No pretended system in our time has been characterized by such daring and unblushing effrontery. It comes forward under a pretense of faith, but ridicules the most awful and fearful things which that faith reveals. It discards the eternal discriminations which the faith of the Lord Jesus maintains between the righteous and the wicked—between those who serve God and those who serve him not—between vice and virtue—except the reward of the one and the punishment of the other, received in this life. It proposes to believe the Bible, and would have men believe that it teaches that he who was an atheist, a deist, and a scoffer at all that God has said, and a blasphemer of God till he breathed his last breath, shall be received up into glory, and seated down with the holy martyrs of Jesus, and enjoy God forever! No other system has so far imposed upon the credulity of. mankind as to face the world, as well as the heavens, and declare that the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels, where the beasts and the false prophets shall be tormented day and night forever and ever—the *gehena* of fire, where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched is in this world, and that the wicked we see are actually enduring its punishments!

No infidel desires any better opposition to religion than this. No man who hates the Bible and wishes its influence upon the world counteracted, desires any more effectual method of doing it than this, so far as men will receive it.

Those who fall under its influence will neither worship God nor keep his commandments. Atheism itself has all the incentives to a righteous life found in this system, and may be trusted just as far. Its influence is to harden the heart, and fill the world with impenitence and indifference.

TRINE IMMERSION.

WE have been requested from several sources of the highest respectability, to write an article on Trine Immersion. We intended complying with this request sooner, but owing to pressing engagements, have not been able to do so. Nor can we now devote a large space to it.

Trine Immersion is three immersions, or immersing three times. Triune God is "three one God," or three persons in one Godhead. Trine Immersion is an adjunct of Trinitarianism, and consequently was unknown to the whole Church till the dispute touching the Trinity had been introduced. When the Church introduced the learned nonsense of three Gods in one God, the doctrine of three immersions was invented, introducing into the three Gods in one. We write from home, having no access to authorities, but, from memory, we believe Trine Immersion existed as early as the fourth century. Nothing but immersion is mentioned for baptism in any writing of the first or second century; and long after the introduction of Infant Baptism, infants were not only immersed, but, in many instances, immersed three times. No period of the history of the Church, or of the world, gives clearer evidence of the inclination of man to corrupt the institutions of Heaven than the second and third centuries. While one party was maintaining the most speculative theories of the three persons in the Godhead, and hence maintaining the necessity of three immersions, another set of visionaries were contending that infants were sinners and must be baptized to save them from the Adamic sin. Another class, about the same time, were mystifying the 'minds of the people with the notion, that if a person should sin after baptism he could not obtain pardon, and consequently that baptism should be deferred till a late period in life, that no sin should be committed after baptism. But we

shall not go into the examination of the doctrine of these parties further now than simply to state our objections to Trine Immersion.

There is a party sparsely scattered in some sections of the United States, called Tonkers, or, as some call them, Dunkards, who pertinaciously and invariably practice Trine Immersion, or literally *three immersions*. The people here alluded to are a kind, friendly and generally peaceable order, and, in many respects, practice the religion of Christ with much humility and simplicity. But in the matter of this article, we think they make a very serious perversion of the Gospel. We object to them on the point in question, as follows:

1. Trine Immersion destroys and entirely defeats the symbolical or emblematical design of the ordinance. As Christ was buried in the tomb, so are we "buried with him in baptism." As he rose from the dead, so we rise from our burial in baptism to walk in a new life. (See Rom. vi, 1-8.) Christ was buried once, and we are buried with him, in baptism, *once,* not three times, to represent his *one* burial. He rose from his burial *once,* and, in imitation of his rising from the dead *once,* we rise *once* from the baptismal grave, not three times. As Christ died *once,* we die to sin *once.* As he was buried *once,* we are buried *once,* in baptism. As he rose from the dead *once, we* rise *once* from baptism. This beautiful and divinely designed analogy, is subverted and entirely destroyed in an administration that buries the person *three times* and raises the candidate *three times.* Christ died but once, was buried but once, and rose from the grave but once; so we die to sin but once, are buried in baptism but once, and rise from the baptismal grave but once.

2. In the same passage, the same verse and the Same sentence, where the word of God affirms that "there is one Lord" and "one faith," it also affirms that there is "one baptism." (See Eph. iv, 5-) When this whole passage is translated, so as to give us, in the place of the Greek, *baptizo,* immerse, it affirms that "there is one Lord, one faith, and

one immersion. That the Apostle here affirms, that "there is but one Lord and one faith," no one who understands the force of language denies. It is equally clear, that with precisely the same force, he affirms that "there is but one baptism," or when *baptizo is* translated, that "there is but one immersion." it would be equally as good doctrine, and do as little violence to the sacred canon, to contend for three Lords and three faiths, as to teach and practice, as the Tonkers do, three immersions. It is an evident violation of the manifest intention of the Apostle, and tends to schism—the identical thing he was guarding against. In inculcating unity among the children of God, he exhorts them to endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, and as a reason of this, gives them an epitome of the units of Christianity. This Divine epitome contains seven units, which every man of God is hound to maintain throughout Christendom, in these days of schism.

These units may be regarded as articles of faith in the Christian code. The man who is not sound here, is unsound in the "unity of the spirit," and is not orthodox, in the true import of that term.

1. The first unit, or*article of faith, in this epitome relates to the Church, or body of Christ. All creeds have an article concerning the Church. This one is not like that in other creeds. It is very short and concise, but inflexible. It affirms that "there is one body." He who denies that there is one body, or one Church, or affirms that there are more than one body, is not sound in the faith—a heretic.

2. The second relates to the spirit, and is unlike any article of faith, upon the spirit, in any other creed in the world. It simply affirms that "there is one spirit." He who denies there is one spirit, or affirms that there is more than one spirit, is not sound in the faith, but advocates a heresy.

3. The third unit, or article, in this epitome relates to the Christian hope, and is not found in the articles of faith in most creeds. The Apostle affirms that "there is one hope." He who denies that there is one hope, or affirms that there is

more than one, is not sound in the faith, but maintains a heresy.

4. The fourth unit, or article, relates to Christ, and differs from any article we ever saw concerning him in any other creed. It affirms of him, that "there is one Lord." He who denies that there is one Lord, or affirms that there is more than one, maintains a heresy, and should be dealt with as a heretic.

5. The fifth unit, or article, in this epitome affirms that "there *is* one faith." He who denies that there is one faith, or affirms that there is more than one faith, is at war with the whole force and intention of the passage, is unsound in the faith—a heretic.

6. The sixth unit, or article, in this epitome affirms that "there is one baptism," or one immersion. He who denies that there is one baptism, or affirms that there is more than one, is at issue with the whole force and intention of this passage, and consequently advocating schism in the body of Christ.

7. The seventh and last" unit, or article, in this epitome relates to the Deity, and differs from the article of faith concerning him in any book, except the Bible. It affirms that "there is one God and Father of all." He who denies that there is one God, or he who maintains that there is more than one God, is at war with the whole force of this passage.

Here is briefly Paul's epitome of the units embodied in the one system of Christ. We maintain that it is as sound reason, sound theology, and sound adherence to the obvious import of language, to teach that there are three bodies, three spirits, three hopes, three Lords, three faiths, and three Gods, as that there are three baptisms. It is as manifest as noonday, that as there is one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, and one faith, there should be but one baptism into the one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith and one God, the Father of all, above all, in all, and through all.

No. IV.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

WHY should our maintaining the all-sufficiency of the Bible, as a rule for the faith and practice of all Christians, prove so obnoxious, so offensive and antipodal to the religious combinations of these times? When this position was first shown to us, we thought all the good would greet it with joyfulness. It was so self-evidently just, right in itself, and manifestly the Will of God; it so honored the Savior of the world, the wisdom, goodness and benevolence of God; it so elevated Christianity, the Bible, the law of the Lord; maintained its perfection, dignity and glory; its supreme adaptation to the conversion of the world, the edification of saints, government of the Church and guidance of the children of God to heaven; opened such a beautiful, safe and God-like way for the escape of all the good, the pious, those who love Jesus and one another, to unite in one community, one holy communion, one precious band of sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, in the unity of the spirit, the bond of peace and love, and thus escape from all the bickerings, contentions, strifes and religious feuds that now mar the peace and comfort of the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, that we thought it would be received with acclamation. We thought the main body of professing Christians would delight to speak of our Heavenly Father, as having given us a perfect, a complete system; to speak of our gracious Redeemer as the author of the faith; a perfect system of faith; complete in all its parts; adapted to man in a world of sorrow and sin, and as having given us the glorious Gospel—the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth. But how sadly we were disappointed here! Nothing appeared more repugnant to the great majority.

It is true, we found many who bless the Lord for the prosperity of their party, and ascribe the honor of it to him. We found many who would honor the Lord for raising up Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, etc. Many praised God for Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Calvinism, Arminianism, for Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, etc., but men who would honor God for the Bible, in all its divine perfections; who would honor and praise God for Christianity, as a complete, perfect and independent system; honor and praise God because he had raised up Christians, followers of Christ, children of God, heirs of the eternal inheritance, but who would be nothing more, were comparatively hard to find. Why is this? How can it be that anything so manifestly right, so perfectly consistent, and so perfectly in accordance with all the authority of Heaven, should find an opponent among all who possess goodness of heart and a desire to do the will of God? The same question may be asked in regard to all those who refused Christianity when it was first proposed to mankind. Why did so many, not merely of the low and vicious, pagans and such like, but religious people, learned doctors, scribes and priests, the most refined, noble and great, reject it at the beginning? Was it because it was not a complete, perfect and infallible system? By no means; but rather the opposite. It was mainly because it claimed to be a perfect, complete and infallible system. Nay, more; it was because it claimed to be the perfect, complete and infallible system, that they hated it. It left no room for the wisdom of man to amend, complete or perfect. It left no room for uninspired and fallible man to prefix or affix. It left no possible room for any compromise with any other system. It left no possible ground for any other religious system to stand upon. It claimed infallibility. It rose up to the highest summit and claimed perfection. It came clothed with all the authority of the Divine throne, and claimed to fill heaven and earth with the authority of the ineffable Jehovah, and left no authority for any other law or any other system. It came with

all the glory of the Infinite One, and left no glory for any other system. It came filled with all the fulness of the incommunicable Spirit of God, with the only power to bless and save man. The power of the Almighty was in it. It called not upon man for favors, for assistance, and a position among other systems, but held out to man the only hand of mercy, of deliverance; of salvation, or pardon. It claimed the whole habitable earth as its rightful territory; the whole family of man as the extent of its mission, leaving no room for anything else.

But all this exclusiveness was not the extent of its offense. It did not stop here; but proceeded to set aside, as null and void, all other systems. To the Jew, it said, "The law is abolished." "The handwriting of ordinances is taken out of the way"—"nailed to the cross." "Christ was the end of the law for righteousness." "By the deeds of the law, no flesh can be justified in the sight of God." To the pagan, it said of all their gods, that they were no gods—that they were powerless and could not save. To all, both Jew and Gentile, it declared them all sinful—in unbelief; gone out of the way and in a state of condemnation before God. It made no distinctions of men in high stations or low, but condemned sin both in king and subjects, rich and poor, priest and people. It waged an open, an unmitigated and uncompromising war upon every species of sin, vice and corruption. It unhesitatingly upbraided the hypocrisy and ostentation of the popular Pharisee, in his affected prayer upon the street, and gave the preference to a poor unpopular publican, who could do no more than smite upon his breast, and say, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" It boldly and firmly set forth the character of the popular priest and Levite, who passed the suffering man who fell among thieves, and honored the unpopular and, we may also add, heterodox Samaritan. It approached the reveling, drunken and profligate Felix, regardless o£ his civil power, popularity or wealth, and set forth to him "temperance, righteousness and a judgment to come." It boldly condemned every lust

of the flesh, the pride of life, and the love of the world. It faced every sinner, high or low, rich or poor, in the Church or out of it, and demanded in the most commanding and authoritative manner of him, in the name of the Lord, to repent—to break off his sins by righteousness, and bow implicitly to its claims—that Almighty God "commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world." It faltered not, feared not, hesitated not one moment to declare to the incorrigible, the persistent in sin, and finally impenitent, that God would punish them with the devil and his angels.

Is it to be wondered at, that a system thus meeting and condemning all evil, sin and wickedness of every description, setting aside all the religious systems in the world as null and void, and setting itself forth as infallibly right and the only infallibly right way to please God here and attain heaven hereafter, should meet with opposition among misguided, ignorant and worldly men? Surely it is not; nor is it any more to be wondered at, that the same Divine system, claiming still to be the only divinely authorized religion, setting aside everything else as human, fallible and unauthorized, and still condemning all the sins of the world, should still be opposed. If we had come forward with another *form* of Christianity; another system that some man had extracted from Christianity, from Scripture, and simply claiming that we could prove it by Scripture, thus standing upon a level with the parties around us, we would have been orthodox enough by this time, and could have been tolerated well enough. This could have been understood without any trouble. But to come forward with the Bible, not as the proof-book, to prove *our* doctrine, but the *doctrine itself;* not referring to Christianity to show that *our* religion is like it; but presenting Christianity itself as our religion; having no religion but the religion of Jesus Christ itself; no faith but the pure faith of the. Son of God; being nothing but Christians, disciples of Christ, followers of the Lamb, and doing nothing only what God requires, is a most intolerable

heresy. It shows no favor to anything, but seems to engross all in its grasp. It literally subverts everything else, sets aside all isms, doctrines and commandments of men of every grade, as the most insignificant childish play. It comes to men, claiming the right to have the attention of all as though all beside were undeserving of any note or any regard whatever. Not only so, but it gives no chance to assail, expose and refute, for it maintains nothing but the Bible, but Christianity, but what God has given by inspiration and proved by supernatural signs and wonders, accompanied with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which all its assailants have to admit true! Can we expect to present the only true religion—the religion of Jesus Christ itself; the only true system—Christianity itself; the only revelation from God—that contained in the Bible; the only authority of God—the authority of the word of God; the only true doctrine—the Gospel of Christ itself; and declare everything else unauthorized, null and void—hindrances to the progress of truth and righteousness, to the edification of saints and the conversion of the world, and meet no opposition? Not rationally. The watchmen on the old party walls of their little Zions will see the tendency of all this. They will see—they can not help seeing —that precisely in proportion as we succeed in fixing the attention of the people upon God, his authority;: his Son, our gracious Redeemer and Savior, his word, his law, his religion, as a distinct, complete and perfect system, with all the power, grace, wisdom, mercy, benevolence and authority of the Almighty in it, calling the attention of man to it as the only medium of salvation, all their systems must necessarily lose their attraction, their command and influence, and hasten to ruin. Many of these watchmen are pledged for life, too bigoted to look if they may be mistaken; too obstinate and self-willed to yield, and will oppose to the last.

THE KINGDOM OF MESSIAH.

BY W. C. ROGERS.

31. Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible.

32. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass.

33. His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay.

34. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces.

35. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, arid became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.

* * * * * * * *

44. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed : and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Dan. ii.

ONE of the strongest evidences in favor of the authenticity of the Word of God is its purity, simplicity and moral grandeur. The purposes of God, manifested in the old and new covenant, are of the most benevolent character, the means employed for the accomplishment of these purposes simple, and the consequences resulting therefrom in the highest degree beneficial to mankind. In all that God has said and done, nothing can be found unworthy the character of the moral Governor of the universe.

Not only is there no antagonism existing between the principles and objects proposed in the sacred Scriptures, but the most perfect harmony. The combined wisdom of the past neither could have projected nor executed such a work as the Bible. It is beyond the conception of the finite mind.

Its origin is higher than earth, and its Projector loftier than him whose days are as a "shadow that declineth." A proud monument it stands in the midst of ruins and desolation. The subversion of governments and the crashing fall of empires disturb not the fixedness of its deep and broad foundation. It was builded by the Most High, and is by him sustained. We are not only astonished at the inimitable beauty and simplicity of the word of God, but are subdued in contemplating the exactness with which the prophetic declarations come to pass. The inspired ,prophet looked through the thick darkness of coining ages and saw the rise, decay and final destruction of tribes, nations and monarchies. But he lived not to see fulfilled what he declared should transpire hereafter. He died, not comprehending the full meaning of his own predictions." The Christian student of the nineteenth century does not, of course, understand all prophecy; but enough of its fulfillment is exhibited in the past and present to demand an acknowledgment from all of the greatness and goodness of Him who doeth according to his will, in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth.

For the purpose of seeing what God has done for the salvation of a lost race, and what good thing is yet reserved for a perishing world, I propose to consider the time when the God of heaven designed setting up that kingdom which shall never be destroyed. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, had dreamed a dream. Daniel, the captive prophet, came into his presence and commenced the revelation of his dream. "Thou sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. * * * Thou art this head of gold." Daniel spoke with remarkable definiteness. There is no evasion in his remarks. Thou art this head of gold settled at once the position of that power ruled by Nebuchadnezzar. The Assyr-

ian empire was a vast and mighty empire. It capital was Babylon. Its walls, gates of brass, proud temples, beautiful gardens, and inexhaustible treasures, spoken of by historians and sung by many a bard, proclaim the magnificence and power of this renowned city. This empire ended B. C. 538, and was succeeded by another kingdom, in accordance with the words of Daniel. "And after thee shall arise another kingdom, inferior to thee." This language was addressed to Nebuchadnezzar. He was assured that on the ruins of his kingdom should arise a kingdom of inferior character. The Assyrian empire surpassed the Medo-Persian empire, alluded to by Daniel, in splendor and treasure and power. It was well represented by the breast and arms of silver. It is a settled fact that the Assyrian empire was represented by the head of gold. The only kingdom arising immediately after it was the Medo-Persian. Therefore, since this is the case, and since the Merle-Persian was not equal to the Assyrian empire, the prophet could have meant no other empire. It continued only for a short period of time. It terminated B. C. 331, and was followed by a kingdom, whose characteristic features were faithfully sketched by the inspired prophet. After the destruction of the second kingdom, "a third kingdom, of brass should arise, which should rule ever the whole earth." The Macedonian empire bore rule over the then known world, extending from the Adriatic Sea to the Indies, embracing the most powerful and warlike nations of that time. The Greeks, from the character of their armor, were called "brazen-coated." In the days of their glory they were invincible in war, unsurpassed in the love of science and the cultivation of literature. These facts are sufficient to identify this empire with the third kingdom—the kingdom of brass. Alexander the Great, who had at least extended and strengthened the Macedonian empire, died B. C. 323. After his death, his empire was divided among his four generals. Their possessions were soon embraced in the fourth kingdom. "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all

things; and as iron, that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." Thus is the Roman empire delineated. The Romans were brave and death-defying. They were indefatigable in whatever they undertook, and usually accomplished their purposes. They were tough as iron. The Roman Empire was emphatically the iron kingdom. No empire more justly merited that appellation.

Thus far have we seen the kingdoms, or empires, represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron of that terrible image, beheld in a night vision by Nebuchadnezzar. In the changing fortunes of these four empires, we see the hand of God. He is not an idle spectator of the affairs of this world. Individuals, communities and nations can not elude this sleepless eye. His searching glance penetrates the deep fountains of the heart, and all the machinations or" good and bad, great and small, are known to him.

II. Dan. ii, 44, makes the following significant declaration : "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." "These kings" and "these kingdoms" are employed in this verse as synonymous. Nebuchadnezzar is addressed as if he were the kingdom of Assyria. "And after thee shall arise another kingdom." Such language: is not inappropriate, since the king is guaranteed supreme authority. But the question to be determined is, *in the days of what kingdom did God purpose setting up that kingdom which shall never be destroyed?* Some say in the time of the four great empires above named; others say in the time of the ten kingdoms which arose phoenix-like from the ruins of the Roman power." Hence, it is believed by some, that the kingdom of God is already set up; others are of the opinion that it is not yet set up, but will be in the future. The ten kingdoms represented by the ten toes are not alluded to in the second chapter of Daniel as kingdoms. They are not once mentioned by him under the appellation of kingdoms.

But the four empires which we have noticed above *are* called kingdoms. It is therefore more probable that God designed coming generations to understand that he would rear his. kingdom in the days of the four kingdoms, mentioned as such, than in the days of the ten kingdoms, not mentioned as such. This little stone cut out of the mountain without human agency, and the kingdom which should destroy all other nations, are descriptions of the same Divine power; because the little stone was to be cut out of the mountain during the existence of the image, was to strike it on the feet, prostrate it, and grind it to powder. And the kingdom of the Most High was to be reared in the days of the four kingdoms, as will be seen hereafter—symbolized by the wonderful image beheld by the Assyrian king. It is worthy of notice that this little stone, before becoming a great mountain and filling the whole earth, struck the image and crushed it. Not before, but after this event, did it embrace the area of the whole earth. In connection with this sketch, notice that the kingdom of the God of heaven should break in pieces certain kingdoms, and should stand forever—should exist when all powers shall have decayed and faded from the earth. But before the erection of this kingdom, it will be perceived by reference to the Old Testament, that a personage of glorious character, of celestial endowments, must make his appearance among the Jews. Jacob, in blessing his sons, remarks, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Thus faithfully did the venerable patriarch speak of the coming of the Son of God, and what should follow. The scepter did not depart from Judah until Messiah came. When he appeared the people did gather to him. The prophecy can refer to none, save Jesus Christ. Isaiah beheld the advent of the blessed Savior, and was enraptured in contemplating the peace that should attend his reign as king, and the immunities to be enjoyed by his happy subjects. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his

shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it, with judgment and with justice from henceforth forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

Jeremiah, looking forward doubtless to the appearing of the same great and good One, alludes to the covenant which God will then make with the house of Israel. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they broke, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." But before the coming of the Redeemer, a herald must appear among the inhabitants of Judea, and prepare them for receiving him. Isaiah describes him as the "Voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." These things are written as the canons of prophecy, by the finger of God. The shade and coloring, the characters and scenes are all executed by him who is "mighty in strength and wisdom."

Opening the New Testament, we are introduced by the four sacred historians to John the Immerser, the harbinger of Messiah. He appeared among the Jews before it was publicly announced that Jesus was the Son of God. With boldness and fidelity did he accomplish the work assigned him. He died a martyr; but, before he finished his career, Jesus of Nazareth was declared to be the Son of God. It was made known that He of whom the prophets and the bards of Israel had spoken, tabernacled in Judea. The time, place and cir-

cumstances of his birth proved that he was the "Desire of all nations." He lived, and taught, and suffered; he died, was buried, and rose from the dead, as was affirmed of him, hundreds of years before his coming.

The Bible student is aware of the fact that John, the harbinger, the twelve apostles and the seventy evangelists commissioned by Jesus Christ, proclaimed the kingdom, or the reign of heaven, as at hand. This was the burden of their proclamation, be it remembered, before the ascension of Messiah. After his ascension, we read of those that "God had delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son." John, on the isle of Patmos, declared that he was in the "kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." When at Caesarea Philippi, Peter acknowledged that Jesus ,as the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus affirmed that he would build his Church on that confession, and in giving Peter the keys of his kingdom, he showed that his church and kingdom were identical. It should be carefully noted, that in this conversation, Jesus affirms that he *will* build his church, had it been reared, he would not have said this. After the ascension of the Son of God, we read in Acts of the Apostles that "the saved were added to the church." "Church of Christ" and "Church of God" are expressions of frequent occurrence in the Epistles. Christ remarked, before going to his Father, that the "beginning" of the proclamation of the law of his church or kingdom should be "at Jerusalem." "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." After his departure, Peter, rehearsing the conversion of Cornelius and his household to the brethren of Jerusalem, said: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at Jerusalem." All things were in readiness for setting up the kingdom of the Son of God. He had vanquished the belligerent powers of earth and hell. He had passed the portals of the grave, entered the confines of Satan, grappled with him, and wrested from him the keys of death and the invisible world—had broken

and cast aside the fetters that bound him, and ascended in triumph mightier than the proudest heroes of the past. Attended by a multitude of angels, he directed his course towards his Father's abode. The gates were lifted up, the everlasting doors flew open wide, the King of glory, the Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle, entered into the palace royal of the universe sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, received from the Father the crown and scepter of universal empire, angels, powers and authorities being subjected unto him. He sent down the Holy Spirit, according to promise, to the Apostles, according to the command of Jesus, waiting at Jerusalem. They were immersed in it, They were endowed by it with power for a special work—a work which was not to be commenced until they were capacitated for it from on high. Peter, to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven had been committed, arose, and, in the strength of Israel's God, proclaimed the law of induction into the kingdom of Messiah. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." "And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Peter, armed with celestial might, fearless as David among the Philistines, determined to obey his risen, exalted and glorified Lord. He declared that Jesus was the anointed Son of the living God —that he was reigning on high—full of power to forgive their sins and heal their maladies. He spoke, that the multitude, hearing and understanding and appreciating his words. might believe on the Son of God, and live. If he did not proclaim these facts for this purpose, for what purpose did he utter a word on that momentous occasion? Christ had said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that

shall believe on me, through their word." Convicted of having crucified the Lord of Glory, convinced of their awful and fearful condition, pierced to the very heart by the startling, overwhelming facts adduced by Peter, the multitude exclaimed, "Men and brethren, what shall we do? "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," said the faithful ambassador of Jesus. They that gladly received the word were immersed—about three thousand. These three thousand believed that Jesus had died, had been buried, and had risen from the grave, because they gladly received the words of Peter. They reformed—changed their conduct, because Peter would not have given a command that might be slighted with impunity. They professed their faith in the Son of God, because Philip required of the Ethiopian eunuch a profession of his faith before he would immerse him. The conditions of pardon are the same everywhere, under the same dispensation. They were immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, unless Peter was unfaithful in proclaiming his Lord's will. They were immersed for the remission of sins, according to the Christian philologist—according to the full meaning of the word of God. They received the remission of sins, because it was declared they should in submitting to the command of Jesus Christ. They received the gift of the Holy Spirit, because they were promised it on certain conditions, with which they complied. They became living members of the Church of Messiah. They became living stones in the temple of the living God. They became obedient subjects of the glorious King of Saints. Builded on the Rock of Ages, nothing could move them. Flood nor roaring tempest could not jostle the sure foundation of that storm-defying Rock. It will stand the shock of the leagued forces of earth and hell. The fierce armies of Satan will ever recoil from the dreadful attack, maddened, confused and distorted. The Kingdom of the Son of God was founded in the days of the iron king-

dom—the Roman empire. However much this may be denied, it will forever remain a fact. Daniel had said that in the days of certain kingdoms, or kings, the God of heaven would set up a kingdom. In the days of the last of the four kingdoms above mentioned, God did set up a kingdom. It may be supposed, that unless all the kingdoms were existing at the time of the setting up of the kingdom of God, the conclusion arrived at is not legitimate. In the Book of Ruth it is said, "in the days when the Judges ruled," evidently signifying in the time of some, or of one of the Judges. So we say an event occurred in the days of the twelve Caesars, meaning in the time of some, or one of the twelve Caesars. Those who adjure this law of interpreting the words of prophecy, will find a difficult task in accounting for the fact that the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron of the Assyrian king's image were crushed together by the little stone. The magnificence of the first, the inflexibility of the second, the dauntless invincibility of the third kingdom were in a certain degree found existing in the fourth kingdom. The little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, in destroying the malignant enemies of the Roman empire, showed its ability to overcome all obstacles, of whatever character they might be. The little stone and the Kingdom of Christ are the same power. The apostles compared themselves to earthen vessels—the Gospel to treasures within these vessels—that the excellency of the power might be of God. Had not God, his Son, and the Holy Spirit presided over, directed and sustained the work, the kingdom of Jesus Christ had never been reared. This kingdom began its progressive march in the days of Tiberius Ceasar. It steadily, firmly, proudly moved on, increasing continually in might, until in the days of Constantine the Great it paralyzed the energies of the Roman empire. Constantine, by an imperial edict, A. D. 33, prohibited the worship of idols, and announced that Christianity should henceforth be the religion of the Roman people. Idols, altars and temples were devoted to destruction. In Antioch and Corinth, in Ephesus,

Athens and Rome, in the most populous and enlightened cities then existing, the Gospel had been successfully proclaimed, and meek submission rendered to the King of kings. In the wilderness, on the mountains, in the caves of the earth, and on the distant island, s of the sea, the sacred Scriptures were read, prayers were offered to the living God, and the songs of Zion sung by the ransomed sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty.

III. When the Son of Man makes his second personal appearance among the inhabitants of the earth, he will find that kingdom existing which was organized by his authority on the Day of Pentecost. If this position can be established it can not be successfully maintained that the God of heaven will setup a kingdom between the present time and that period, or that he will set up a kingdom at that time differing from that kingdom which is now standing and will then be standing, of which his Son is now King and will then be King. If the above proposition can be sustained, the time when God purposed founding that kingdom which shall have no end, or shall never be destroyed, is forever settled, and all opposing argumentation ineffective. In Luke, we are informed that a nobleman went into a distant country to receive for himself a kingdom or to procure for himself royalty; the nobleman went abroad to receive a kingdom; Christ went to the Father and was crowned Lord of lords. The nobleman, before his departure, gave to his subjects talents to be increased; Christ has committed to the citizens of his kingdom abilities to be improved. The nobleman returned and reckoned with his subjects. The Son of God, at his appearing, will demand of his followers an exact account of their stewardship. From this narration and others, it may be inferred that there will be no change in the Divine government until the conclusion of all things. In Matthew, Christ is represented as coming in glory, accompanied by the holy angels, seated on the throne of his glory. All nations are before him. The good are separated from the bad. The righteous are addressed by the King, "Come, ye

blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Of this kingdom the Son of Man is represented as then being King. It has already been stated that Jesus became King of a particular kingdom on the day of Pentecost. Of that kingdom he is still the King, and since it has not been authoritatively announced that there will be a change of rulers, until the grand drama of redemption shall have been closed, he will, therefore, at that fearful period mentioned by Matthew, be King of the same kingdom.

Corroborative evidence is found in the first letter to the Corinthians. It is remarked that in the resurrection of the dead, every one shall come forth in his own rank, or character. "Christ, the first fruit, afterward they that are Christ's at his coining. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." From these citations, it is manifest that Christ will reign as King until having subdued all enemies, until having ended his glorious work, he returns with the crown and scepter to his Father, that God may be all in all. But previous to the end of the reign of the Son of God, the destiny of the living and the dead shall have been decided and forever fixed. Because all nations shall appear before him, and being separated, the wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. Those who affirm that God will rear a kingdom in the future—in the days of certain kingdoms—contend also that this kingdom will destroy all other kingdoms. This can not be the case, since we have just seen that Christ must reign until he has put under his feet all enemies—the last enemy being Death. Therefore, could it be proved that God would set up a kingdom hereafter, and could this kingdom be identified with the kingdom described by the Prophet Daniel, taking into consideration that this kingdom must break in pieces all other kingdoms, it could

not possibly fulfill its mission, inasmuch as there would be kingdoms to bruise—none to destroy.

IV. The King of this kingdom is the Son of the Most High, the chiefest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely, the – Alpha and Omega in redemption, the loftiest, purest and most glorious being that ever tabernacle among men, or communed with the invisible and unsearchable Jehovah. Heroes, philosophers and poets, the great the royal and the mighty have passed away, and now sleep that sleep which "knows no waking" until the morning of the resurrection. But Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, though once dead, now lives, and will live forever Seated at the right hand of the Everlasting Father, clothed with plenary power, he intercedes in behalf of all who approach the Lord God Almighty in accordance with his will. He remembered a fallen world while in the midst of the iniquitous, and, though absent, forgets not the deplorable condition of the sons and daughters of Adam. In all that he said and did, in Gethsemane. on the cross, and while the shadows of death encompassed him, he remembered the high purpose of his mission, to seek and to save the lost. He is now our Prophet, Priest and King. Would you, sinner, be happy? Then obey this King.

The privileges of this kingdom have no end. In this kingdom the blind are enabled to see, the weak arc made strong, the diseased receive health, the dead are made alive. In this kingdom the captive is set free, the faltering is encouraged, the innocent protected, the humble exalted—the weary find rest. In this kingdom new joys are continually springing up, bright prospects are ever opening in the distance, and the future is gilded with fadeless hues of beauty and loveliness. Here the voices of the just of all ages, falling on the ear in sweet cadences, speak words of consolation. Here communion is enjoyed with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Here a peace is enjoyed the world can not give and which the world can not take away. Friendship decays not, and the light of hope never departs.

The subjects of this kingdom will enjoy everlasting life. They fear not the sullen mutterings of hostile powers. Storms may gather round them, lightnings wild and fierce may blaze in awful grandeur above them, thunderbolts of wrath may fall about their pathway, they stand firm and fixed as the everlasting hills of God, for an arm omnipotent is outstretched for their protection.

Under the broad banner of Prince Messiah, gemmed with the star of Bethlehem, are they marshaled, a blood-washed army, going from conquest to conquest, from conquering to conquering, and onward will they proceed until the thunderings of victory and triumph ascend from every land to Him that sits upon the throne and to the Lamb forever. Soon the portals of the great city of our God will be opened; crowns, honors, and royalties will soon be given the holy and faithful conquerors, who will, during the ages of eternity, be happy in a world in which there is no separation, no suffering, no night, no death.

No. V.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

IS IT not desirable that debating, disputing, and all the unhappy religious wars and strifes should cease? All the good, answer Yes. How, then, can they ever cease, until some one system, one institution, one doctrine, or one faith, claiming the attention of all, having a mission to all men, clothed with all authority, and one that all admit true, shall be presented and received? Never, till such a system shah be presented and maintained, can there be an end to strife among the people of God. But are we in reach of any such system, institution, or faith? We maintain that we are, and that it is the duty of all good men to make a mighty effort, at this particular crisis, to extricate it from the encumbrances, trammels, fetters and shackles that men have hung about it. There is, in the midst of all the errors and confusions of these times, something that all parties talk about, that they call "the truth." There is something they call "Christianity." They speak of "the Church of Christ." There is something they call "the Gospel." They speak of "the religion of Jesus Christ." They all speak of "the doctrine of Christ." They also speak of "Christians," "disciples of Christ," "saints," etc. Now, what do they mean by all this? What do they mean by the *truth, Christianity, the Church of Christ, the Gospel, the religion of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of Christ, Christians, disciples of Christ, saints,* etc? If the speaker be a Methodist, what does he mean by "the truth"? He does not mean his doctrine, for he does not claim that it is the *truth,* but simply that it is according to truth, that it is taken from the truth, and may be proved by the truth. When he speaks of the *Gospel,* he does not mean Methodism, for he does not claim that Methodism is the

Gospel itself, but a system founded, upon the Gospel, taken from it, according to it, and that may be proved by it. When he speaks of the religion of Jesus Christ, he does not mean Methodist religion, for he does not believe that any man can be saved who does not receive the religion of Jesus Christ, but he admits that persons may be saved and not receive Methodist religion. He only claims for Methodist religion, that it is like the religion of Jesus Christ, that it is taken from it, founded upon it, and may be proved by it. When he speaks of Christians, he does not mean Methodists, as such, or you would not hear him say "Christians of all denominations." The name Methodist designates, simply, those who have subscribed their Discipline and united with the church bearing that name. But the word Christian designates an entirely different class. It takes in many not included in the term Methodist.

In the same way, when you hear the Presbyterians speak of the truth, the Gospel, the doctrine of Christ, Christianity, etc., he does not mean Presbyterianism; for he does not claim that it is the truth, the Gospel, the doctrine of Christ itself, but a very wise system deduced from the Gospel, founded upon it, and that may he proved by it. Hence, he admits that persons may receive the truth, the Gospel, the doctrine of Christ, and be saved, who are not Presbyterians. When he speaks of Christians, disciples of Christ, saints, etc., he does not mean Presbyterians, as such, for he says "Christians, disciples, saints, etc., of all denominations." Hence, too, you hear all parties speak of "Christians, disciples, saints, etc., of every faith and order."

There is not a party with a human creed, beneath the skies, when it speaks of "the Church of Christ," that means simply those in its own communion, or its own body; they do not claim that they are the Church of Christ, but like it; sometimes identical with it, or as near like it as any other' nor is there one of these parties that claims that their doctrine is the doctrine of Christ, the Gospel, but deduced from it, founded upon it, and that can be proved by it. Hence, you

constantly hear them declaring with great earnestness that "we can prove *our* doctrine by Scripture." "We can sustain *our* doctrine by the truth of heaven." "I have proved *my* position by the unerring word of God." "I can prove my creed by the Bible," etc. Can any man fail to discover here the continual distinction made between *our* doctrine and the *Scripture? our* doctrine and the *truth of heaven? my* position and the unerring *word of God? my* creed and the *Bible?* This distinction runs through almost all the preaching and writings of our day. You will hear a continual stream about our doctrine, our creed, our church, our way, our views, our faith, our religion, as well as your doctrine, your creed, your church, etc.; and both *your* doctrine and *our doctrine, your* creed and *our* creed, *your* church and *our* church, must be sustained and well proved by Scripture. This, of course, will be the work of *your* preacher and *our* preacher. Here is a clear distinction made between three systems. 1. *Your* doctrine. 2. *Our* doctrine. 3. The *Scripture*. Here the continual concession is kept up, that your doctrine and our doctrine are not Scripture, but something we are trying to prove by Scripture.

Now, where is the necessity for all this? Did the Lord give us the truth, the Gospel, Christianity, the Scriptures, that we might deduce systems of our own from them, found them upon them, and prove them by the Scriptures? Surely not. But in all this there is a continual concession of a departure from the Lord; and we are just as well assured, as we are that God has revealed himself to man, that a return is indispensable to our acceptance with God. All these systems that they call "our systems," and doctrines that they call "our doctrines," that they are trying to prove by Scrip-true—no matter how near the Bible, or how far from it—are not the gracious system itself, given us by our glorious Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, but departures from it, but substitutes for it, and innovations, such as men can not maintain and appear guiltless before the Lord of hosts. The holy Apostle says, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is

profitable *for doctrine, (2* Tim. iii, 16.) He does not say "all Scripture is profitable to *prove* doctrine," but "is profitable *for* doctrine." The Scripture is the doctrine itself; not the mere proof-book to prove *our* doctrine. It is the truth itself, and not merely a book to refer to when we are trying to show that something else is true. While men talk about *their* doctrine, their creed, their church, their religion, their way, etc., etc., the great Master of Assemblies speaks of *his* doctrine, his religion, his truth, his Church, his people, his way, etc., and he demands the attention of all men to him, as the Way, the truth and the Life; and says, "no man cometh to the Father but by me." (John xiv, 6.) If men know what the truth is, what the doctrine of Christ is, what Christianity is, so that they can appeal to it to prove the*ir* doctrine, they know what it is so that they might receive it it*self,* enjoy it, and be saved by it, and consequently they will be left without excuse. There can be no apology for a man who knows what the truth is, what the doctrine of Christ is, what Christianity is, who will use it merely as a proof to sustain, prove, and impose something else upon himself and others, for he might just as easily have received the truth, the doctrine of Christ, Christianity itself, enjoyed it, and been saved by it, as to have trifled with it in trying to prove something else by it. But if a man does not know what the truth is, the doctrine of Christ, Christianity is, and adopts something else, he is simply guessing at it, and is not to be relied upon. He has no foundation.

We are as well convinced as we are that there is a glorious heaven for the righteous and a hell for the wicked, that no man now living, who knows what the Lord's truth is, what the Gospel of Christ is, what Christianity is, and what the Bible is, and has appealed to it to sustain something else, and now continues so to appeal to it, could, if his life were at stake, give a good reason why he did not receive the truth itself, the Gospel, Christianity, the Bible itself, rely upon it, as his only hope for life, his only guide, as the only Divine system, the only Divine institution, in the place of perverting

its glorious influence and power to sustain and prop up something else. And we are equally certain, that no man can answer to God, when the actions of all men shall be spread out in the last judgment, for such a course. If Christianity is a system, if it is a Divine institution, if it is the religion of Jesus Christ, if it is from God, and now binding upon the human family, as almost all the religious parties of these times admit, and as can not be denied, the sin of departing from it is great enough; but to have the assurance, to try to make it sanction any other system, to testify in support of any other, to try to divert its influence, power and authority from its own work, to sustain and prop up some human system not mentioned in it, when it has expressly, under the most fearful and awful penalty, forbidden any perversion, addition or subtraction, is a species of daring and aggression upon the institution of heaven and government of God, such as one would suppose no believer in the Bible would risk. Still it is done—almost daily done, in the pulpits all over the land; and those who will not do it, who condemn it, who receive the Bible, Christianity, the Gospel, the religion of Jesus Christ, all that God has revealed to man—all that has the name of God upon it, keep it distinct from everything else, and will have nothing more, are opposed everywhere, sneered at and branded as *heretics.* Be it so. We look not to man for reward. We look not to sectarian parties to honor God, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bible, Christianity, or the Gospel. We do not expect them, as parties, to come to the Bible, unless to draw support for their own schemes. But we regard not this; we know we are right; and it is not the great number that will stand, but those who are right. "Truth is mighty above all things, and will prevail." Brethren, push on the war, on this great question. The Bible will prevail in the end. Its enemies will all fall.

No. III.—THE MISSION OF INFIDELS.

IN our No. 2, under the above head, we showed the practical workings of unbelief, in its mission of destroying the work of righteousness and paralyzing the word of God, through the vain and empty pretences of Universalism. This led us into a field too inexhaustible for anything like a full elaboration in a single article. We, therefore, enter the same field again, with the following proposition:

Atheism furnishes all the rewards and punishments that Universalism does, and has all the incentives to a righteous life.

We, of course, are now speaking of that class of Universalists who deny any rewards and punishments after death, which comprises an overwhelming majority of all who wear the name. But though they deny any rewards or punishments after death, they say that they believe in rewards and punishments as firmly as any of their opposers, but they are all in this world. They believe in a hell for the wicked and a heaven for the righteous, but all in this world; they hold that the wicked shall not go unpunished—that every man shall receive according to his works, but he must receive it in this life. We call upon the Universalists to find this heaven for the righteous in this world. He commences expounding such passages as, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," "They who do his commandments shall enter by the gates into the city," "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life," etc.; and he finds the heaven, where the treasure is to be laid up, here in this world, precisely where the atheist finds his heaven, and the enjoyment of it to consist of the natural results of a correct life, such as a good name, the friendship of the world and worldly prosperity, such as would have been the result if Jesus had never lived nor died, and such as an atheist will admit to be a legiti-

mate result of a correct life. Such a religion as this has no God in it, no Savior, no Holy Spirit, no piety. But he proceeds to expound: "They who do his commandments shall enter by the gates into the city," etc. The city here, he says, is New Jerusalem, or the Church. The Church consists of all the children of God, and all men, he says, are the children of God. To be a human being is to be a child of God, and to be a child of God is to be in the Church or city, and the consciousness of having lived a correct life is the enjoyment of the holy city, New Jerusalem! Here again, the atheist gives him the right hand of fellowship, and says that he believes in this holy city and all its enjoyments, though he does not believe in the existence of a God. But our expositor proceeds: "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life," etc. The life spoken of here is in this world, and consists in the satisfaction a man feels in having done what he believes to be right. "This is the life you are seeking, is it?" says the atheist; "I believe in seeking this life too," says he.

In one word, all the reward a righteous man finds is not only confined to this life, according to this system, but it consists in the natural and legitimate results of a man's conduct. For instance: if a man is temperate he is apt to rest well, feel well, have a clear head, good appetite, and good health. If he speaks the truth, is honest in his business transactions, benevolent, moral and genteel, he enjoys the confidence of those who know him, has good credit, is loved and esteemed as a legitimate and philosophical result. This reward, as a general thing, we all admit, a man will receive. But all this would have been so if God had never loved man, if Jesus had never died, and if Christianity had never been preached. An atheist may believe in this class of rewards, and can consistently appeal to them as reasons for a righteous life. So can a Christian appeal to all the natural, legitimate and philosophical results, tendencies and advantages of a righteous life, as reasons for conformity to correct principles, with as much force as either, of them, and then rise transcendently

above them both and present the additional, superlatively grand and overwhelming reward promised to the good, the pure, and the holy, of an unperishable and eternal crown in the world to come.

But now we turn our attention to look for the punishment—the hell threatened for the wicked—according to this theory. It says, "I never denied that there is a hell, but then it is in this world." Well, where is it? "It is remorse of conscience. Well, an atheist believes in this hell. "Hell is the Valley of Hinom, where criminals were executed and their bodies consumed." Atheists believe all that. "Jerusalem was destroyed." Atheists believe that too. "Men who are immoral, corrupt and dissipated, bring disgrace upon themselves, subject themselves to fines and imprisonment." Atheists believe all that too. "But men who dissipate, degrade and abuse themselves, destroy their constitutions, impair their health, and become wrecks of humanity." ".Atheists believe all that and much more of the same kind. But Christianity admits that all calamities of these kinds have fallen upon men in this world; admits all the natural evils that follow, as legitimate or philosophical results; that they have resulted, and do result, from transgression, and urges them as a reason for a righteous life, with as much force and power as either of the parties mentioned, and then rises infinitely above them to the last resort for the incorrigible—the eternal punishment in the world to come.

We are perfectly aware that the unbelieving sophists to whom we refer tell the people that they do not believe in such long credit as the orthodox hold to; that they believe in the man being punished for his sins as he goes along. But what punishment do they believe in not admitted by all the orthodox, as they style their opposers? Do they believe in the lashing of conscience? All others believe in it, and certainly *feel it*, when they do wrong, as much as they. Do they believe that transgressors wilt be fined, imprisoned, or hung? All others believe it as much as they. Do they believe that transgressions will destroy character, bring pov-

erty and disgrace; that dissipation, corrupt habits and gluttony will destroy the physical man? All others believe it as much as they. DO they believe that all transgressions of physical laws are followed by certain fixed and unalterable penalties? All others believe in all these penalties, or more properly, consequences; that they are as severe, speedy and certain, as any Universalist; but the Universalist makes this *the hell, the only* hell of the Bible—the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels; while the Christian looks above all this to a judgment after death, followed by an eternal punishment and banishment from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power.

The mission of unbelief, in this direction, is

1. To force the Bible to agree with the atheist in theory, that a man's conduct in this life, no matter what it may be, can not destroy his happiness in another life.

2. That there shall be no reward in another world for virtue, righteousness and obedience rendered to God in this life.

3. That there shall be no punishments in the world to come for disobedience, corruption and crime committed in this life.

4. That the death of Christ amounts to nothing, as the consequences to sin all follow now, and fall upon man just as they did before he died.

5. That repentance amounts to nothing, as the punishment of sin is simply the natural result of a violation of a natural law, and must follow its violation whether you repent or not.

6. That there is no pardon of sin; that as you put your hand in the fire the burn must follow—as you spend your money, you must become poor—as you dissipate, your physical energies must be impaired; so, as you sin, in all cases the penalty must follow.

7. All this being conceded, the grace of God is at an end. There is no such an attribute as mercy in the government of Jehovah.

8. No love of God is manifested either in the life or death of Jesus, nor has his death produced any change in the world.

No Wonder that infidels hail this theory with joyfulness, flock around the Universalian preacher, and call him "brother." His operations are fatal to the Bible, to the mission and Divine authority of the Lord Jesus, and better calculated to turn the whole subject of religion into ridicule than any open infidelity" ever advocated in the world. By this kind of circumlocution, the Bible is now sought to be subverted and its influence upon the world destroyed. But all men of discernment can see that this is only a scheme to pull down and destroy—that it has no efficacy to save, to make good or improve mankind that it ,can do no good, in any event, to one soul of our race, either in this world or the world to come. It is only an instrument, one of the most effectual instruments of unbelief, in destroying all good, all virtue, and all piety.

No. VI.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

AMONG those religious structures founded upon human creeds, there is a kind of general understanding, viz: That as they all occupy a similar position, a similar foundation, and are about alike vulnerable, they will mutually concede to each other the right peaceably and unmolestedly to enjoy their positions. Hence, the main point of attack—the most vulnerable point—is not touched. The point we allude to is the unrighteous, untenable and arrogant assumption of *deficiency in the law of God, and that human creeds can supply this deficiency,* which is the foundation of every creed in the world. The great position we have taken, are maintaining and pushing throughout the land, is that all creeds are wrong and should be rejected, as rules of faith and practice, whether the doctrine contained in them is true or false. We reject a human creed as a rule of faith and practice, without looking into it, or regardless of the doctrine contained in it, whether true or false, because it *is a human creed.* We put them all upon a level here, put them all upon the defense, and demand of them before the holy law of God, and before God who gave that law, to give a strict account of themselves. If one of them stands up and says, "I contain nothing but true doctrine," we reply that the charge against you is not—the *main in*dictment is not—for containing, or preaching false doctrine, but for impiously impeaching, at least by implication, the law of God, in asserting that it is *insufficient,* and that you are a substitute *sufficient* to accomplish what it could not do, and thus attempting to set aside the law of God and occupy its place. This charge we maintain and can sustain against all human creeds, wherever used as authoritative rules of faith and practice. They assume the authority of the throne of the Lord, set aside the law of the

Great King, occupy the place of it, and demand the homage and submission due alone to the law of God.

This point all the parties founded upon a human creed glide over. This charge they never make. No one of them can make it, because all the balance would reply, "Physician, heal thyself." In this way, all being alike criminal on this point, there is a mutual agreement to let it alone, as all live alike in glass houses, it shall be the mutual understanding not to throw stones. They make some slight attacks upon 'each other, but not upon vital points, and consequently but few wounds are inflicted, or deaths caused. Their attacks upon each other are such as distillers make upon each other. They frequently allege against each other that, You do not make a good article of brandy—that we produce a better article, etc.; but in all these charges the admission is made that it is perfectly right to make the article, but it should be *a good article.* But the genuine temperance man approaches and takes a deeper hold on them. He assails them at another point that they kept entirely quiet about. He gives himself no trouble about what kind of an article they make. He cares nothing about the comparative merits of the article they make, but assails the business, without any regard to the article, whether good or bad, as a public nuisance, injurious and detrimental to all the great interests of society, and insists that the whole business should be thrown aside. He insists that the article they produce, whether what they call good or bad, is evil, and only evil continually, in all its tendencies. As a matter of course, they will all drop their frivolous disputes about the comparative merits of the article they produce, and unitedly meet the common assailant, who questions and denounces their entire operations, and seeks to have them set aside. In the same way, when we assailed the whole family of creeds, without any respect to their comparative merits, as a nuisance, injurious in all their tendencies, usurpers of the place of the law of God, destroyers of peace and union among Christians, and insisted that they should be rejected and set aside bodily, their adherents

ceased all their little disputes about the comparative merits of their creeds, and united against the common enemy, united and combined, with all the talent, learning and prejudice they can command, to stand up, defend and maintain, not the doctrine contained in their creeds, for in this there is but little agreement among them, but the *right to have a human creed at all of any description*. They maintain the right, and we deny it.

The issue is between the Bible and human creeds. We are for the Bible, they for creeds. Having thus far defined and defended our position, we proceed to notice some of the excuses, or apologies, for human creeds, as offered by their devotees.

Apology 1.— "It is not necessary to make such an incessant war upon our creed; it is just like the Bible; it is all Scriptural." In this case, admitting, for the sake of argument, What is not true of any human creed, that it is "just like the Bible," we reply, that it is useless, and will do no better than the Bible itself. If it is just like the Bible it will accomplish nothing more than the Bible, and be just as deficient. Nothing can be gained by it; nothing can be accomplished by it which the Bible itself could not accomplish, so that it must be utterly useless. In that case there can be no excuse for having it; not only so, but the person holding on to and contending for such a creed is inexcusable on another account. To give up a creed just like the Bible, and take the Bible itself as a rule of faith and practice, a man would lose nothing, for he would find all his creed in the Bible. We insist, therefore, that one of the most inexcusable, unreasonable and unjustifiable positions a man can occupy, is to hold on to, contend for, and insist that he can not do without a creed which he insists is just like the Bible, though he can have the Bible itself! The Bible will certainly accomplish all that any creed just like it can.

Apology 2.—"It is useless to be contending against our creed. It contains nothing that is not in the Bible. It is simply an abstract, epitome and abridgment of Bible doc-

trine, so arranged as to be convenient and show at a glance what we hold." This is quite a specious apology, and has succeeded in deluding, and deceiving many persons, and silencing their consciences, and is therefore more especially deserving of attention. This apology is dangerous, because it acknowledges that the creed contains and sets forth what the party believes—its faith. Now, we assert, without hesitation, that any man who believes no more than is set forth in any human creed on earth, and will do no more than any human creed requires, has neither faith nor obedience enough to be acceptable with God. There is not a human creed on earth that contains the *whole Christian faith*. Their, faith is too narrow. We have no confidence in epitomes, abstracts or abridgments of the faith. Nothing less than the faith, the whole faith of Christ, is sufficient to meet the Divine' approbation. No man's faith not as broad as the Bible is broad enough for us. His faith must contain Moses and Jesus, the prophets of the Old Testament and the Apostles of the New. There must be no abstracting, no epitomizing, no abridging. The man not willing to receive Christ, and the whole Christian faith, as God has set him and the faith forth in the Holy Scriptures is not a Christian, and had better make no pretense to Christianity. We do not wish a man to come describing how he *views every point of doctrine*, We do not desire him to come declaring that he receives Christ, as a Trinitarian or Unitarian, a Calvinist, or an Arminian, but to come with a contrite spirit, avowing it as the desire of the heart and his full determination to receive Christ with all his heart, as God has revealed him in the prophecies of the Old Testament and the apostolic preaching of the New.

The advocate of a human creed says he wants his creed to "show at a glance what we hold." Look over your creed, then, right carefully, and see *what you hold*, and look over the New Testament with the same care, and see what an amount it contains that *you do not hold*, or that is not in your creed, and you will see that your creed is not a respectable

skeleton—that it not only lacks the flesh, blood, muscles, arteries, veins, etc., of the body, but it lacks many of the bones, and, what is vastly more, it lacks the life, the soul, the spirit. If it contains *what you hold*, much as precious as any part of the Christian faith, and as binding as anything God has revealed, clearly and explicitly laid down in the New Testament, is not contained in what you hold at all. Much of as precious truth as is contained in the Bible, a vast amount as clear to the children of God as anything contained in the Christian faith, an immense deal as consoling to the dying saint as anything in the word of God, as any man who has ever looked must admit, is not found in any human creed. We say again, and can prove at almost any length, that there is not a human creed in the world that is a respectable skeleton, that is even a perceptible shadow of the Christian faith. Indeed, no creed appears to have been intended simply to set forth the *Christian faith.* It does not appear to be the object of any human creed to set forth the simple faith of Christ or Christianity. None of the creeds claim to be the *Christian faith, the Christian confession, Christian discipline, or Christian system*, but one is "The Philadelphia Confession," another "The Westminster Confession," and a third "The Methodist Discipline." The object of these books, and all of the same kind, appears to be more to set forth the views their authors had of certain points of doctrine, or their notion of these points, than to set forth the whole Christian faith itself. Their object is much more to show how the parties adopting them held certain points of doctrine, and to distinguish their views from some others, than to set forth the Christian faith. The creeds, then, are but little more than epitomes of men's views of certain points of Christian doctrine, their abridged understanding of these points. Now, the belief and reception of *men's views* of the Christian faith will not save any man, much less the belief and reception of the*ir views of a few points* of doctrine; but, to be saved, a man must believe and receive the Christian *faith—the whole Christian faith itself.*

No. I. The CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED.

The Presbyterian Board of Publication in Philadelphia has recently 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*, a short time since, of a tract of similar size, in return for the Doctor's kindness. To the Presbyterian Board of Publication, therefore, but especially to Rev. N. L. Rice, 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.

1. What is *Campbellism?* This has been a puzzling question. 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 what it is. It has been called a dangerous *heresy* and so many hideous warnings have been given against it, that the hair would almost stand upon a man's head to hear about it, and yet no one has told what it is. The reason no one has defined *Campbellism* is simply, that the*re is no such thing in existence,* except in the imagination of some misguided doctors. As near as any man can now come to what they mean by Campbellism, it is *Christianity itself,* unmixed, unadulterated, and without any other name. This is evident; for when they hear a man preach who preaches nothing but Christianity, nothing but Christ, simply aiming to convert men to him, and induce them to receive him as their only leader, they call it *Campbellism.* It is nothing but a nick-name they have given the Gospel to keep men from hearing it. In the same way, they call the preacher a *Campbellite* who will preach nothing but the Gospel, nothing but Christianity, to raise prejudice against him and prevent people from hearing him. In pre-

cisely the same spirit, here comes Rev. N. L. Rice, of heresy. hunting memory, in a tract of forty pages, against Campbellism, which the reader may think as he pleases about, but which is as much against the religion of Christ and those trying to receive it, practice it and maintain it, and it *alone,* as was in the power of Dr. Rice to make it, without in so many word saving so. 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 law of God, as the only rule of faith, without being called a Campbellite. and branded with preaching Campbellism. This is precisely what Dr. N. L. Rice has spent a large share of his life in opposing. This will be fully developed in the following pages. The first point of contrast between him and those he opposes, or the Disciples of Christ, as here instituted, is that they think that Christianity itself, as the Lord gave it, sufficient that to receive it in all its fulness, be a *Christian in* the Bible sense, governed by the law of God alone, is sufficient. This the Doctor opposes, and insists upon sundry human appendages, as will be seen. Here is the real issue.

2. On page 1, the Doctor says, "It was 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 offense. Here is the issue, as stated by himself: The Disciples proposing to reform the Church throughout the world, but Dr. Rice opposing it. Strange 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.

3. He quotes from the *Millennial Harbinger,* Vol. III, p. 362, the following question and answer: "And what of the apostasy—do you place all the sects in the apostasy? Yes, all religious sects who have any human bond of union, all who rally under any article of confederation other titan 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 amounts to nothing—or rather it is necessary to have a "human bond of union," "articles of confederation other than the Apostles' doctrine," and "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 apostasy, if having a *human, in* the place of a *Divine* bond of union, other articles of confederation than the Apostles' doctrine, and refusing to yield 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* bond of union, in accomplishing what it could not do without the *human!* The Disciples oppose all articles of confederation other than the Apostles' doctrine. The Doctor maintains other articles of confederation than the Apostles' 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.

3. 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 his Apostles effected a radical reformation! They certainly never effected any reformation in the Jewish Church, for it instigated the crucifixion of Christ and persecuted the Apostles till its overthrow. The "*one new* man," or Church, which the Lord made of the twain, of which he said, "Upon this rock I *will* build my Church," had not apostatized so as to demand a radical reformation in the Apostles' time. It did not during this period adopt any "human bond of union, any articles of confederation other than the Apostles' doctrine, nor refuse to yield all homage to the ancient "order of things," and consequently had not become an apostate

Church. Christ and the Apostles never effected, nor tried to effect a radical reformation in any Church. They let the old apostate Church, as the Lord accused them of, keeping doctrines and commandments of men, and disobeying the law of God, go, as beyond the reach of reformation, and built a Church upon Christ, the rock, laid of God, for a holy temple—a habitation for the Lord through the Holy Spirit.

4. 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 the rule of faith." But he says, "Mr. Campbell undertook a radical reformation among those who took the Bible as their only faith and practice." This statement is made upon page 2, and he only proceeds to page 7, where he gives as one of the two principles upon 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 produce a radical reformation by inducing them to "reject all creeds, and unite upon the Bible *alone.* 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 upon their only rule of faith and practice—the *Bible alone!*

Why did not the Doctor say that Luther, Calvin, etc., "effected a glorious reformation *in the Church,"* as he said Christ and the Apostles did? He says Christ and the Apostles effected a reformation *in the church,* but when he gives an account of Luther's reformation, he leaves out the words, "in the Church." He knows how to look out for the danger. With him, Christ did not build a Church, establish a new building, or make "a new man," a new Church, but merely reformed an *old Church.* But he saw that it would look ridiculous to speak of Luther effecting a glorious reformation in *the Church* that he came out of, separated from, that

never was and never will be reformed. Luther and Calvin found many opposers in effecting this glorious reformation, 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.

5. 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 have a brief notice in the same order in which they are stated.

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 these points have been maintained with as much zeal and pertinacity by all Baptists as they ever were by Mr. Campbell. He had no new advantage in advocating these points. The Baptists had always had the same advantage, but had not been able to make so good a defense on these great points. But it is entirely natural that Dr. Rice should think of these points, when he mentions Mr. Campbell. He tried him on these questions, and is aware of the force his noble energies world have on the public mind. Why does not Dr. Rice gain large numbers to the Presbyterian Church by maintaining infant baptism and opposing immersion? He has 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 immersion and opposing sprinkling, but in no remarkable success on the opposite side! How is this? It is a clear matter to a man who candidly reflects. It is 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 and commented upon by a man of Mr. Campbell's ability, must, in the very nature of things," make headway among all classes of opposers. It is also

known that immersion is admitted to be *valid* baptism by all men of all parties of any considerable degree of respectability, and that sprinkling or pouring, for baptism, is "not mentioned or even hinted at in the Bible, or any book written in two hundred years after the birth of Christ, and has been held in dispute and doubt by a large number of learned and pious men ever since introduced. It is known, too, that every Greek lexicon in the world defines *baptizo* immerse, or something equivalent. When this is shown and commented upon by a man of Mr. Campbell's ability, with the expressions of the common version, such as "went down into the water," "came up out of the water," "baptized in Jordan," "baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there," "baptized in the river of Jordan," "buried in baptism," and "planted together," it must tell upon the minds of candid men. Success must attend the effort; but the most that can be done in the opposition is to retard; no remarkable success is expected.

2. The Doctor's second reason for this "remarkable success of this movement 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 the success of this movement, as the sacred doctrine of union enforced by the authority of the Almighty, not that "misled many well meaning people," but *led them rightly,* into one fold, under the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls. It was the holy prayer of our Lord and Savior, that believers should be one, as he and his Father are one, not that "misled so many well meaning people," but *led them rightly,* to unite upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone, under the "faith once delivered to the saints." It was the divine mandate of the Holy Spirit, speaking through Paul, with all the authority of the eternal throne, beseeching them in 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 "misled so many well meaning people," but *led them rightly,* to unite upon the law of God, under the name which the Lord gave his people, discarding all human laws and names. This righteous appeal, from these premises, not only reached the "well meaning," but the *good,* those who love God and his people, and was a mighty means, under God, in leading them to discard the' silly and unlearned disputes of the clergy, and unite under Christ, and this holy Sentiment and requirement of the Spirit of God, and the prayer of Jesus, is what Dr. Rice not only resists, but teaches men to resist, and fights against with every power of his soul, The Disciples are laboring and praying for this union, and he 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. The way of becoming a Christian proposed by Mr. Campbell, or the way in which persons became Christians, under the teaching of the Apostles, was extremely simple and easy; and what was in its favor more than any other system ever approved by Dr. Rice was that it never failed to make, a *Christian,* and made something else with another name. The prophet, looking down through more than seven centuries at this system, said the "way shall be so plain that the wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein." The Lord said of it, "They who seek shall find." In divine encouragement, he said to those whom he would invite, "My yoke is easy and my burden light;" and at the close of the holy volume, he says: "Whosoever 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 on the day the Lord was seated

upon the throne, and sent forth the Spirit to guide the Apostles into all truth, on hearing the first announcement of the Gospel from their infallible utterance, three thousand inquired the way, and, without a single exception, found it. Not one of them went from the place seeking, or was put off till another day. This never could have been the case without clearer instructions than Dr. Rice ever gave seekers. Not a single case is mentioned upon 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, and on the same day on which they came in contact. All the tedious process, such as that called confirmation, that at the anxious seat, or mourner's bench, which result in keeping people seeking, mourning, agonizing and grieving for weeks, months and years, in the midst of doubts, sometimes driven into despair, or insanity, are as unscriptural as Romish penance, and as unreasonable as unevangelical or unscriptural. Who could have believed that the holy, the plain, the easy and infallible way of the Lord should be spoken against, on account of the very fact that should commend it to our respect, viz.; *that it is adapted to the whole people and made accessible to them*, and not like some of these blind systems that keep men groping in the dark! But simple and easy as the way of the Lord is, it made Christians anciently and does the same now, and nothing else. It 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. But Dr. Rice is one of the last men who should ridicule any system about an *easy way*. The easiest way yet heard of, is to sprinkle a few drops of water upon the face of an unconscious infant, in the name of the Trinity, without any faith, any 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 to deceive people into the belief that they are in the Church of Christ, when they are not; to introduce them

into the Presbyterian Church; to deceive them when they come to" the years of responsibility, making them believe that that has been done for them, which none but themselves can do—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, conversion, or any knowledge what it is. This "easy way" has involved more people 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 doctrine in the world 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 unmeaning ceremony performed upon them, into it as possible. How can a man who thus "draws" unconscious infants into a Church, before they know there is a Church, a Holy Spirit, a Redeemer, or even a Deity, have the assurance to speak of men *drawing"* well meaning persons into a movement, when they make their appeal openly and to the intelligence of those who have attained to the years of accountability? Those operating through a mother, already in the Church, as deeply prejudiced and misguided as the preacher, to "draw" infants into the Church, before they know anything, are the persons who "draw," not "well meaning," but infants without *meaning*, into the Church, and who have the *easy way.* This honor no man taketh to himself more than Dr. N. L. Rice.

4. The Doctor's fourth reason 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 an abiding sting, which Dr. Rice feels

sensibly to this day, seeming only to increase in intensity in the place 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, seems destined to signalize himself in defense of the traditions handed down, and being so constituted that he can learn nothing, and feel the force of no reason till public sentiment forces him, he receives many severe cuts that a little prudence would have relieved him from. Whether Mr. Campbell applied the rod too severely is a question of but little importance now; but if Dr. Rice is anything like a fair exponent of the clergy, and his temper, spirit and general bearing represents 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, wherever success has attended the effort, by the numerous houses of worship built, the institutions of learning erected, the preachers supported, contributions to the Bible Union and other good works. Who were they that left other religious bodies and united upon 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 several States, in the last 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 place else.

5. The Doctor 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 reason amounts to nothing. The Disciples stand upon the primitive practice, and will maintain it though it should give a rapid increase. They are willing to throw all the restrictions found in the New Testament around preachers and preaching, but no others. But the truth is, the Doctor is under a grand mistake about it being

so easy 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 of blows from every direction—from the atheist, infidels, Universalist, and through all the ranks of sectarian partisans. He has not 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, exhorting them to repent of their sins, turn to God, and personally seek the salvation of their souls. He has never tried this yet; but if he does, he will find it a different work from persuading mothers, who belong to his Church, and are already under his influence, to bring their infants to be sprinkled, and that it will require a different kind of talent, Many men, with a little literature, whether regenerated or not, can read sermons, say prayers, hear an organ and sprinkle infants, who never could convert a soul to Christ, or build up a saint in the most holy faith. 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 upon the efforts of the ministry, appealing to the judgments and to the hearts of those capable of thinking and acting for themselves, inducing them to repent, believe, and turn to God, in person, and *yield themselves* to the obedience of faith. The easy ministry is that which operates upon infants, *drawing them in* before they think or know anything about it. Such are the Doctor's five reasons for the remarkable success of this movement.

6. 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: First, the rejection of creeds and union upon the Bible alone, second, asking but one question of candidates for baptism, whether they believe Jesus Christ to be the Messiah." Dr. Rice appears so averse to what is right, so determinedly, perpetually and inevitably disposed to the wrong, that if there is any wrong way in his reach to state a thing, he is

certain to find it. Both the points here stated as laying at the bottom 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 they could be in the same number of words. He, as a matter of course, places the point, which naturally and scripturally comes first, last. He has so long been in the habit of preaching Church polity to men of the world to convert them, or so addicted to presenting and preaching his creed, that they may give their assent to it and be converted 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 the structure of Christianity than in this. If there is anything clear in Christianity, or in the evangelical procedure set forth in the New Testament, 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 the primitive evangelists of Christ, is as wide as heaven and earth. They went out with hearts overflowing with the love of Christ, with minds overwhelmed with the glories of him whom they were sent to preach, who was lifted up to draw all men to him. They gloried in him, preached him, and labored to convert men to him, and induce them 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 Christ is 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, for 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 tells 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, doctrine and ministry. In this case, as a matter of course, it is necessary to ask many questions, take the applicant through a rigorous examination, to know whether there is soundness in the intricate matters of an unintelligible catalogue of doctrines, many of which the preachers themselves never did and never can understand or agree upon. 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, and 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; or, in other words, he receives the whole system and takes its obligations upon him, when he confesses and receives Him who is the head of it. But this, as a matter 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 ancient evangelist received those who confessed and submitted to Christ; Dr. Rice receives two classes, viz.: First, those who receive Presbyterianism, as set forth by the ministry and the Confession; second, those unconscious infants brought to him that he may sprinkle water upon their faces in the name of the Lord, who never answered even "one question," or had one thought upon the subject. What do these know about the doctrine of the Church 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 of Faith, 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 members know no more of their entrance into the Church, and

had no more to do in it than they know of and had to do in entering this world, would oppose and ridicule the precise practice of the holy Apostles and first evangelists of Jesus Christ, because they simply labored to save men—to convert men to their Lord and Master—receive them when they would confess and receive him! He also would sneer at and prejudice all men, if it were in his power, against all those who now insist that we must preach precisely what the Apostles preached no more, no less; those become his now must believe precisely what those who believed who were converted under the Apostles' preaching, and that converts now must make precisely the same confession they did then and render the same obedience. This he opposes with every power, and would improve upon the wisdom of the infallible Spirit that guided the Apostles and first evangelists, by adopting a few of the appendages devised by Presbyterian *divines!*

7. The rejection of all creeds all *human* creeds—and union upon the Bible, the *Divine* rule, and the *only Divine* rule. What Mr. Wesley calls the "sufficient and the only infallible rule both for faith and practice," the Doctor thinks a most dangerous and ruinous step. He then proceeds to make war upon those receiving the Bible as their only rule of faith, and presents the following proposition: "*The body possesses no unity or faith, but errors of every shade find a home in it."* He then sets out with almost the zeal and madness of young Saul on his way to Damascus, hunting heresy. But there is one thing which 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 do commit blunders, they are not in the rule of faith bound upon the Disciples. But Dr. Rice and his preaching brethren commit as many blunders and show as many imperfections as other men, and have a creed abounding in errors, bound upon them and all their brethren into the bargain. Let us open the Confession, almost at random, and see what will turn up. See the following: "By

the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestined and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be increased or diminished."-*Con*. p. 23. Now, granting the truth of this, the conduct of men in this life has no more to do with eternal life than the volition of an infant has to do in its baptism or initiation into the Church. The predestination and foreordination of God, and not the action of men or angels, fixes immutably their eternal state, whether it be life or death, and all the preaching, prayers, tears and repentance of all the men in this universe can not 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. Now, if the officers in the Presbyterian Church had claimed the keys of that Church, 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 "remit and retain sins," will not be believed by well informed people. The Presbyterian Church is not "the kingdom of heaven," the door of it is not the door of the kingdom of heaven, and the keys to. it are not the keys to the kingdom of heaven. This same book, notwithstanding all Dr. Rice's noise about the heathen, teaches that they can not be saved. It says: "They who having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, can not 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. But since Dr. Rice speaks of "all sorts of doctrines," he shall rest a little from this lesson in the Confession and hear John Calvin. Calvin says: "And therefore even infants 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; even their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin, and therefore can not but be odious and abominable to God.—*Institutes,* vol. ii, p. 483. What if these sinful infants die? The Confession answers: "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 and most influential men they "have ever had in this country have strayed to, with all their synods, presbyters and learned ministers aided by the Confession! Look at the Beechers, disciplined in Presbyterianism, and their minds confused with the perplexing and unintelligible questions that form the main features in the system. Where is it leading these to? Look at Finney, who was one of the most distinguished men in the Presbyterian Church. What does he now think of it? Let us hear him speak of these wise presbyters and synods. 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 his spirit upon such a contentious body."

This is the language of a man who was well acquainted with this 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 Presbyterians developed the wisdom, prudence and necessity of having a *human* creed to accomplish what the law of God could not 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 the Bible-alone position, and come under the Presbyterian Confession?

The truth is, Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell, being both perplexed, in their younger days, with the unintelligible language of Presbyterianism, involved in its perplexing disputes, but brought up in different countries, ran considerably apart on some points; but when they resolved to relinquish all unscriptural doctrine, and even unscriptural style, and give supreme honor to Christ, they united without regard to differences of opinion. After this the difference vanished, and the fruitless disputes of their younger days disappeared to a great extent; and that Barton W. Stone honored our Lord Jesus Christ more than Dr. N. L. Rice ever did, is susceptible of the clearest proof, though he refers to him as contemptibly as if he had been an atheist. But he knew what was in Presbyterianism, and so did Alexander Campbell, and both renounced it for the Bible as their only rule of faith, of which they 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 in 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 look upon the Bible as their only rule of faith and unite upon it, but it will amount to nothing at last, for every man must be as conscious as that

he is a living being, that if the man who honestly reads the Bible to know his duty, or the will of God, and does it to the best of his ability, praying daily for the Divine "aid, both in understanding and doing, is not safes infallibly safe and right, no man in this world is safe. Suppose, for the sake of the case, the step in receiving Brother Raines, with the 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 upon the position. It is manifest enough that those who hold Universalism do not hold it as an opinion, but make it the prime article in their faith. But Brother Raines, true to his position 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. Indeed, Dr. Rice holds and maintains, with the utmost pertinacity, the main error of Univer-salism, 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 a man can do in this life can in any way affect his condition in the eternal state, that before the world, God, by an immutable decree, determined the precise number and persons to be saved and lost; and, according to this, all the Bibles, missionaries, preaching, praying, with all other efforts, has never saved one soul, and all the sin on earth has never damned one. Such is the position of the man, such the absurdities in which he is involved, who would ridicule the effort of all sincere and good men who are trying to escape from the delusions of this age, and return to pure Christianity as it came from heaven, men who believe and maintain all that is Divine, all that is from heaven, and escape all that is human. Can men lead the people astray by insisting upon their adhering strictly to the law of God, the whole of the law of God, uniting upon it, living in peace and love? Let the Lord reign. Let his law be the supreme authority. The Bible is right, if anything is right. All led by it are led rightly; all under its influence

are under proper influence; all opposed to it are wrong—all the way wrong. Dr. Rice stands in the opposition, and there we must leave him for another month, when we shall finish his pamphlet.

No. VII.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

WE closed our article under this head last month in considering some of the common apologies offered for maintaining and holding on to human creeds. In that article, we considered Apologies 1 and 2—in this we proceed to

Apology 3. One of the most common excuses offered for human creeds is that, "We want something to keep us together—something to binds us in union." This apology is based, virtually, upon the same two preposterous assumptions we have before mentioned. It assumes, with great apparent innocence, that the Bible can not keep us together, that it can not bind us in union. Then it assumes, with much modesty, that a human creed *can* keep us together—bind us in *union—can do* what the Bible *can not do.* This, it appears to us, should startle any good man at once. These assumptions are arrogant in the extreme, and not only arrogant but made without any regard to facts. Do human creeds keep Churches together? We assert, fearless of successful contradiction, that the whole history of human creeds proves that they do not keep Churches together. Let us take one look at three of the most popular creeds in this country, and see what they have done in keeping Churches together. How has the Baptist creed succeeded? Has it kept the Baptists together? By no means. From the one original Baptist stock we have now not less than nine or ten parties of Baptists. How has the Presbyterian creed succeeded in keeping its adherents together? It is thought to be a very wise and powerful document. Has it kept Presbyterians together? It has succeeded no better than the Baptist creed. With all its adhesive power. Presbyterians, within the last century, have sundered into some eight parties. This needs no com-

mentary. How has the Methodist Discipline succeeded? It is itself nothing but an offshoot of the Episcopalian creed, which did not prevent the Methodists from stranding off from the Established Church. The Discipline has not been in operation more than one hundred and twenty years. How has it succeeded in keeping Methodists together during that period? During that time Methodism bas stranded into some eight or ten fragments. What a comment this furnishes upon the efficacy of human creeds to cement together. Other creeds have clone no better; and yet, in the face of all this, men want human creeds to *keep them together!*

But now we lay along side of this another fact. While the inspired Apostles were in the Church; while the Holy Spirit, not merely as a Comforter, as he is and has always been in the Church, but inspiring men, delivering revelations through them, performing miracles to confirm them, and displaying many spiritual gifts, the Church had no creed but the law of God. Nor did they have any other creed for more than two hundred years, in the days of the Church's greatest prosperity, her greatest unity and greatest glory, than the word of God. Nor did they, while there was no creed but the law of God; have but one Church, or one order. Not only so, but we are not aware that the Church ever did divide, where there was no law, no rule of faith, no creed but the Bible. We do not doubt but that trivial factions took place in individual congregations, but anything like a general division in the whole body, resulting in two distinct orders or denominations from the time of the division forward, has never taken place, that we are aware of, where they had no creed but the Bible. All history shows, beyond all dispute, that wherever human creeds have prevailed, divisions have abounded, partyism has increased, and unity has been diminished. But where the people had confidence in the Bible, the law of God, the *"perfect* law of liberty," union has more widely extended, and peace has more generally prevailed. Why, then, in the name of reason, hold on to human creeds

to keep Churches together, when they have so universally failed, and refuse the Bible, which has never failed?

Apology 4.– "We simply want our creed to distinguish us from other denominations. How could we understand and discriminate between our doctrine and the doctrine of Other denominations, if our doctrine were not set forth definitely in a creed?" But why do you wish to distinguish between yourselves and other Christians? The very circumstance of keeping up these distinctions and perpetuating divisions, which we know is the work of human creeds, is a strong argument against them. No distinctions in doctrine should be kept up among the people of God; and the apology we are considering admits that these distinctions would be lost sight of, if we had no human creeds. If we had no creeds but the Bible, we would have nothing to believe but the Bible, and nothing else to describe our faith, and, as a matter of course, would have no faith but Bible faith. We would have no names but Bible names, no doctrine but Bible doctrine, no churches but Christian churches, and no law but the law of God. We would have no authority but the authority of God. The submission would be to him, and not to man. Men would trust in him, rely upon him, and honor him, and not trust in, rely upon and honor some human contrivance, and forget him. It is no honor to any Christian man to distinguish his doctrine from that of some other man, or even to show that he is more orthodox than another; but it is an honor to any man to distinguish his Savior from every other teacher or head in the universe, and to distinguish his doctrine from every other doctrine, and hold on to him and his doctrine with the utmost pertinacity. This, too, is easily done, if any man will set himself about the work. There is no teacher like him, or that a man may mistake for him; nor is there any head of Church or State that bears the least similitude to him. The main body of clerical teachers, the great bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and the pope are as unlike him as heaven and earth. No one acquainted with his character, as delineated

upon the pages of the New Testament, would ever mistake the pope or a vast majority of the clergy for him, or their works for his. Nor would any man acquainted with his doctrine, as set forth by his Apostles, mistake any of the other doctrines of these times for his. There is not a sufficient similitude to lead to any such mistake on the part of any man who is on the lookout, or, as the Lord commanded, is *watching*. There is, therefore, no excuse for keeping creeds to enable parties to recognize distinctions between parties, for the very recognition of these distinctions is an assistant in keeping up partyism, and a mighty hindrance to the union for which our Lord prayed.

Apology 5.— Why assail our creed? We do not receive nor expel members by the creed. Many of our members never saw it." In such cases as this, and there are many of them, we admit the creed does but little harm compared with one in lively operation and full force. But the reason of its doing less harm is, that in such a case they are approaching what we are pleading for. A creed partially dead is not as bad as one fully alive. But still, in such a case as mentioned in this apology, the idea is kept up that we have a creed, and it contains *our doctrine*. It is true one who never saw his creed, as a matter of course, does not know what is contained in it, or does not know what his own doctrine is, and really does not know whether he believes it or not. But still, when his mind reverts to his doctrine it turns to his creed. Thus the creed, though he never saw it, calls his attention when he does happen to reflect upon religion, and diverts it from the Bible. In the place of having it fixed in his mind that his doctrine is in the Bible, that when he would examine it he should go to his Bible, the preposterous idea is settled in his mind that his doctrine is in his creed, which he never saw, and if he would consult it he must go to the creed.

But we ask any man, in the name of common sense, what use a creed can be which is not read in the church, which many of the members never saw, and which is used in

no way in the church or private families? The faith of a Church should not be laid away in a creed in some safe drawer, but should be alive in the hearts of the members, producing fruits of righteousness. What strange freaks we rind in the religious world! There are thousands of people in this country who never saw their creed, the book containing their own articles of faith, their own faith and order; who have taken so little interest in it that they have never tried to see it, nor to get to read one line in it, and who, of course, know nothing about what is contained in it; but who will be offended in one moment, when we tell them that their creed is useless. And yet what man of understanding can fail to see that in all such cases the Koran, the Book of Mormon, or a last year's almanac, would have done just as well! How strange, too, in all the creed-making assemblies the utmost pertinacity is seen to have every word exactly so. The doctrine must be expressed in just so many and just such words, without the omission of the cross of a t or the dot of an i. When this system of doctrine is complete, it must be sacredly regarded and defended. But how many of the members ever know anything about it? What proportion of them can ever be said to believe it? Not one in fifty of all in the parties now under the domination of human creeds. The people in general have never read their own creeds, and have never heard them read, except some particular portions of them. They do not know, and are not the worse for it, what is contained in them. But still they can not do without their creed! They would be ruined to set it aside! We should like to. know wherein? That creed, that they never read, of the contents of which they know nothing, did not make them Christians. Faith in that creed did not convert them, or bring them to God. If they are Christians at all, faith in God, in the Redeemer and Savior of men, in the word of God, in the Gospel of Christ, has made them such, and to God and the word of his grace, they should commit themselves, their everlasting trust, and not allow themselves to be divided by human creeds.

No. II.—THE CONTRAST FAIRLY STATED.

ON page 8, the Doctor 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 willful misstatements 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; nor is there any body of people in the world among whom errors of every shade find so little repose, or are so far from finding a home. Every preacher and writer is entirely free and untrammeled, with the most perfect liberty to attack, assail, expose and refute every error of 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 obligation to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints"—to "preach the word"—"preach Christ"—to "make known nothing but Christ and him crucified"—to "glory in nothing but the Cross"—to "stop the mouths of gainsayers" and "put to silence the foolishness of ignorant men." Not only so, but every private 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 a Christian. Every man among the Disciples that oversteps the bounds of the doctrine of Christ, or steps 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 hand 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 for 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 not only is a home for some of the worst errors in the world, but these errors are canonized, sanctioned and maintained by the highest ecclesiastical authority in his 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 fatal Calvinism, and others, as the Beechers, like wandering Stars, seeking an escape from Calvinism, in Unitarianism, or pre-existence, or transmigration of souls. Look to the disputes of Dr. Wilson, of Finney, and many others, within the last thirty years; and the later disputes on Slavery, of which the debate between Dr. N. L. Rice and Blanchard is a fair illustration, 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 upon the frailties of human nature, or the 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 works 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 where Disciples have been preaching the word of God! They have entered communities where the people were divided into parties and commenced preaching peace by Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all, and collected men from all these parties, united them upon the foundation of Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone—seated them down together in heavenly places in Christ, having destroyed the enmity that was between them and made them one. This is the work that troubles Dr. Rice.

On page 14, Dr. Rice proceeds to speak of "some of the acknowledged evils of the system." Here we find pettifogging in abundance. Here the Doctor enters his old trade of *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. As a matter of course, the errors in practice, in the estimation of a deceived man, or one who would deceive others, are to be made an objection to the system itself. So sophistry teaches, so sophistical doctors think, or at least would make others think. The logic is this: Some men, who have received Christianity as their only system, Mr. Campbell acknowledges, have failed to teach and practice it correctly; therefore, there are acknowledged evils in the system. Dr. Rice may extend his reasoning still more widely. By the same sophistry, the same ,system might have been condemned in Paul's time. He confessed that there was. division in the Church at Corinth—that a corrupt man had his father's wife—that brethren went to law with brethren—that the Lord's Supper was turned into a pagan feast, and that many in that Church denied the resurrection of the dead. Some enemy heads an article, "Acknowledged Evils of the System," and then 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. Look here! exclaims our pettifogger, what a list of "acknowledged evils" I have collected from Paul's own pen. This same sophistry is used by infidels against the holy religion of our Lord and Savior. They point us to the defections, unloveliness and perverseness of such men as Dr. Rice—to their bitterness of spirit, proneness to misrepresentation, selfish and partisan course, and make such men an objection to the religion of Christ and to the Christian ministry. The only reply that can be 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; man practices it, or *professes* to practice it, but sometimes come far short. His failure in the practice, in the place of being an "acknowledged evil in the system," is only an evil *in the man, a* departure from the system. The wayward course of such unlovely, opposing and averse men, under a profession of religion, or in the ministry, is no evidence against the system, religion, or the ministry, but an evidence of the weakness and imperfection of such men. They would be perverse under any system. They are not exponents of the religion they profess, nor the system they have adopted. The system is not to be judged by the men, but the men must be judged by the system.

"The system examined and its errors exposed," is the next head. Under this head, the Doctor attacks, demolishes, kills and buries "Baptismal Regeneration." If he only could 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 doctrine of baptismal regeneration; but still, if we could believe him, it is alive, and efforts must be made to kill it. Now that Dr. N.L. Rice knows that the Disciples no more believe in baptismal regeneration than he does, is just as certain as that he is a man of common sense. But, since he is haunted with baptismal regeneration, and determined 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 canceled, 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. 2, p. 477.

"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 preposterous 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. 2, p. 478.

Here is baptism, not only for past but future sins, and baptism, by implication, a "remedy or expiation" for sins. But let the Doctor 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 the want of considering that the power of the keys of which they speak, is so dependent on baptism that it can

not by any means be separated, from it."—*Calvin's Institutes,* vol. 2, p. 479.

Commenting upon 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. 2, p. 480. On the same page, he 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 on 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 "remission of sins, or absolution." But Dr. Rice must be well instructed by his venerable father Calvin 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 proceeded." Still further, same page, he says: "For who will attend to Chrysostom, 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 can not but be odious and abominable to God. By baptism, believers are certified that this condetonation 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. 2, p. 483. Hear Calvin again: "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, page 488, he says: "By baptism, God promises remission of sins, and will certainly fulfill 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 our unbelief; now, then, let us receive it by faith." Please hear Calvin yet again: "The virtue, dignity, utility and end of this ministry, 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 man. For, as though it were a contemptible thing to be baptized in water according to the precept of Christ, men have invented a benediction, or rather incantation, to pollute the true consecration of the *water."—Institutes,* vol. 2, p. 490. Be not surprised at the

mention of being "baptized *in water,"* here, 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."

But to dose up 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 no 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 there 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 then 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 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 no wise 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. 2, p. 508.

Now, if the Doctor 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, and 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 his Church until 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 following from 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 nacre-hers 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 these infants, who die out of the visible Church? Let the following answer: "They who have never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, can not be saved.—*Conf.*, p. 208. If we would be certain in regard to all children—those not in the Church, with the whole pagan world—look at the fol lowing: "The visible Church is a society made up of all such as in all ages and places of the world do profess the true religion, and of their children."—*Conf.*, 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, arc regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, 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 these infants of parents not members of the true Church, who are here decided out of the body, of whom Christ is not the Savior? Dr. Rice says "none of these die in infancy." No matter when they die; they always were non-elect, always will be, and can not be saved, for they never had a Savior! Here we have, not "all sorts of doctrine," for then we should find some good, but some of the most pernicious doctrine, not only of water regeneration, regeneration of elect infants, but of infants without a Savior! Not simply preached by some ignorant and irresponsible preacher, but put forth and bound upon the unenlightened by a learned and powerful tribunal of Presbyterian *divines! N*or is this even a tithe of the preposterous absurdities contained in this book.

Would it not be a brilliant move for the Disciples to yield the Scripture 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 born, 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 can not see the kingdom of God—that ye must be born again—that if thou shalt believe in thine heart that God raised our Lord from the dead, and confess with thy mouth, thou shalt be saved—that to whomsoever a man *yields himself* a servant to obey, his servant he is—to yield the doctrine of personal submission to Christ, in personal confession, with th*e whole heart*, in personal and willing obedience, under the Divine influence of a previous change and purification of the heart by faith, in which the entire being bows to the authority of the Great King, for an empty, lifeless, spiritless system of infant regeneration, baptism and membership, in which the subject has no will, no heart, does not yield to

God, and about which it has no more personal knowledge than it has of being born into the world? No, Doctor; while the Disciples believe there is a God, a glorious Savior, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead 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 recollect their confession of the name of Jesus, and the solemn covenant into which they entered with him, voluntarily, in penitence, trembling and tears, dare they, can they, yield for the poor, empty and unmeaning ceremony of infant church-member-ship? 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 of heaven, a holy impulse, act or thought not held by the Disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know, or might know, if you would inform yourself, that if all the truth held by the Disciples were stricken out of your Church, that not one scrap of anything Divine would remain in it. What is the meaning, then, of your warning, other than the struggle of a determined partisan to maintain a system that can not stand the test of Gospel light and truth?

Dr. Rice 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," p. 30. Now, if Dr. Rice does not know that Mr. Campbell does not deny, but has always admitted and asserted the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, he is certainly much more blinded by determined partisan zeal than even the most enlightened thought possible. The very first quotation he makes to prove that Mr. Campbell denies the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, 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 and sanctifying power, or influence, for Mr. Campbell con-

stantly attested that he does put forth this influence; but whether he puts it forth th*rough his word, or abstractly from* it. Mr. Campbell asserts that the Holy Spirit puts forth power, or influence, in conversion and sanctification, in the following quotation, made and italicised by Dr. Rice: "As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas, so the Spirit of God puts forth :d] its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas." This expression of Mr. Campbell, asserting that the Holy Spirit puts forth power in converting and sanctifying, is quoted by Dr. Rice to prove that Mr. Campbell denies the power, or influence, of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification! As if to show his blindness and stupidity more fully, he quotes the following from Mr. Campbell to prove the same thing: "We plead that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine Word." Here Mr. Campbell is speaking of the "converting power of the Holy Spirit," and how it is exhibited, in the very words quoted by Dr. Rice to prove that he denies the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification! The Holy Spirit not only *influences* men in their conversion and sanctification, but all converted and brought to God, are *converted by the Holy Spirit.* By one Spirit are they all baptized into. one body. The Holy Spirit as certainly puts forth his influence, exercises his power, and the work of regeneration and sanctification is done by him, and is as much his, though he does it through the word of truth, the ministry, ordinances, and acts of obedience, as' if he had done the same work without the use of any instrumentalities. Dr. Rice has been challenged for ten years, and so have all who believe with film, to produce an instance where the Holy Spirit has converted and sanctified one person in the absence of the Gospel, declared by Paul to be, "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" hut an instance of this kind neither he nor any man has or ever can produce. But instances numerous are recorded upon the sacred pages, where men were converted by

the power of the Spirit of God put forth through the Gospel. The Holy Spirit of God now puts forth his influence through the Gospel and the ministry, his divinely chosen means, and converts men in numerous instances. In the face of all this, Dr. Rice conies forth and publishes, and Presbyterians circulate, in a tract, that those who believe that the Holy Spirit operates through the Gospel in converting men, deny the influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification! The Apostles, under the infallible influence of the Holy Spirit of God, preached the Gospel to convert men, to turn them from darkness to light, and by the power and authority of the Spirit converted thousands. All the ministers sent of God, in our time, preach the Gospel to convert men; and all those converted by the Holy Spirit, so far as yet informed, have been converted through his own divinely appointed means, the Gospel, the ministry, etc.; nor is there one scrap of authority for any man to preach that men can be converted, or try to convert men, without the Gospel. And to allege that he who believes, and teaches, that the Spirit of God operates through the Gospel and 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 final 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?" What 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 word of the Lord is perfect, *converting the soul."* Here, Doctor, follows the seed sown by the Holy Spirit, which springs forth in the new birth, or regeneration. The

Spirit says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Pet. i, 23.) Here is the seed which the Spirit of God sows in the heart, to produce the new creation, the birth, or regeneration, All born of the incorruptible seed, the *word of God,* are born of the Spirit. It is the work of the Spirit, just as much as if he had seen fit to perform it without the incorruptible seed, the word of God. Now, will Dr. Rice face these holy and infallible teachings, and declare 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 "born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by 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 of God has seen fit to make the word of God the seed of regeneration, or the new birth, or because he regenerates or converts men through the word, and not without the word? 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 a little more serious still for the Doctor to reflect upon here. If sanctification of believers is through the word, as Mr. Campbell teaches, the Doctor asks "is not prayer solemn mockery?" All the Disciples answer, No; for our Lord and Master prayed the Father for believers, "Sanctify them th*rough thy 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 *"through thy truth."* It is the sanctification of the Spirit, through the truth, just as much as if it were without the truth. Come, Doctor, take back all this rashness, and remember that the whole is the work of the Spirit, both in regeneration and sanctification, and it is just as important

that we should pray that it may be done, if the Spirit does it through the truth, as if he did it separate from, or without the word.

The limited space allotted to this tract is now near filled, and a very few words must close it.

1. The cause of the tract, penned by Dr. Rice, no doubt, was his mortification arising from so many people being converted from sectarianism in reading the Lexington debate. He has come to the conclusion that his productions, touching the positions of the Presbyterians and Christians, in a tract circulated among "big brethren without Mr. Campbell's replies, would prove more effectual.

2. Many Presbyterians will hear the Disciples preach, become awakened, and exchange their birth-right membership, conferred upon them without their choice or knowledge, for the membership proposed by the Savior, into which they choose for themselves to enter, in personal confession and submission to God. This annoys Dr. Rice exceedingly, and this he hoped to avert, in some degree, in sending a tract prejudicial to the Disciples to be circulated and read privately by his brethren.

3. Dr. Rice knows that a large majority of the members of his Church never decided for themselves to become members, did not 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 kind are awakened by the plain preaching of Christ among the Disciples, and they act for themselves, choose and decide the course they will take, they choose to go with the Disciples. This he hoped to prevent, in some degree, by prejudicing the minds of his brethren, so that they would not hear the Disciples preach.

4. Dr. Rice knows that a large majority in the Presbyterian Church, well meaning and honest-hearted, have no baptism but infant baptism; and that they did not, as a matter of course, *choose this for themselves,* but somebody else *chose*

it for them, decided that they should have it, and imposed it upon them, without their consent or knowledge. Many of these when they come to mature years, and hear for themselves, see that baptism is an act of obedience, which requires the person's own will, consent and action, and, on hearing the Gospel, will decide to yield a personal and voluntary obedience to God in baptism. This, also, the Doctor desired to counteract.

5. The Doctor knows that a large number of his brethren, as honest and well meaning as any they have, without their choice, consent, or knowledge, and before they could decide any question, in their infancy, had sprinkling imposed upon them for baptism; and that when they became capable of thinking and deciding for themselves what God requires them to do, on hearing the Disciples preach, insisting upon all reading the Scriptures and deciding for themselves what is right, conclude that their sprinkling, in which they had no choice, consent, or heart, could be no obedience to God, and chose to be immersed, thus carrying out the convictions of their own consciences. This Dr. Rice dislikes, and this: he aims to prevent, by keeping his brethren from hearing.

6. Dr. Rice knows that his Church is governed by a human creed, which the members must believe or be excluded ; and yet that this creed admits that "the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation," and that these Scriptures themselves declare that "he," Christ, "hath given 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," and that "they are for doctrine," and that many of the best members of his Church, on hearing the Disciples preach, prefer to take these Holy Scriptures as the man of their counsel, and guide to a better world, and lose their reverence for the Confession, and go with those who love and follow the Lord Jesus Christ. This mor-titles Dr. Rice, and this his pamphlet is aimed to prevent.

7. Dr. Rice knows that many in the Presbyterian Church are separated by sectarianism from their nearest and dearest

friends on earth, division wails running between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, neighbor and neighbor, etc., and that the pious have all along prayed that the time might come when these unhappy divisions might cease, when all who love God would "see eye to eye," and unite in the holy band of Christian love. He knows that the Disciples come preaching peace hy Jesus Christ, the Lord of all, urging his holy prayer, that *all who believe may be one as he and his Father are one, th*at the world may believe—urging that exhortation of the holy 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." He knows that this union can never be brought about among the pious, the good, those who love God and his people, the only ones who desire it, under any other rule of faith but the law of God, and that this is just what the Disciples are urging, and that all the better portions of his brethren will know this when they hear for themselves; hence this effort to keep them from hearing. Why does he not exhort Iris brethren to go, with their Bible" in hand, and hear what unscriptural doctrines they preach? Because he knows that all their prejudice would soon vanish in this way, and therefore he prefers giving them garbled extracts, which he knows do not fully nor fairly exhibit the minds of the writers quoted.

8. Dr. Rice knew, when trying to prejudice the minds of his brethren against the Disciples, on baptism, that his own dear Calvin and his Confession express the very doctrine he was battling, stated in more objectionable terms than in his garbled quotations; and the reader of this will agree to the same, when the quotations contained in this tract are examined.

9. Dr. Rice knows that he does not know, or hold a truth, of all that God has revealed to man, not held by the Disciples; nor is there a revealed truth of the Bible in all Christendom, not held, sacredly held, by the Disciples.

We trust the day is dawning when the Lord, lifted up to draw all men to him, will be honored, regarded and followed, and when men, not having his spirit, will cease to control those who desire to do the will of God. The Lord hasten that day!

SECTARIANISM CONFESSEDLY WRONG.

THERE has been much discussion upon sectarianism within the last thirty years, and immense light has been elicited and great good accomplished. Still, some of the blind guides of these times will never see, till irresistibly forced, that sectarianism blights, strikes with death and sinks everything upon which it is inscribed. Many, however, knowing sectarianism to be ruinous, suicidal to everything upon which it is written; and neither catholic nor orthodox, having been long wedded to it, and loving it more than the bread of life, still cling to it as to life itself. In the place of inquiring, as they ought, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" they are simply contriving how they shall hold on to the old sectarian bodies of sin and death. But contrive as they may, the breath of life can not be kept in them. *Ichabod* is written upon them. The voice of Heaven is against them. The voice of the people is against them. The voice of their won friends is against them. *Die they must.*

Why not call the American Tract Society the Episcopalian Tract Society? the Methodist Tract Society? the Presbyterian Tract Society? the Baptist Tract Society? Because it is known that the seeds of death are in these names. There is enough poison, it is known, in any one of these names to kill the society. To put any one of these names upon it would blast it forever. Why not call the American Foreign Christian Union the Episcopal Foreign Union? the Presbyterian Foreign Union? the Baptist Foreign Union? Because it is known that there is death in these names. The poison in any one of them, it is known, is sufficient to kill the union. If any one of these names were inscribed upon it, it is known it would blast it forever. Why not call the Sunday School Union the Methodist Sunday School Union? the Baptist Sunday School Union? the Presbyterian Sunday

School Union? Because it is known these names have no popularity, are partisan, and have the seeds of death in them. Anyone of them inscribed upon the Sunday School Union would blast, kill and sink it forever. This they all well know. Why not call the American Bible Union the Baptist Bible Union? the Presbyterian Bible Union? the Episcopalian Bible Union? Because they know the poison of partyism is in these names, and that it will kill everything upon which it is inscribed; because they know that these names have no popularity and would sink it. In one word, it is distinctly understood that any religious movement, designed to be general, or, which is the same thing, catholic, and obtain the general concurrence and co-operation of Christians, must not have any of these unpopular and prejudicial names upon it.. They must be ignored and kept out of sight. How preposterous it is, then, to inscribe any one of them upon a servant of God, and thus compel him to encounter its poisonous, blasting and deathly influence, in all his honest efforts to serve God, through his entire life! Why not cut him loose from this dead weight, this miserable incumbrance, weighing him down, sinking him and destroying him, as they have done in the case of the above-mentioned enterprises? If it is wrong to fasten upon these enterprises a name known to be poisonous, blighting and ruinous, it is equally wrong to fasten such a name upon all individual or a congregation.

The reason it will not do to call the Bible Union the *Baptist* Union, is simply that the name *Baptist is* so unpopular, prejudicial and partisan, that every party in the land, except the Baptists, are opposed to it. The same is true of the names Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopalian. Inscribe any one of these names upon it, and its fate is sealed. Every other party from that time forth is against it. It is therefore distinctly understood and agreed upon, that all these names must be kept off of every movement commanding general respect and co-operation. The reason is, that these names are barriers, known to be in the way of good and pious men, and that they must be kept clear, or we can

not get the co-operation of these good men! What must be the effect, then, when one of these names is fastened upon a man, only to bar off all those good men opposed to that name—and all are opposed to it except the one little party adopting it—from co-operation or participation in any good work with him? What can the effect be, when one of these names is fastened upon a Church, but to bar off all opposed to that name? Why not, then, disincumber every individual and every Church of every one of these unpopular, prejudicial and exclusive names, and call the Church the Church of Christ, or the Church of God, and individuals, Christians or Disciples, as found in Scripture? No man has or can have any reasonable objection to being a member of the Church of Christ, or the Church of God; nor has any man any objection to being called a Christian or Disciple. Indeed, the question will be in death: Am I a Christian—a disciple of Christ? Do I belong to the Church of God—the Church of Christ? No man objects, if in reality a good man—a Christian—to a work or movement because it is called *Christian.* No man disallows you to call him a *Christian*. Then, if all good people desire to do good in their day, let them disavow their prejudicial and injurious names, that serve no purpose only to bar good men from them, and be content with divine names and divine things.

Nor are the doctrines indicated by these names any more catholic, or general, than the names. That which is called Episcopalianism is believed by one Church, and *one only*. All other Churches oppose it—do not believe it at all. That something called Methodism is not believed by Baptists at all. That something called Presbyterianism is not believed by Methodists at all. It avails nothing to say that all those named believe a great deal in common. That which they believe in common is not Episcopalianism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, nor Baptistism, but simply *Christianity;* and that contains all the good and does all the good among them. That which is peculiar to the party makes the party. That which the party holds and practices, not held and practiced

by other parties, is the occasion of the party—that which distinguishes it from others and is strictly *its own.* Nothing held in common makes the party, is peculiar to it, or can be claimed as its own. Strike out all that is held by the Methodists not held by any others, and though you would not have stricken out much, there would not be left one Methodist idea, or one particle of Methodism. But there would be much of Christianity left. Strike out of the Presbyterian confession everything not believed and practiced by any other party, and though but little is stricken out, there is not one Presbyterian idea, or one particle of Presbyterianism, left. In the same way, if all believed and practiced by Baptists not believed by any others was stricken out there would not be one particle of Baptistism left; yet much of Christianity might be left.

This is all pretty well known by these parties, when they think of it. A Presbyterian knows that Presbyterianism is not Christianity; hence he will admit that a Methodist, who does not believe in Presbyterianism, can be a Christian, yet he knows that a man can not be a Christian and not believe in Christianity. If a man can be a Christian and not believe. in Presbyterianism, but can not be a Christian and not believe Christianity, then, unequivocally, Presbyterianism is *not Christianity.* If a man can be a Christian and not believe Baptistism, Baptistism is not Christianity—it is not the Gospel; for a man can not be a Christian and not believe the Gospel. How many Christians there may be in these parties, we presume not to say; but they all concede that there are some. These are not made Christians by believing Methodism, Presbyterianism or Baptistism; for a man can be a Christian without believing any one of these, or else there are no Christians among Episcopalians who do not believe any of these doctrines; but many become Christians among Episcopalians who do not believe in any of these doctrines; but they become Christians by believing in and submitting to the Savior of the world, as people did hundreds of years before these doctrines were born; or by believing what all

these hold in common, and without which none can be saved. The Christianity, then, held in common by them all, which none can be saved without believing, is that which saves all that are saved among them; and that which is peculiar and constitutes the sect, which a man can be saved-without believing, *never saved anybody and is useless.* It is not orthodox, not catholic, not popular, can never be agreed upon, and can only serve to prejudice the people against him who holds it, and bar them from him. Let us separate pure Christianity out from everything else, call it by its own proper name and unite with all who love it and Him who gave it.

THE BEGINNING CORNER: OR, THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IDENTIFIED.

BY DR. J. R. HOWARD.

> Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. * * * Upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it. —Matt. xvi, 16, 18.

SUCH were the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, in reference to the foundation and perpetuity of his Church—the kingdom he came to establish on earth, and which is destined ultimately to supercede all other dominions, and to become the last universal empire of the world; for "the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." These words of Christ, above quoted, were spoken by him in reference to the reply of the Apostle Peter, who had anticipated the other Apostles in assenting and confessing the great cardinal truth, that JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD. It was upon this grand, comprehensive truth that Jesus declared he would build his Church; and that the powers of the unseen world should not prevail over it; but that it should continue to exist through all future time, amid the origin, progress and decay of all other systems and organizations, whether civil, ecclesiastical, political or philosophical; and amid the rise, existence and fall of republics, kingdoms and empires.

In accordance with this prophetic declaration of the Messiah, his Church was founded upon this ROCK by his Apostles—his inspired and divinely authorized ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary to the world; and they left it pure, uncorrupted, undivided, and in unity. It was at first a unit—but one;. "one body," animated by "one spirit"—the Holy Spirit; and of which body Christ was the great head,

and "Lord of the Spirit," and his disciples the members. But how is it now? Corruption and disunion have been doing their sad work for thirteen long centuries or more, and reverse and disastrous change, schism and division have been the lamentable result! Instead of the one Church of Christ, there have been and are now more nearly a thousand and one sectarian Churches!

"This is indeed an age of "Churches," all claiming to be orthodox, founded on the Bible, and appealing to its authority; and all busily engaged in making proselytes to their different systems, and in rivaling each other in power, influence and numbers. The sincere inquirer after truth is frequently perplexed and at a loss to know to what Church or denomination to attach himself; and generally aims to find the Church which he conceives to be nearest to the Bible. Why not endeavor to find the true Church at once—the one founded on the Bible—and enter into that? since there must be a true Church somewhere, as Jesus declared that "the gates of hades should never prevail against it;" and as that alone is to triumph; and all others are destined to be utterly destroyed and annihilated! But a question of great importance may arise here, one involving a most interesting inquiry, and that is—*where is* the true Church *now* to be found? and how shall we be enabled to know it, to identify and recognize it?

Now, there were certain marks by which that Church could be known and identified in the days of the Apostles. These marks are now to be found in the New Testament as plain and distinct as they were then; and where they will apply, that is the true Church of Christ, and all other Churches are spurious, mere counterfeits of the genuine, and not to be found in the Bible, or only predicted there as emanations from the great apostasy, the harlot *"mother* and mistress of all" apostate "Churches," and as her daughters, granddaughters and their progeny. It is impossible for all the different sects, or even the self-styled "evangelical denominations," to be th*e* Church of Christ, as they are many—"their name is legion"—and that is a unit, but one;

nor are they "branches" of it, for it never had, and can not have, any of these sectarian branches. Branches they may be, and no doubt are, but not of the Church of Christ—branches of some other body from which they have originated, of the parent trunk that sprung up at Rome, or at least the most of them. But let us examine the different marks of the Church of Christ, in order that we may identify it, and ascertain where it is now to be found. There are several of these, and among them we will begin with

I.—ITS ORIGIN AND PERPETUITY.

The Church of Christ originated, as we have shown, in the days of the Apostles, and was founded by them; while all others began in after ages, and were founded by uninspired men. It was founded by the Apostle Peter, under a special commission from the Lord Jesus Christ—the other Apostles "standing up" and concurring with him—and began at Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; while all other churches were originated by Other and uninspired men, without any Divine influence or authority, and began at other places, and in after ages, most of them in modern times, and some of them even in our own day. But such were the corruptions of the Christian religion for ages—such was the influence of false systems, pretending to derive their authority from the Bible such the perversion, misapplication, suppression and obliteration of its truths—that these marks were well nigh lost sight of, particularly those by which the primitive Gospel is to be recognized and identified, as that preached and taught by the Apostles. These marks were *faith, repentance* and *baptism* in order to the remission of sins, in the original and scriptural import of these terms, and with their true object and design. But we can perhaps better illustrate this by the following anecdote of the "beginning corner:"

In early times, and before the settlement of the Western country, many thousands of acres of land were taken up in it under authority of Congress, by various individuals in compensation for services rendered the-country. The manner of

this was as follows: A corner was made, "called the "beginning corner," on some tree by making three chops through the bark with a hatchet, one above the other, facing some one of the four cardinal points, so as to be at right angles with the other row. If one faced east, for instance, the other must face north, or south, as might be desirable, so as to form a right angle. Or, if one faced north, the other must face east or west, and so on, so as to form the tract of land from the angle made. Lines were then run, in the directions facing these chops, to certain distances each way, and then right angles again made, called corners; and lines run again, facing these, so as to meet or "close" at another point called a corner, diagonally opposite the first or beginning corner—including within the angles or lines a tract of land of a given amount of acres, in a square or oblong, as might be most eligible. But none but the first, or "beginning corner," was marked as above, which was done in order to identify the tract at a future day. The survey or tract had always a call for a certain tree, with these marks or chops upon it, as the *beginning* corner; and to render the finding and identification of it certain, the trees around this "corner tree" were also marked with chops facing it, called "pointers," because pointing to it, and the finding and identifying of this corner tree was necessary to the identification of the land and the consequent possession of it. Sometimes another tract of lands was run out, or called for, calling for this particular tract and its beginning corner; and then perhaps several others calling for this, or for each other as connected with that. These were called a chain or connection of grants or surveys; and the beginning corner of the first tract, the *key* corner, as when found, as it were, unlocking or opening to the whole, or as a key or clue by which to find and identify all the others. Sometimes, and in some cases, where many years had elapsed, the beginning corner was very difficult to find, and required much searching for, and close examination; and sometimes the aid of some one acquainted with it when made was necessary, in order to find and identify it,

Such was the case before us, which we have selected for our illustration, and in order to understand which we have made the preceding remarks.

An old Revolutionary soldier in Virginia held a claim for one of these tracts of land, or "old surveys," as usually termed, somewhere in the Western country. He had neglected it for a long time, until the country became settled up, and covered over with other claims and tracts, made by entries, when at length he came out West to search for, find it, and take possession. But it could nowhere be found! The whole country in which it lay was covered over by other tracts or claims—no room was found for his, and no one could inform him where it was. What was to be done? After searching long and in vain, he was about to sit down in despair, when he heard of a man who knew where the corner was, and could point it out to him. Joy and hope fill his bosom, and he immediately goes for him, engages his services to show it, and brings him to the section of country. They commence the search. A particular tree is called for in the grant, in a certain location; and a similar one is found in a corresponding situation. But vines and parasitical growth have so grown, and twined, and wound around the trunk and covered it over, that no marks can be found. They go to work and tear out and strip it of these, when, behold! there are the identical marks, the original chops in the bark, as made there at first; and joy springs up in the old soldier's breast and animates his heart at the glad discovery. The beginning corner is found, the land identified, and his claim established. But his land is all covered over by other and subsequent claims. One man has made himself a beginning corner, and run off a tract—another had taken the first as a key corner and run him off one, and another and another, until the whole of the original survey was covered over! What is to be done? Here is the original and real claimant, his corner found, and his land clearly identified, but all claimed by others! Will they now surrender their claims as false and untenable, and purchase of the rightful owner arid

settle, or live upon his tract? By no means. They will rise up in arms against him, call him all sorts of hard names, vilify, abuse and slander him, and contend against the clearest evidence that they are the rightful owners. There is a general combination against him to put him down and oust him! The cry is that he is trying to take our land from us, that his claim is a false one and ours the genuine, and all this. They say that he is mistaken about the beginning corner, that these marks on it won't do, that they are not the same made there at first, etc. They all go to law with him, in the vain hope of gaining and establishing their own claims, by perversion, misrepresentation, or in any other way that will offer them, and their well-paid lawyers, any hope or chance. But the testimony is produced in court that these old chops are the true and genuine marks and this the original beginning corner; and suit after suit goes against them, their claims are invalidated, and the old grant is established to their complete discomfiture!

We come now to the application of this illustration to the restoration of the primitive Gospel and primitive Christianity. In that part of the commission recorded by Luke, we read: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Here, to use our illustration, is the BEGINNING CORNER of the Christian Dispensation. It was made by the Apostle Peter, at Jerusalem, on the first Pentecost after the resurrection and ascension of our Savior, by the authority of Christ, and in accordance with the general commission here quoted, given to all the Apostles, and the special one given to Peter to set up, or open the kingdom of heaven. He made the three *marks* necessary for a legal corner on the old Jerusalem trunk.

I. *Faith,* produced by his discourse, and evinced by his hearers being "cut to the heart" by the words of the Holy Spirit spoken by or through him, and the question, "What shall we do?"

2. *Repentance*, when he commanded them to "repent."

3. *Baptism,* for remission of sins, when he commanded them to "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

These marks were plainly and visibly made, so that all could see and understand them; and none then disputed them, or the validity of this beginning corner. But in the lapse of ages, they were well nigh lost sight of, and came near being entirely obliterated. The parasitical growth of error, superstition and mysticism, and the traditions, inventions and corruptions of men crept by slow degrees, and twined and wound around the old Jerusalem trunk and covered and matted it over, until the old marks were obscured and almost entirely lost sight of and forgotten.

Some, taking advantage of this state of things, and others having made fruitless searches for the old corner, began, each one, to make a *new corner* for himself, and to run out a corresponding tract on the old survey to suit their own notions and opinions. In process of time other tracts were run out, in accordance with new corners, or in correspondence with preceding ones, until, tract added to tract, they had almost entirely covered the old survey.

The Roman Catholics were the first trespassers on it, and made the first new corner, and run out a very large tract. This trespass on the old grant opened the way for others; and the corner they made became a *key* corner for a chain or connection of chains.

The Episcopalians then made a corner, from the Roman Catholics, and run out a tract. The Presbyterians made one in connection, and run out at first one tract, and then this became a key corner, from which they ran out several other tracts, and then divided their first tract between the Old School and the New School. The Methodists made a corner from the Episcopalians, and at first run out one tract, and then from this as a key corner ran out several other tracts, and then divided the old tract between the Church North and the Church South. The Baptists made one, but "ran

past Jerusalem," not to Jericho, but to John the Baptist in the river Jordan, and thought they had made their corner there, but were mistaken, as they made it in modern times and somewhere else, and then ran out One and afterward several tracts. And thus on with all the other sects or denominations. But none of these began at the right corner.

The beginning corner of Roman Catholicism was made at Rome. The beginning corner of Episcopalianism was made at London, that of Presbyterianism in Scotland, that of Methodism at Oxford in England, of Baptistism in Germany, of Lutheranism there at Wittemburg, of Calvinism at Geneva. And so on through the long catalogue of sects or denominations and religious parties. None began at the right place. But the beginning corner of the Gospel—of pure, Apostolic, primitive Christianity — was made at JERUSALEM— "beginning at Jerusalem."

Justinian made the beginning corner of Romanism, Henry VIII of England made that of Episcopalianism, John Wesley that of Methodism, Menno of Baptistism, John Knox of Presbyterianism, Martin Luther of Lutherism, John Calvin of Calvinism; and thus on to the end of the long catalogue of religious sects or parties in Christendom. But the Apostle Peter made the beginning corner of the Christian dispensation, of pure, uncorrupted Christianity, and, as we have shown, by special commission of the Lord Jesus Christ himself. (See Matt. xvi, 19 and Acts ii, 14, 38; x. xv, 7.)

The Apostle Peter, and *not* Alexander Campbell, made the beginning corner of the Christian Church. Alexander Campbell only acted the part of the man who *showed* the beginning corner of the survey. He exposed and tore away the human additions and appendages, the traditions, mysticism and error with which the marks on the Jerusalem trunk —the corner of primitive Christianity—had been covered over, obscured and hidden from the view of men, and identified it, by the original marks, to be the same one made by Peter. And this is the reason why there is such an outcry against Alexander Campbell, and why he is so much op-

posed and abused by the various religious parties, who have made their new corners and run out their tracts on the old survey. They know that the identification of the old corner, for which he is contending, will be fatal to all their old claims; that if that stand (and it *will* stand), they will have to give them all up and "abandon the ground" which they have *taken—the* man-made systems they have espoused. Hence the great excitement and contention throughout the length and breadth of the land, the opposition to this identifier of the old corner and those associated with him, the debating and declamation everywhere.

Had Alexander Campbell made a new corner, and run out a new tract on this old survey, according to the chart and compass of "orthodoxy," (as so self-styled), so as not to have interfered with the *claims* of others, he would have been hailed as a good orthodox neighbor, and welcomed into the sectarian community. But he identified the old corner: and in this consists the great head and front of his offense.

And as finding and identifying the original corner of the old survey did not constitute the man who found it the locator or owner of the land, so the identification of the old Gospel, of the Church of Christ, does not make Alexander Campbell the *inventer of a new system,* or the founder of a new party. This he has always disavowed or disclaimed in the strongest terms. He has been only the humble instrument in the hands of God in the restoration to the world of apostolic and primitive Christianity, as it was left uncorrupted by the Apostles, and as it came completed and perfected from their hands.

The sectarian occupants of the new tracts, made and run out on the old Gospel survey, have tried in various ways to show that these marks made by Peter are not the true marks of the old corner. Some have endeavored to prove that faith alone is the only mark, and they accordingly made but *one chop* on their tree. But this would not do would not constitute a legal corner. Others contended that there were but two marks necessary—faith and repentance and they

accordingly put two marks only on their tree. But neither of these will do, as the law requires th*ree* chops in all cases, all the country over, to constitute a genuine and legal corner; and to be a lawful and acceptable one it must have these three. Hence one chop will not do, and two are no better than one. These three marks were necessary; and accordingly the Apostle made three on the old Jerusalem trunk—1. Faith; 2. Repentance; 3. Baptism "for the remission of sins." And as every corner must have its "pointers" to point to it and show where it stands and is to be found, and that it is the true corner, so this has its pointers. It has thirteen pointers, the thirteen Apostles, who always point to it as the genuine corner—to this alone, and never to any other. The genuine Corner must have these three marks; and every corner that lacks them is not the right corner. To begin at such a one is to begin wrong; and there is great danger, in such a case, of running wrong and ending wrong! "Take heed." "Be not deceived." "So run that ye may obtain."

2. *Perpetuity.—"* On this rock," said Jesus, "I will build nay Church, and the gates of hades shall never prevail against it." Nor have they ever done so, nor will they ever be able to do it. The powers of the unseen world, persecution, corruption and division, opposition of every kind and character, have been arrayed against it, and have all been unsuccessful in attempting to put down and destroy it. And though it was predicted concerning it that it should be twelve hundred and sixty years in a state of depression, and perhaps of corruption, or partial corruption, yet it has never become extinct. It has always continued to exist in some place, and in some state or condition. It was at first in a state of purity, as represented by the emblem of the "white horse" of the first seal in the Apocalypse. But this state did not continue long, for even in the days of the Apostles "the mystery of iniquity had begun to work." It was then, or after that, for a long time in a state of depression, and perhaps partial corruption, as remarked, from the influence of that corrupted state of things represented by the "black horse," the Roman

Catholic apostasy, in the third seal. Then, or afterward. atheism prevailed, and the French infidel philosophy, growing out of the abuses of religion by Romanism, and represented by the "pale horse," when true religion became nearly extinct in the heart of the civilized world. From these conditions it is now emerging, and shall again be in a state of purity, as indicated by the "white horse" the second time, (Rev. xix, 11), and in a state of universal prevalence and triumph, consummated after the great battle of Armageddon, as indicated by the events predicted as then to follow, in that chapter, and to result in the introduction of the Millennium. Hence Satan attempted at first to destroy the Church by persecution, but "the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church," and he failed. He then attempted to destroy it by corruption, and the long, dark night of the Roman Catholic apostasy came on. But Luther sounded the trumpet of reformation, the light of truth began to dawn Upon the benighted world, and the true Church began gradually to emerge from the long, gloomy, dark night; but she did not get entirely out. Seeing her emerging, Satan then attempted to destroy her by division. And then "a thousand and one" sects arose, one after another, or really more than six hundred! But he is destined to be foiled and fail here, for the full blaze of Divine truth is now shining in all its pristine purity, by the influence of the current reformation In restoring the ancient Gospel; and the Church, again in her primitive apostolic purity, is destined to go forth in the strength and power and irresistible might of the Lord of Hosts, and to achieve a universal triumph, and Satan is to be bound down in the bottomless pit for a thousand years and a seal set upon him, so that he "shall not go forth to deceive the nations." Here, then, we have the first mark of the true Church of Christ—origin and perpetuity. The Church, now, which can establish a claim to these marks, is "THE *Church of Christ*, all things else being equal, or if not otherwise defective.

II.—NAME.

The Church of Christ is known and recognized in the New

Testament, by such appellations as these: "Church of God" "Churches of Christ." Jesus calls it, "My Church." Hence, we may with propriety call it the "CHRISTIAN CHURCH," or "Church of Christ." In fact, we are not authorized by the Bible, or in the New Testament, to call it anything else than according to the Divine nomenclature. The New Testament recognizes no party or sectarian names whatever. The names, "Roman Catholic Church," or "Episcopal Church," or "Presbyterian Church," or "Baptist Church," or "Methodist Church," and so on, are nowhere to be found there, and are not recognized by it; nor are the names Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc. All such names, as party appellatives and distinctions, or as distinctive appellations, are condemned by the Apostles in the most unreserved and unqualified terms, and ranked by them among the "works of the flesh." Says Paul to the Corinthians, in reference to this: "Ye are carnal [fleshly]; for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?"

Will the Lord Jesus Christ, when he comes the second time, own as his Churches those wearing any other names than his—or than those names in the New Testament authorized by him to be worn? Most assuredly not! For illustration: Suppose a man was to leave his wife and family to make a visit to a distant foreign country, necessary to be made and to be necessarily absent for some long-stated or indefinite period of time, but at the same time with the promise and assurance of returning again, to receive her again, and live with her as his bride, and to be again united to his family; and suppose that during his absence, she was, with a perfect knowledge of all these things, to throw away *his* name and take some *other* name, and be found when he returned wearing that other name, think you that he would own and take her as his bride? By no means. He would most assuredly refuse and reject her. Now, the Church is

called the bride, or wife, of the Lord Jesus Christ, and he is called her husband. "The bride, the Lamb's wife." "Prepared as a bride, adorned for her husband." "I have" espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."

Now, the Lord Jesus Christ left the world about eighteen hundred years ago, ascended to heaven, was crowned Kings of kings, and took his seat on the throne of the universe ,,at the right hand of the Majesty on high," and has left in his WORD the promise and assurance of his returning again to earth, to receive his bride, the Church, and be united to her, to reign on earth with her a thousand years of sinless happiness and millennial glory! But what has taken place since he ascended? As We have shown, corruption, division and apostasy have done their evil work; and his Church, which his Apostles left pure, undivided and uncorrupted, wearing his name alone, and observing his ordinances, worship and commandments, has apostatized from him, "left her first love," and become an abominable sectarian organization, called the Roman Catholic Church, full of loathsome corruptions and cruelties and evils and abominations, and has persecuted and tortured and evil treated and put to death his faithful followers, until their blood has flowed in rivers and oceans, and cried to Heaven for vengeance upon this apostate Church! Nor is this all. She has "*committed fornication* with the kings of the earth," and has, by this illicit intercourse, played the harlot "and become the mother of a numerous progeny of illegitimate daughters, *wearing other names than* that of Christ, as "Episcopalian Church," etc., full of the spirit and corruptions of the old scarlet "mother and mistress of all" such "churches." And these daughters have "played the harlot" too, and produced a brood of illegitimate granddaughters to the old mother, as the "Episcopal Methodist Church," and others in the same category, the blood of the old grandmother in their veins, and full of her spirit, traditions and corruptions! Hence the Lord Jesus Christ, when he comes the second time, to be united to his

bride, the Church, will disown every one of these corrupt, unauthorized religious organizations remaining—will reject every one of them, and will recognize but the one true Church, wearing his name, to the exclusion of all others. And fearful will be their destiny then! It will be that of great Babylon herself—that of the beast and false prophet," in Rev. xix, where this union with her, and their destiny, are fully and vividly portrayed.

Here, therefore, is the second mark or the true Church. The Church that wears the Christian name, to the exclusion of all party or sectarian names, and whose members do not wear any names but that of "Christian," "Disciple of Christ," etc., as found in the New Testament, is the Church of Christ, all other things being equal, or having all the other necessary marks.

III.—CREED.

Such documents as human "creeds," "Confessions of Faith," "Disciplines," "Articles of Faith," "Abstracts of Doctrine," etc., were totally unknown to the Apostles, never permitted by them, and have no authority whatever, not the least shadow of authority anywhere in the Bible or New Testament, but are subversive of its authority, full of evil tendencies, and supplant that volume by their uninspired, unauthorized human legislation, and usurping and nullifying the ordinances and commandments of God, by their assumed authority over the minds and consciences of men. "In vain do they worship me," says Christ, "teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." "Making the word of God of none effect through your traditions." These written and published creeds virtually "add to" or "take from" the Bible, and incur the Divine malediction for so doing, pronounced there for all such conduct. They create and continue parties, foment disunion, and keep up and perpetuate divisions.

The primitive Christians had no other creed but the Bible, nor did those who lived for ages after them. This alone kept

them united for three hundred years, kept out heresy, and was all-sufficient to perfect them in holiness and character And if the Bible was sufficient, then for all these purposes, it is amply so now; and we have no need of human creeds.

The Church now which has no creed but the Bible, which owns and recognizes none other, whose motto is, "The Bible, the Bible alone, and nothing but the Bible, is, all things else being equal, the true Church of Christ.

IV.—UNITY AND CATHOLICITY.

Another mark of the genuine Church of Christ is its unity and catholicity.

I. *Unity*.—It was but one—a unit. Jesus calls it "my Church," thus implying that it could be but one, a unit, and not "churches" in the plural. Wherever it is mentioned in the New Testament, in the general or abstract, it is only as one. "There. is one body and one Spirit"—"the Church, which is his body." "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." "We have many members in one body." "Now they are many members, yet but one body." "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Hence the Church is composed of one general body, and not many sectarian bodies, and had no sectarian "branches." How would a cedar tree look, with here an apple branch, there a peach branch, yonder a pear branch, and yonder a cherry branch? How odd, unnatural and grotesque would it appear! And how would the old Jerusalem trunk look, with a Roman Catholic branch, an Episcopalian branch, a Baptist branch, a Presbyterian branch, a Methodist branch, etc. What an odd, unnatural and heterogeneous appearance would it present? But it neither has, and never had, any of the these sectarian branches growing from it. Its branches are all homogeneous with itself—of the same nature, and nothing more than its members, or the organizations compose the true Church of Christ.

2. *Catholicity.—The* Church of Christ is catholic—not Roman catholic, nor Greek catholic, but *Christian* catholic. The word catholic means *universal,* and the Church of Christ

is the only true catholic or universal Church; all others are only sectarian parties—partial and imperfect in every respect, and destined to fall and perish, to be utterly overthrown and annihilated; while this is to prevail universally and everywhere, in every land and clime and part of the world, where "all shall see eye to eye, and hear ear to ear"—when "all shall know God from the least to the greatest," and when "righteousness shall cover the land as the waters do the great deep."

Where this unity and catholicity are to be found, that is the Church of Christ, all things else considered being equal.

V.—TERMS OF ADMISSION.

A fifth mark of the true Church of Christ is its terms of admission. These are Faith, Repentance, Confession and Baptism, in the order here presented, and in their Biblical import and application.

I. *Faith* in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Messiah Son of God, and Savior of the world. 2. *Repentance, or* reformation toward God. 3. *Confession,* with the mouth, before men, that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God." "These [miracles] are recorded," says John, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name. And says Jesus himself, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven,"—including him who refuses thus to confess him. Hence, he says, "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels." This confession must be made with the mouth. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus Christ is Lord, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." It is first in the heart when believed, then comes out of the mouth when confessed, which is the evidence of its being

believed; and hence, "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed"—that is, to confess him. This was the confession made by the Ethiopian eunuch to Philip the Evangelist, when he demanded baptism of him: "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest," said Philip to him. "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," replied and confessed the eunuch. 4. *Immersion* "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," for, or "in order to the remission of sins. (See Acts ii, 38, xxii, 16, etc.; and compare Rom. vi, 3-7, with 17, 18, and Col. ii, 10-14.)

When all these are not expressed *together* in the New Testament, in the order here presented, they are understood; and hence persons were addressed with one or more of them, according to the various situations, conditions and circumstances by which they were surrounded. I. If infidel, or perhaps never having heard of Christ, as the jailor at Philippi, they were addressed, as he was, by Paul and Silas, *"Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." When there is faith enough to change the heart, and lead to action or obedience, then it is strong enough, and sufficient in degree or measure. 2. If already believing, as were the Jews on Pentecost, who inquired what to *do,* and evinced their faith by the question they asked, people must be addressed as Peter addressed them, *"Repent,"* etc. He did not command them to be sorry for their sins, to grieve, mourn, etc., on account of them, for "they were cut to the heart" by his words, and had already evinced their deep contrition and penitence by the question they asked; but he commanded them to "reform." When an individual is sorry enough for his sins to forsake them, then he is penitent, or has repented enough; he has mourned or sorrowed sufficiently, and his penitence is sufficient in degree or measure. So anyone may always know when he has believed and repented enough—when the measure of his faith and penitence is sufficient,—when they are deep enough and strong enough. 3. *Confession,* as in the case of the eunuch, and as spoken of and referred to elsewhere, according to the quota-

tions already made. 4. Where persons have both believed and repented, as in the case of Paul, they are not enjoined to do either, but merely to *"be baptized,"* as Ananias said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And hence, it must be for, or in order to, the remission of sins, as we have already observed. Hence the expression in Acts ii, 38, "Be baptized for [in order to] the remission of sins;" and in various other places, as Rom. vi, 3-7, compared with verses 17 and 18 of same chapter; Col. ii, 10-14; Heb. x, 22; I Cor. vi, 11; Mark xvi. 16; I Pet. iii, 21; Titus iii, 5, etc.

The Church now that requires all these, in the order here presented, in their Biblical import and design, and for the purposes here named, is the true Church of Christ, all other things being equal; that is, if she has all the other marks required. Such a Church, according to the declaration of our Savior, shall never become extinct, but shall prevail and triumph universally.

VI.—ORGANIZATION AND INDEPENDENCE.

Another mark of the true Church of Christ is its organization and independence. Persons thus admitted into the Church of Christ, or according to the preceding terms of admission, were constituted into different distinct and independent bodies, called "churches," or more properly "congregations." These were formed, or constituted, by the disciples of Christ assembling themselves together at some designated point, according to previous understanding and notices, and there covenanting and agreeing to meet together as a congregation of Christ, at some particular place or house, to worship God and keep the ordinances of his house; and manifesting this their covenanting and agreeing together by giving each other the right hand, or in some other significant and appropriate way.

Thus constituted, these congregations were then organized by the appointment and ordination of certain officers. These consisted of three classes only: 1. *Bishops,* or elders; 2. *Deacons* and *"deaconesses;* 3. *Evangelists*. These three

classes are all that are recognized in the New Testament; and each class had its appropriate duties to attend to, peculiar to itself, and not confounded or combined with those of the others; and the duties of all, in their respective spheres, are essential to the existence, increase and extension of the Church of Christ; to the continuance and perpetuation of the discipleship of its members, their growth in favor, knowledge, holiness and happiness, and their perseverance in the divine life and character.

1. The business of the Evangelist was to immerse penitent believers, on a confession of their faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; to then form or constitute them into congregations, and then to organize these by "setting "all things in order"—the appointment and ordination of the scriptural and proper officers, according to the qualifications required in the New Testament and in the manner there authorized and prescribed; and then afterward to see that the congregations continue properly organized, as aforesaid, and to put them in order again whenever necessary, when in confusion or out of order in any way, and to aid in correcting and putting down errors that may arise in faith and practice. 2. The duty of the Bishops or Elders was to oversee or rule the church, to teach or feed it with the word of God, to attend to all its spiritual concerns, to exercise a supervision over all its members, to watch over the church as a body and over them individually; in short, to be the executive officers, of the church, in the application and execution of the laws of the kingdom of Christ. 3. The business of the Deacons or Deaconesses was to attend to the temporal affairs of the church, and everything connected with and pertaining to them; to be its treasurers or almoners, to collect and take care of its contributions and dispense them, see to the relief of the poor and needy, etc.,—each class acting in the department appropriate and peculiar to it, and not invading the prerogatives and duties of the others, the deaconesses attending to the female department of that office in particular. Of these last two classes of officers, (bishops and deacons,) there

was always a plurality in every church or congregation, where necessary; and they had no jurisdiction or authority in any other congregation than the one to which they belonged. The New Testament is an utter stranger to Romish sees and diocesan episcopacy—to Roman and Episcopalian bishops and archbishops, priests, rectors, deans, etc. —and to Methodist bishops, presiding elders, deacons, etc. They are all of human, not Divine origin; and have not a particle of authority, or even the shadow of it, in that Divine volume.

These different congregations of the Church of Christ were entirely independent of each other, as regards ecclesiastical polity or church government, management of their religious affairs, etc. There was no higher body than the congregation; and to that was always the ultimate appeal, whether acting as a body, or through her appropriate officers. Sometimes they co-operated with each other, but always for definite purposes, and without sacrificing their independence as individual congregations. And the New Testament is also an utter stranger to all such bodies and things as "General" and "Annual Conferences," "General Assemblies," "Synods," sectarian "Presbyteries," "Episcopalian Conventions," Baptist "Associations," etc.

The Church now which has the organization here described, and the independence referred to, is the true Church of Christ,. everything else being equal; and no Church can be the true Church which is deficient in these important requisites, or lacking any of them.

VII.—WORSHIP AND GOVERNMENT.

The congregation thus organized met together every Lord's day, to break the loaf, or partake of the Lord's Supper, and to attend to the public worship of God connected with that institution; and to engage in and attend upon the public religious exercises, teaching, instructing and training of the congregation belonging to that day; with prayer, praise and thanksgiving, and to attend to such spiritual and temporal matters as were connected with their meeting to.

gather on that day considered in reference to all the scriptural purposes for which they came together. (See Acts ii, 42; xx, 7; 1 Cor. xi, 17-34; Heb. x, 25; I Tim. iii, 1-4; Col. iv, 16; 1 Cor. xv, 12, and other passages on these subjects.)

The government of these congregations was strictly that of the New Testament form, as this contained all the rules and laws which they needed and had. By that volume they were governed in all respects and in every particular; by it were all cases of discipline tried; and to it was all the appeal, and to no other, documentary authority. The bishops or elders constituted the presbytery or eldership of the church, and were the governing and executive officers of the church, to see that its constitution was not violated, and to apply and execute the laws of the kingdom; while the deacons and the deaconesses constituted the diaconate of the church, to attend to all its temporal arrangements, and, when necessary, to carry out such action of the eldership as fell within their sphere.

The Church now having this worship and this government is, all things else being equal, or having all the marks, the true Church of Christ.

CONCLUSION.

We have now given the *marks*, or the most important marks, by which the *true* Church of Christ may be identified and recognized.. Wherever they will all apply, that is most certainly the true Church—the only organization of the kind on earth that has the authority and approbation of God —that will prevail and triumph, and stand when all others shall fail, and the only one that the Lord Jesus Christ will own and receive as his bride, when he shall come again, "without a sin-offering unto salvation."

It may be said to us, as it was once said to the Savior: "This is a hard saying, who can bear it?" And it may also be said to us, "You have unchristianized every Church in the land but one—but your own—and consigned them all alike to the disapprobation of God, disownment by the Lord

Jesus Christ, and utter extinction and annihilation!" If so —if thus consigned—it is not *we* who have done it, but it has been done by the New Testament, by the WORD of God. If they are recognized by that, it is beyond our power to unchurch or unchristianize them; nor do we wish to do so. If they are not the true Church, or true Churches, of Christ, they can easily become such. Any Church can become the true Church by acquiring all these marks of identification, by parting with everything inconsistent with them, and by conforming to everything taught in the New Testament, as regards its constitution, organization, laws and regulations.

The Church which has all these marks, to the exclusion of what is inconsistent with them and the Bible, and claims to be the true, catholic, Apostolic Church, has taken high and vantage ground in religion—the highest position on earth. She has taken ground that must be sustained at every point, which she must never abandon, and which she must occupy worthily and improve perseveringly, in a manner that shall result in her own welfare and happiness, the glory of God, and her eternal happiness and salvation.

If she is no better than the sects around her, or perhaps not as good, in piety, temper, good works, the practice of Christian duty and keeping the ordinances of the Lord's house, what will be the inducement to unite with or enter into her? Or what advantages will she possess by a mere external conformity to the Bible in all these marks of identification ? The inquiry with her should always be, Wherein do we excel? Her members should indeed be "a peculiar people, zealous of good works," and in obeying the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ. They should endeavor to have "a good report of those without," or of the world—should avoid everything inconsistent with their high and holy profession and be found in the daily discharge of every duty—should be "living epistles, known and read of all men," and "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blamelessly." Then will the Church be "clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and as terrible

as an army with banners"—"the pillar and ground of the truth."

Such must be the Church in order to be prepared for entering on the glorious period of the millennium. She must have all these marks, and be in possession of this character. Before 'entering upon that she will have to pass through an ordeal that will try her as with fire, purge her from all that is impure and corrupting, give her members the spirit of martyrs, and make her the Bride, the Lamb's wife —the Church Triumphant.

No. VIII.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

Apology 5.—Having in previous articles considered four popular apologies for human creeds, we shall now proceed to consider a fifth, and the last one we shall trouble the reader with at present. It is generally couched in the following brief sentence: "Our creed will do us no harm, if it does no good." This is very soothing, quieting and relieving-to the conscience. Many honest and well-meaning persons, after being awakened and brought to reflect on the subject seriously; after having their attention called to the Bible, the infallible law of the Lord, as a rule of faith—have dropped the subject, and quieted their consciences, by drawing a long breath and saying, "Well, I know the Bible is infallible, the only sure guide to heaven–'the only infallible rule of our faith and practice '—but our creed will do me no harm; I never read it, do not know what is in it, nor care anything about it." This makes the matter assume the appearance of being of very little consequence. But the matter can not be disposed of in such an easy way as all that. There are certain great principles, most important and leading principles of Christianity, that all human creeds are in eternal hostility to, and the issue between those principles and all human creeds must exist, until one or the other is overcome. The Lord prayed for the believers—those who should believe on him in all time to come, through the words of the Apostles–"that they may be one, that the world may believe." All Christians will admit that the belief of the world is essential to its conversion. The world can never be converted without believing. No man can fail to see that our Lord in this prayer (John xvii, 20, 21,) makes the belief of the world depend upon the oneness, or the union of believers. He says, "I pray for them, that they may be one, that the world may

believe that thou hast sent me." The reason he assigns for desiring the unity of believers, is *"that the world may believe,"* or that the world may be converted.

Now, that believers never can be one till we get rid of human creeds, is just as clear as that Jews and Christians never can be one, with the law of Moses in full force over one party, and the law of Christ in full force over the other; or that the Methodists and Presbyterians never can be one. while the Confession and Discipline are both in full force; or that Mohammedans and Mormons never can be one, till the Koran or the Book of Mormon is set aside. There never was, and never can be, such a thing as two religious parties becoming one, with two creeds remaining in full force. Two parties can not, in the very nature of things, become one. without disposing of one of the organizations. This can not be done without disposing of the constitution and laws of the organization dispensed with. We have now an immense number of organizations, mostly formed upon human creeds. These creeds, and the organizations under them, must be thrown aside, before the union of believers ever takes place; for no man of reason ever thinks of all ever uniting upon any one human creed; nor is any one party thinking of all ever uniting with them. It can not, with any reason, be expected that all the good, pious, devoted and truly Christian ever will unite upon any human platform; for no one can ever show any superior claims to all others. Before a union of all the believers, the truly pious, devoted and Christian can be intelligently prayed for, expected, and confidently urged upon all the followers of Christ, a basis superior to all others, characterized by infinite wisdom, and clothed with the authority of the Almighty, must be urged. This no human creed claims, or can claim. No man claims that he has one particle of Divine authority for his creed. No one thinks of such a thing as claiming that God required or authorized his creed. No party thinks that any man is bound to believe his creed; for all parties admit that persons can be and are Christians, who neither believe nor submit to their creed. This is ad-

mitted in regard to every creed. Then, a man can be a Christian and neither believe nor submit to any human creed. It is not the belief nor submission to a human creed, then, that constitutes a Christian. These human creeds, then, in the place of having superior claims, have no claims at all. That which God has never required, never authorized, which makes no man a Christian, but which men can be Christians without believing, has no claims upon Christians, to say nothing of *superior* claims.

But the Bible has superior claims. The "law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" it is the "perfect law of liberty." Men can not be Christians without believing it. As it converts the soul, men can not be converted without it; and as it is the perfect law of liberty, men can not object to it as a rule of their faith and practice. No good man coolly and carelessly set it aside, and a human creed substituted in its place, and let it all pass, with the careless and thoughtless expression: "Our creed will do us no harm!" It does harm, even if you never saw it, for it prevents you from union with those whom you admit to be Christians, who believe the Bible, the Gospel, Christianity, and love the Savior as ardently as yourself. Why not, then, in the name of all that is sacred, unite upon the Bible, the Gospel, Christianity, the Savior of the world, to whom you are indebted for every pious impulse, for every spiritual impression, for every joyful feeling, for your conversion from sin and your hope of heaven, and forget your creeds, to which you are indebted for nothing, except your lamentable divisions, and leave them forever? Do you say that Unitarians dishonor our Lord, in making him a mere prophet, merely a distinguished reformer, one highly gifted and favored of God, etc.? In this no doubt you are perfectly right, but how much more do you dishonor him, in substituting a human law for his? You pray to him, and argue his essential Deity and equality with the Father, but how much confidence do you show the world, Unitarians, unbelievers and all, you have in Jesus Christ as a lawgiver, governor, ruler or king? Is his law

your law—your *only law*, as he is your only lawgiver, Savior and king? As you exalt him in your prayers, in your arguments on his Divinity and co-equality with the Father, do you honor his word, his Gospel, his religion, his holy law, above all words, religions and laws? How can you call him your only king, your guide and ruler, unless you call his law your *only law* and your *only rule* of faith? How can you believe he will hear your prayers, however highly you may speak of his Divinity, while you adopt a human creed in the place of his Divine and infallible rule of faith and practice? He rules, like all rulers, by his law; and the man who sets aside his law and submits to a human law, sets him aside as his ruler, and gives a human ruler the preference, or, to express it in Scripture style, declares that he will not have him to rule over us. Is not this offering a dreadful insult to his dignity as the great lawgiver, governor, ruler, and King of kings and Lord of lords? To think that he is our wisdom, our righteousness; the way, the truth, and the life —that no man cometh to the Father but by him—that he was lifted up to draw all men unto him—that he, as the Supreme Ruler, has issued a law; declared it a "perfect law," nay, more, "the *perfect law of liberty*,"—commanded it to be published to every creature, with the assurance that he who would believe it and submit to it should be saved, but that those who should reject it should be lost, and that man should ever have attempted to make a law, a rule of faith, or creed to bind upon those who have received the great Ruler and his law, is perfectly overwhelming! Such an insult to his majesty, offered by his professed friends, under the idea of aiding and honoring him, is ridiculous in the extreme. There is not any earthly king or potentate in this world that would not call a set of men to account for such an attempt in his government and punish them severely, lie would look upon them as wicked and dangerous persons, who impeached his government, and consequently him, as a governor, is insufficient and not capable of ruling them; and he would look upon them as arrogant, in claiming the ability to

make a law that would supply the deficiency in his law, and as usurpers, trying to wrest the government out of his hands that they might rule themselves, and would punish them accordingly.

With what ineffable contempt, then, must the Ruler of the Universe—the only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, the Almighty—look down upon the council of a poor, short-sighted, finite and erring creatures, that ought to be upon their knees praying God that they might understand *his law*, who have assumed that the law of God, the *perfect law*, is not sufficient to govern his people, and assumed the responsibility of making a law, better adapted to the work. more convenient, more easily understood, and that can accomplish what the law of God can not do! If it should be said, this law is not intended as a substitute for the law of God, but merely to aid it, the idea would be as ridiculous as he who would light up candies to aid the sun in its beams at noonday in giving light. It still dishonors the law of God, as also the Law-giver, as incapable of answering the purpose, as being insufficient and needing aid. The whole procedure of creed-making, and the reasons for it, grow out of a dissatisfaction with what the Lord has done, what he is now doing, and a desire to improve upon it. There must be a dissatisfaction with the law of God, and our adorable Lord and Savior Jesus Christ as law-giver and ruler; faults must be found with his law; complaints must be made against it; a desire must exist to get out from under it, or to have something else to aid it, before the idea of another law can enter the mind. Can one who has all confidence in him—one who wishes to commend him to an unbelieving world as his only King and Savior, who would honor him above all law-givers, and as worthy not only of the homage, the reverence and faith of all men, but as having a right to demand the implicit submission and obedience of the human race—let such thoughts ever enter his heart, to say nothing of expressing them? Let believers show implicit confidence in him and his law, and the world will believe.

No. IX.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

WE do not pen these articles because we love to annoy our religious neighbors, perplex them, or war upon that which is dear to them. We are sorry that duty, solemn duty, demands of us this examination of our position relative to human creeds, and this expose of the barrenness of the ground they stand upon, knowing, as we do, the unpleasant sensations it produces in the breasts of some persons. But our sympathy must not get the better of our judgment and silence us upon what we know to be a great vital point. If there are any two great objects which may be regarded aa the main burden of the Gospel of Christ, the main mission of Christianity, and essential to carrying out the great purpose of God, they are the following:

1. The union of all the children of God; their harmonious co-operation in all the great and good works of Christianity, as well as the scriptural worship of Almighty God.

2. The conversion of the world.

That all Christians, or all the children of God, can never unite in the worship of God and the good works of Christianity, until human creeds are abandoned and the Lord honored as the Supreme Ruler, and his law honored as the supreme law—the only ecclesiastical law—is one of the clearest and most manifestly self-evident propositions. And. that the law of God requires such union in worship and good works—that it imperiously demands it—that it continues to demand it—that this demand comes clothed in expostulations, in inspired persuasions—that it comes clothed in all the authority of a Divine command from the law of God—that it comes with all the authority, of Him who controls the thunders of the universe—no man will attempt to deny who knows anything of the letter and spirit of the word of God.

What, then, shall we do? what can we do? If the Almighty requires union, and all human creeds stand opposed to union, we must reject the creeds, or stand opposed to the God of our existence. We can not stand opposed to the Almighty. We must, then reject the creeds. If there can never be a harmony or union till the power and influence of human creeds are destroyed and disregarded; and if the world can never be converted, if the nations of the earth can never be induced to regard Christianity, have confidence in it, and believe in its adorable Author, as implied in his prayer (John xvii, 20, 21), then the world can never be converted till the abolishment of all human creeds.

But why need we argue against human creeds? Who is defending them? Who has written a book in their defense? Who has undertaken to show any Divide authority for them? We have never seen a hook, any article in a book or printed publication of any description, or heard a man in the pulpit try to show any Divine authority for human creeds. Nor have we ever seen anything like an attempt to establish their utility and necessity, in any book, important document, or public speech. It is true, when Mr. Campbell affirmed in the Lexington Debate the schismatical tendencies of all human creeds, Dr. N. L. Rice plead "not guilty" for them, insisted upon their innocence, and tried to show that they did not do the harm alleged; but that they had any authority from God, that they did any good, or could do, in governing Churches, comforting saints or preventing heresy, what the Bible Could not do, we believe he did not attempt, by any regular course of argument, to prove. We are free to admit that in many instances he seemed to imply this much, but did not make it a clear point and directly attempt to establish it. Why, then, if no one argues the Divine authority of human creeds, undertake to prove them" usefulness, or that they can do, in governing churches, comforting saints, or shutting out heresy, what the Bible can not do, contend against them or try to put them down? Because, though men do not contend for any Divine authority for human creeds, but generally

know there is none, nor undertake to prove their necessity, or that they can accomplish what the Bible can not do, they have them as their rule of faith and practice, submit to them, bind others to do so, govern churches by them, and substitute them in the place of the law of God.

If a man pushes on his distillery, keeps it running and rolling out barrels of fiery intoxicating liquor, whether he ever attempts to make any defense or not, I feel bound to speak of his ruinous operations, and try to dissuade men from countenancing his work. Or if a man keeps his liquor-shop open, continues to sell and make men drink, we must continue to speak against it, and discountenance the business, though he may never offer an argument in justification of his work, or even though he confesses all the time that it is wrong. Some of the worst sins that men are addicted to are practiced, their perpetrators admitting them wrong all the time.

So long, then, as human creeds are bound upon men, going on with their ruinous work, keeping up division, the issue exists. They are in direct opposition to the interests of the Bible. The great work of uniting all the good, the pious. those who love and desire to serve God, in one holy and happy band, that they may harmoniously co-operate in all the great works of mercy and humanity, and converting the world—the main objects of Christianity—can never be accomplished till all the human creeds are rejected by Christians.

Here, then, we file our reason—our main reason—for our unmitigated opposition to all human creeds. Two of the main objects for which we labor are continually impeded, obstructed and hindered by human creeds. Our first great work—the union of all the children of God, which our Lord prayed for, the holy Apostle commanded, and which is inculcated by the whole spirit of the New Testament—we can not give up; nor can we cease to labor for it, and in laboring for it we must rescue those whom we labor to unite from human and put them under Divine instruction; from human

and put them under Divine leaders; from human and put them under Divine law; from human and put them under Divine authority; from the fallible dictation of uninspired men to the infallible dictation of the Spirit of God; from the power of poor, erring mortals, and put them under the power of the Almighty. This is necessary—lt *is essential* —to our second object, the conversion of the world.

The object of the Lord's mission into the world, as stated by himself (John iii, 17,) is, "that the world through him might be saved." The Church, being "the light of the world" and "the salt of the earth," has an object—a mission —and that object or mission must correspond with the object of our Lord in coming into the world—" that the world through him might be saved." If the mission of the Church corresponds with this object—with the idea of being "the light of the world" and "salt of the earth "—it must be to enlighten and save the woad. Human creeds are in continual hostility to this work. Their horizon is too limited, narrow and circumscribed for such a work as this. They are not made for the world—for mankind, or for the human race, but merely for a party. The great objects of converting and saving the world are supremely above all the conceptions of all human creeds. The idea of being "the light of the woad," or "salt of the earth," has never entered into them. They are not designed to operate upon the world; nor are they designed for the Church of Christ, as a whole, but merely for a little party; and all the provisions of every human creed have respect to some faction and their peculiar interests, and all the efforts of the party are directed in some way merely to the peculiar interests of a party.

Now, to be a partisan—a mere devotee to a creed—all that is necessary is to become acquainted with the peculiar objects of the party, or the objects of the creed, and labor to promote these objects. Such persons generally fix their attention upon a few peculiarities, views, and party interests, and confine the labors of their lives to these, and suppose that

such zeal and devotion will go for Christianity, and gain the approbation of the Author of the Christian faith. But this Is infinitely too insignificant, little, and circumscribed for Christianity. To become a Christian, in the New Testament acceptation, a man must *receive the Savior of the world,* and not some man's *views* of him, but receive *Him,* as God has revealed him, as his Prophet, Priest, King, Ruler, Governor, Law-giver, and place himself under him, give himself to him, follow him, and put his everlasting trust in him. He must receive Christianity itself, and not some man's views of it—the whole of Christianity, as set forth by Christ and the Apostles in the New Testament. He must fix his attention upon it, as the great system to which he has subscribed, and look for its great purposes, designs and objects; and never allow his objects to be circumscribed to anything more limited, narrow and little than the great objects of Christianity itself. He must take-the Church of Christ into his embrace, his fellowship, with all its great interests and objects, as a whole, and not some little, insignificant party that have split off for the purpose of maintaining and promoting some partisan peculiarity or peculiarities. He must take the great work of God upon his soul, the whole of it; fix the purpose of God before his mind, and make the purpose of God his purpose, the work of God his work, the Church of God his Church, the people of God his people, the law of God his law, the Book of God his Book, and the will of God his will. He is not then continually trying to prove his doctrine by Scripture, for his doctrine *is Scripture itself,,* not trying to prove his creed, for his creed is the law of God itself; nor apologizing for unscriptural names and peculiarities, for he has none. He is enraptured with the glories of his Lord, and his wonderful works to the children of men. His heart is filled with the Spirit of God. He is embraced in the Church of God, and all his powers engrossed in the work of God. His whole trust is in God. The Almighty is pledged for his protection, and he leans upon the blessed promises.

He is girded as with the everlasting hills. The Everlasting Arms are underneath him. He dwells with God, and walks with God. How high his objects, how grand his work, and how expanded his soul, compared with the man circumscribed to the limited interests of a party!

No. X.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

"IN having no creed but the Bible, requiring no experience, no explanation of convert's views, his feelings, and faith, except the simple confession that ' he believes with all his heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' you make the Church liable to imposition, in receiving many who have no change of heart, and who will not hold out faithful to the end." In appearance, this is a very specious objection, and has no doubt had much weight with many persons. It assumes such an air of piety, that an unsuspecting person would scarcely think of any sophistry in it. It puts on such a deep and cautious concern in regard to a thorough work in converting men, and the protection of the Church from imposition, that not one out of ten thousand would ever suspect it of being a most wicked and daring assumption. Still, when it is carefully looked at, it is most unquestionably such. It commences with an admitted dissatisfaction with the work of conversion under the immediate administration of the infallibly inspired Apostles of the Lamb. It impeaches the procedure of the holy Apostle to whom were committed the keys of the kingdom of God, alleging that he opened the way for imposition. It challenges the Holy Spirit of God, who led the Apostles into all truth, with being too loose in the reception of the first converts to the faith of Christ, of demanding too little of them, and not using proper precautions against imposition. In one word, it impeaches the wisdom of God, in assuming that he has not safely guarded the door of admission into the kingdom of Christ, and consequently that his system is defective, permitting persons to enter without proper feelings, views, impressions, and unprepared for admission.

Having assumed, reasoned and decided that the Apostles,

under the guidance of the unerring Spirit of all truth, in receiving persons into the Christian institution, were faulty, to be complained of, and not a suitable example for preachers in our day, it proceeds to the second assumption, viz.: "That uninspired men, in their wisdom and discretion, should supply the defect in the procedure of the holy and inspired Apostles of Jesus! In order to this important object, they should *add to* the simple confession, that the penitent "believes with all the heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" or rather, *substitute for this,* something like the following: "Do you feel a desire to flee the wrath to come? Do you feel that you are a great sinner? that you are the chief of sinners? Do you feel that you are entirely unworthy of the Divine favor? Do you feel that if you had received your just deserts, you would have been sent to perdition before now? Do you realize the heinous, awful and damning character of sin? Do you loath and hate sin, and feel a full determination to abandon it? Do you love God with all your heart? Do you desire nothing but God? Do you hunger and thirst after righteousness? Do you feel your continued need of God? Do you feel determined, by the help of God, to seek the Lord, find him, obey him and serve him all your life? Do you feel that your heart is changed? and that the love of God has reached your soul? Can you tell us what the Lord has done for you?" These questions are all found in two or three places in books I have read, and have been put to applicants for Church reception, in one form or another, thousands of times. We are free to grant, that a true penitent might answer the most of these affirmatively, very conscientiously. But what would be gained by it? The most consummate hypocrite could, and would, respond to them affirmatively as readily as the most sincere. So *can*, and so *do,* such tell the most thrilling experiences, and frequently call forth the greatest applause, and the most hearty approbation of the inquisitors, make their way through them all, and gain admission into churches more readily than they pass the great confession of faith in the

Redeemer, and the first solemn test of submission to him. To a man, however, who admits the wisdom and works of God, and who has become acquainted with the great and incomparable wisdom and superiority of the arrangements of the All-wise God, above all human contrivances, it is an instructive lesson to notice some of the silly and puny efforts of man to improve upon his works; and in no instance that we know of is it more so than in the very matter we are considering. When the Almighty revealed his Son, at his baptism, it was in the short but comprehensive oracle, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased," and in the holy mountain of transfiguration, in the presence of the eye-witnesses of His majesty, when he repeated this great oracle, he added the simple, very brief, though most comprehensive and world-wide command, "HEAR HIM!" In this oracle, we have the Father's own revelation of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, to the world; and in this command we have the authority of the ineffable Jehovah to adhere to him. In this short oracle is concentrated the whole revelation from God to man. It is the base, the rock, the immovable pillar or foundation upon which the whole rests. He who receives it, if consistent, receives the whole, and is bound to the whole. God puts the whole, concentrates the whole in it, when presented to the children of men in the confession, as the great test of faith. He who makes the great confession, acknowledges his confidence in the great Teacher, which confidence he can not have without confiding in all he sanctions. He sanctions the whole revelation of God, and whoever believes in him with all the heart, believes in and receives all he sanctions. In this short oracle, or confession, is contained more than is found in all the catechisms in the world. God is in it. The Lord Jesus Christ is in it. The Holy Spirit is in it. The whole Bible is in it. The power of God is in it. The only salvation for man is in it. The only hope of the world is in it. All Christianity is in it. The whole Christian institution is in it.

"But we want something binding." Look, then, at the

command accompanying this oracle, or confession, or immediately following it, if you desire something binding or authoritative. We allude to the authoritative utterance, "Hear Him!" God who made the worlds—God who rules among the armies of heaven, who hurled angels down to hell for disobedience, whose voice shook the earth—God who holds the destinies of all nations in his hand, who "weighs the hills in a balance, and handles the isles as a very little thing," in connection with the revelation of his Son to all the nations of the earth—with all the majesty of his authority-says, "HEAR HIM!" give him audience, regard him, bow to him, follow him, be guided by him, honor and obey him forever. How utterly futile and insignificant the attempt of puny and erring mortals to add anything to the great oracle or confession, in which is concentrated the whole Christian institution, and with which is connected the authoritative words of the ineffable Jehovah, *"Hear Him!"* If a man receives the revelation God makes of his Son, or rather, if he receives his Son from the revelation he has made of him, and bows in submission to him in accordance with the command to "Hear him," confesses with the mouth before men what he believes in the heart, that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and submits to the Divine test of loyalty, in the requirement to be buried with his Lord in baptism, while that great formula is uttered over him, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," he gives the highest assurance in his power to give that he is changed in heart, that he loves God and will serve him, and is bound by the strongest pledge, the highest and most solemn obligation that ever did or ever can bind a human being to love and serve God. To add a thousand human ceremonies to this would give no higher assurance of the preparation of the heart, the designs and resolutions being genuine, and bind the individual no more solemnly to be faithful to the end. The confession that God requires is the greatest confession that man can make, and the making of it is the best evidence a man can give

that his heart is right. The first test of loyalty God has required of the penitent confessor is the strongest, highest and most solemn to which man can submit, and the submission to it is the strongest evidence of loyalty the person can give. The authority that requires this submission is the highest and most binding that can rest upon a human being, 'and if it does not govern, control and restrain the person, no authority can.

If such a confession as this—one that takes in God and man, heaven and earth, the Savior and his words, the whole revelation from God, the sublime confession that Christ is the Son of God made in a proper manner—will not show that the heart is right, you need not add any such catechisms or experiences as are common in these times. They are all perfect nothingness compared with this great confession, which, like the spider's web, may catch flies and gnats, while the dangerous wasp and hornet will pass through with ease. The safe ground, and the only safe ground, is to follow the simple and infallible leadings of the Spirit of God. Appeal to the sacred record, and examine his Divine and unerring procedure the day he came down from heaven and guided the Apostles into all truth. What did he require of men on that day before receiving them into the Church? Follow him as he guided the Apostles in all the cases of conversion mentioned in the sacred record. What did he require in all these cases? The same must be required now, and no more. We must be led by the Spirit of God in converting sinners, and not by human creeds; we must be guided by the wisdom of God, and not by the wisdom of man; we must have confidence in the ways of God, and show no hankering after the ways of man. God will depart from all who turn away from the simplicity of the apostolic practice under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit. No man is led by, or has the Spirit, who has not full confidence in requiring precisely the same of all entering the Church required by the Apostles, as by the Holy Spirit, who guided them. He simply required the *confession with the mouth, of the faith of the heart.*

ADDRESS ON ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

[The following is the opening address of the editor on Endless Punishment, delivered on the second day of the debate on the claims of Universalism, with Rev. Bosserman, of Dayton, Ohio, in Lexington, Ohio, September 21, 1856. By the request of many friends who heard the speech, we lay it before our readers. It was delivered perfectly extemporaneously, as every speech of ours was, as we had not time to open a single book to make the slightest preparation after we knew the debate would certainly take place, until we were on the ground. This will account for any lack of method or arrangement in the speech. We have aimed to write it out as near in the precise words in which it was delivered as possible, from memory, and a brief skeleton prepared during the short intermission of an hour and a-half that preceded its delivery, in the midst of talking and greeting friends, who were taking some refreshment on the ground.—B. F.]

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I have appeared before you only as a respondent during this discussion till now. Heretofore I have simply replied to the effort of my opponent to prove that all men will be finally reconciled, made holy and happy. Having, in my reply, not only defeated the argument of my friend, but brought negative proof ruinous to his whole system, and going far to establish my affirmative proposition, I am now to proceed to discuss Future Punishment. The proposition, as written by my friend, reads as follows: "Will any part of the human family suffer endless torment?"

Mr. Bosserman has made several strong appeals to your prejudices, only calculated, whether so intended or not, to prevent a candid hearing and deliberate decision. Similar appeals might be made to induce you not to believe in the existence of a fine, chain-gang, prison, penitentiary or gallows in this world; but after all his fine rhetoric, sensible people would still believe in the existence of such places of punishment. Nor would it avail anything with them should he read to them as tenderly and affectionately as he told his

experience last night, during which he shed tears, or thought he did, as I judged from his applying his handkerchief to his eyes. He might, in the most feeling manner he could invent, tell the mothers present, that if there be such places of punishment, they know not but the tender infants in their arms may be the victims, and they may be separated from the objects of their fond embrace. But not many of the mothers here could be induced, by such argument, to deny the existence of such places of punishment, or to try to reform their children by making them believe that there are no such punishments. Good mothers believe, or rather they know, there are fines, jails, etc., and let their children know it, and advise them how to live so as to avoid them. In the same way, a good mother does not deny the existence of a place of punishment for the wicked after death, but labors to direct her children as the Lord commands her, to walk in the way that leads to life. The same is true of a good minister of the word of God. He does not deny nor attempt to quibble round the punishment threatened in the Bible, but guides the people in the way to life. No good guide was ever yet found who would deny the dangers to Which they are exposed he professes to guide safely.

Upon this momentous question, the Bible is the supreme authority. Whatever the Bible teaches is true, whether it suits our notions or not; and it is much easier for us to bow to *the Bible* than to *bend the Bible to us.* We shall, therefore, proceed to make a condensed statement of the argument now before yon, with some additional argument, to show that people who die in their sins will be judged and punished after death, and that the punishment will be endless. In so doing, I shall grasp as many of the principal passages that I can rely On as possible, that my opponent may have a fair opportunity to make the best response in his power.

1. There is punishment or :torment for wicked men after death. The case of the rich man and Lazarus is recorded—Luke xvi, 19—31. At verse twenty-two, we are informed that the "rich man died and was buried, and in hell he lifted up

his eyes, being in torment." Such is the testimony of the Lord. The rich man himself testified, saying, "I am tormented in this flame." Abraham testified, saying, "Thou art tormented." The only use we now make of this case is to show clearly that a man was in torment after death. In connection with this, I quote from Luke xii, 4-5, "Be not afraid of those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." Here we find our Lord admonishing his disciples to fear God, because he not only can kill, but after that cast into hell. This could not be true if there were no hell beyond death. This Valley of Hinnom my opponent must find after death—after the body is killed—not merely a place to burn bodies, but in which both *souls* and bodies may be destroyed after the body is killed.

2. The next passage I shall quote to show that the Lord reserves the ungodly unto the day of judgment to be punished, is 2 Pet. ii, 9: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to *reserve* the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." In the same letter (iii, 7,) the Apostle says: "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, *reserved* unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Both of these passages are in the same spirit, setting forth the fact that the world is reserved for the day of judgment; and the latter connects the coming of Christ with the day of judgment. Let us hear Paul, whom Mr. Bosserman tried to prove a Universalist on last night, giving a charge to young preachers: "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." 2 Tim, iv, i: Here we have an account of judging the *dead* at the appearing and kingdom of Christ. This connects the coming of Christ and judgment together, and shows by the *dead*, as well as the quick, or the l*iving*, being judged, that it will be after death.

But we must hear the Apostle Peter in his first sermon to the Gentiles (Acts x, 42): "And he commanded us **to** preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." Here again, we have judgment of both the living and dead. We must be explicit on this point, and afford clear light to show that the dead will be judged, as my friend is slow to learn. The Apostle Peter, speaking of a certain class of the dead, viz., the antidiluvians, tells us for what the Gospel was preached to them in the days of Noah, as follows: "That they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." (I Pet. iv, 5.) In the verse preceding this, speaking of other vile characters: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and dead," we find the dead included.

If the foregoing does not satisfy any candid mind that our Lord will judge the dead, look at the following: "But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you." (Matt." xi, 22.) Hear the Lord again: "For I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." The Sodomites had been buried in ruins ages before this; the cities Tyre and Sidon were destroyed from the face of the earth many long centuries before the Lord uttered these words; yet he declared that they should be in the judgment with the generation to whom he spoke. No man ever made even a plausible show of argument on the question here in dispute, who denies that this passage teaches a judgment after death. Let us attend to the teaching of the Lord again. He says, "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The Queen of Sheba shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it, for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here." (Matt. xi, 41-42.) We have now found

that the antediluvians, those of Tyre, Sidon, the land of Sodom, the Ninevites, and the Queen of Sheba, all dead and gone ages before our Lord's lifetime, are included in the judgment of which he spoke. But this is not all. There are more than these to be there. Look at the following: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Pet. ii, 4.) Here we have the angels that sinned reserved unto judgment. Let us hear about these angels that sinned once more: "And the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto. the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.) There has been no judgment in this world since the writing of these scriptures, at which the citizens of Tyre, Sidon, the land of Sodom, Nineveh, the Queen of Sheba, the antediluvians, the angels who sinned, with those to whom the Lord spoke, to say nothing of all who have lived since, were present. The reason is, that, "as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them who look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (or sin-offering) unto salvation." (Heb. ix, 27-28.)

3. We shall now connect the coming of Christ, day of judgment and resurrection of the dead together. Indeed, the passage just quoted puts judgment after death, and the coming of Christ at the same period. The gentleman has quoted Isaiah xlv, 23-25, and applied it to the resurrection state. In this he is right; for Paul quotes the same passage and applies it to the same state, to prove that we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. (Rom. xiv, 10. 11.) Let us hear him: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught, thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Now, Paul, let us hear you prove this? "For," says he, "it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then, every one of us shall

give account of himself to God." The identical passage, then, quoted by my opponent to prove that all will be saved, is quoted by Paul to prove a judgment; and, as it relates to the resurrection state, it proves a judgment at the resurrection of the dead.

But, my friend no doubt is anxious to hear from I Cor. xv, 22, 23. Let us hear the Apostle then: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be. made alive, but every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." The making all alive, predicted in this passage, is the raising all from the dead. This the passage declares shall be "at his coming." This, beyond controversy, connects the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. But this passage does more than this: at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead it discriminates between those "that are Christ's" and those that are not his. The expression "they are Christ's" implies that there are some not *his,* and this is at his coming and the resurrection of the dead. These discriminations between those who are Christ's and those not his, at his coming and the resurrection of the dead, are ruinous to the whole theory of my friend. Paul makes the same discrimination, speaking of the just and unjust, in his allusion to the resurrection of the dead in reply to Tertullus (Acts xxiv, 14): "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." The Lord himself makes the same. discrimination in the words, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." An intimation of the same discrimination in the resurrection is found in Luke xx, 35, in the following words: "They who shall be accounted *worthy* to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead." See also Dan. xii, 2 : "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." He follows in the same passage: "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." The same is inculcated in John v, 28-29: "Marvel

not at this; for the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Thus you perceive that in every allusion to the resurrection, the Lord discriminates in some form or other between the righteous and wicked. We close this part of the argument with John's account of the matter. In his splendid vision, in the island of Patmos, he appears to have presented to him, and passed before him, in one grand panorama, the whole period called "Time," the delivering up of the souls in the invisible state, the collecting of the bodies from both land and sea, or the resurrection of the dead, and he says: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."

Now, cast your eye back, and take one solemn look at these expressions touching the resurrection, and see the discrimination between the righteous and the wicked, such as, "they that are *Christ's* at his coming"—"they that shall be accounted *worthy"—"*the resurrection of the just"—"a resurrection both of *the just and unjust"—"*they that be *wise"* "they that shall *turn many to righteousness"—"*they that *have done good"—"*were judged every man according to *their works* "—and then tell what these continued and oft-repeated discriminations between the righteous and wicked mean, made at the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the Lord and day of judgment. Recollect it is after death; the quick and dead are present. The antediluvians, Tyre, Sidon, those of the land of Sodom, the Queen of Sheba, Nineveh, the angels that sinned, those to whom the Lord in his lifetime spoke, and all that are in the graves, with all alive on the earth, are there to be judged according to their works. "Those whose names were not found written in the book of life were cast into the lake of fire," Here is the last state of the disobedient.

But while I am making an effort to grasp as full a summary as possible, in my opening address, that my friend may have a fair opportunity to make a response, if he has any, I proceed to another class of evidence upon the state of those who die in their sins. These passages are negative proofs, some of which have been referred to. The Lord says: *"He* that believeth on the Son has everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. (John iii, 36.) This passage looks forward as far as unbelievers can be found, and declares that "he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life."* Jude, 12, 13, describes these. He says, "They are clouds without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." This description certainly follows these down to their last state. Let us hear the holy Apostle again: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction." (Phil. iii, 18, 19.) The end of these corrupt persons is unquestionably their last state. If their *last stale is destruction,* as here affirmed, it is all the veriest nonsense to speak of their ever being saved. The same high and holy authority, comparing corrupt characters to "thorns and briars," says they are "rejected, and nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned." (Heb. vi, 8.) Here is the last state of a man whom the Lord declares it impossible to renew again to repentance: "he is *nigh unto cursing, and his end is to be burned."* Let us hear the Lord while upon this fearful and momentous point. He says: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (John viii, 24.) Just before, he had said: "Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go, ye can not come." One of these expressions declares that those who believe not shall die in their sins, and the other declares that those who die in their sins shall not go where the Lord is, or shall not enjoy him.

This passage never was and never can be harmonized with the theory that all will be saved.

One man, while the Savior was upon his public mission, like many idle speculators of our time, more curious to know the precise number that will be saved than desirous, to learn his Lord's will, or do it when learned, inquired, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" Now, I can but think that if my friend had been there, that he would have responded, "Why, my dear sir, they all will be saved." At least, such is the doctrine he is here to prove. But such is not the doctrine taught by our Lord. He gave that man a much more solemn lesson. Let us be attentive to his words: "Strive to enter in at the straight gate, for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know ye not whence ye are; then shall ye begin t.o say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I know not whence you are; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity." (Luke xii, 23-27.) This language can never apply to men in this world. The language of the Lord to men in this life is, "They who seek shall find," "They who ask shall receive," —to "those who knock it shall be opened." "Whoever will may come," "He who cometh to me, I will in nowise cast out." As we sing, "The doors of Gospel grace stand open night and day." But this language applies to a time when the door of grace will be shut; when the applicant for admission shall not gain an entrance, but shall be thrust away, followed with the awful language, "Depart, ye workers of iniquity, I know you not." Here follows the Lord's own reason: "Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out nay hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and

destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you; then shall you call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me." (Prov. i, 24-28.) This reaches beyond time, beyond the day of grace, beyond this world, and beyond all Gospel invitation—beyond all repentance. To this list I will add but one more passage on this point. I allude to the closing words of the New Testament:." If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." (Rev. xxii, 19.)

Let us glance our eye over this list, and grasp as far as possible the amount of it. What, then, shall we think of the man who would try to prove that those will be saved whom the Lord declares "shall not see life;" "upon whom the wrath of God abides; .... who died in their sins;" of whom Jesus said "whither I go ye can not come;" those whom he styles "trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots;" "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever; .... whose end is destruction; .... rejected, nigh unto cursing, whose end it to be burned;" "who shall seek to enter in hut shall not be able;" but shall be thrust away with the sentence "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity;" whom the Lord will "mock when their fear cometh;" "who shall have their part taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things which are written in this book." We say, what shall we think of him who teaches, and tries to make men believe, that those to whom this language applies, shall be saved? Does he believe his Bible?

Having now followed punishment, not only to the after death state—not only to *hades* but to the day of judgment, at the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead, when those whose names are not written in the book of life are sentenced to the lake of fire, (as our Lord expressed it, "cast into hell, where the worm dieth not and the fire shall

never be quenched,") or *gehenna*—we are ready to look at its duration. My friend need not trouble himself about old *Gesohenna,* near Jerusalem, where criminals were executed, and dead bodies consumed; for its fires had gone out some four hundred years before our Lord uttered this fearful language. The Savior was not threatening a punishment (like our Universalist friends in finding a hell for the wicked at the destruction of Jerusalem), that he knew to have been done away, four centuries when he uttered the language. But we must proceed to the duration of this punishment. We do not read of an "endless hell," my friend says. True, for the good reason that hell is a place; and an endless place would be rather a long place. We affirm nothing about the length or width of this place of punishment; but the duration of the punishment we affirm is endless. This is intimated in our Lord's words:'" He who shall sin against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness; but is in danger of *eternal* damnation." (Mark iii, 29.) Here the terms used to express the perpetuity of unpardoned or condemned state are as unlimited in duration as human speech can employ. How can you express the unlimited duration of a man's unpardoned state in stronger terms than to say "he hath never forgiveness?" The same kind of unlimited duration, or perpetuity: is given to the fire of hell. The Lord says, "It shall *never be quenched."* What is the meaning of this? and what shall we think of him who will try to prove that this punishment shall have a termination? This can only be, when that which the Lord says "shall *never be"* shall come to pass, or when Universalists shall prove that our Lord's words are not true.

My opponent is right in applying the expression "The Lord God shall wipe off all tears" to the eternal state. John so applies this expression (Rev. xxi, 4,); but John soon finishes his description of those in the holy city, New Jerusalem, and just four verses after gives an account of others not in the holy city, but of whom we have the following overwhelming language: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, arid whoremongers, and sorcer-

ers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." Recollect this is in the resurrection state, at the precise period when all tears shall be wiped from those in the holy city, where there shall be no death. As my opponent desires a little light, touching the object of this "lake of fire," I am willing to contribute my mite to enlighten him. Matt, xxv, 41, we are informed that it was "prepared for the devil and his angels." As he has also asked, so significantly, learnedly and piously, "What or who is the devil?" I feel also under some obligations so assist him a little on that point. The Lord says: "He was a murderer from the beginning." Again, he says, "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." (John viii, 44.) Such is a hint of his character. In the same connection, we are informed that "he abode not in the truth." From this we learn that he was in flue truth, but abode not in it. This *"everlasting* fire," (Matt. xxv, 41,) prepared for the devil and his angels, is the same that the Lord says shall never be quenched, into which vile characters shall be cast immediately after the judgment, which we have seen followed immediately the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead.

The angels who sinned, we are informed, (Jude 6,) "he hath reserved in everlasting chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day." "*Chains,* under darkness," here used as a figure of the power by which they are held, or bound, are called *everlasting. "Everlasting"* here does not come from the Greek *aionion,* but from *aiodios,* which occurs in but one place in the New Testament. In that place it expresses the perpetuity of the Godhead, and his power, in the following words: "Even his eternal power and Godhead." This word means endless, or unlimited, duration, and is so used in the only two occurrences it has in the New Testament. The same word, then, used in the Christian Scriptures to express the perpetuity or eternity of the power and Godhead of the Deity, expresses the perpetuity, or eter-

nity, of the powers by which the angels that sinned are bound in punishment. The chains, or powers, in which they are bound, are everlasting. (See Jude 6.) The fire prepared for the devil and his angels is everlasting (Matt. xxv, 41.) The punishment is everlasting (Matt. xxv, 46.) Angels can not die in any such sense as to be incapable of punishment, nor can men in the resurrection "die any more" in any such sense as the natural death, for the Lord says of those in the resurrection, "neither can they die any more, but are as the angels." This corresponds with the Lord's own words, "Their worm dieth not." In this same sense, the Lord affirms that man "is not able to kill the soul." It can not die as the body dies, and become incapable of punishment. But it can suffer the "second death," which means the same as "destroy in hell," or "lose his own soul," or suffer the vengeance of an eternal fire," or "everlasting punishment."

Some destructionists have concluded that if the wicked have eternal existence, they will have "eternal life." But this only shows how loosely and carelessly they have thought upon the subject. "Eternal life," in no place, that we are aware of, in the New Testament, means simply *eternal existence*. Nor does immortality ever simply mean eternal existence. These terms always mean more than mere eternal existence. Where eternal life is presented as an object to be sought, it is not mere eternal existence; but it includes all the blessedness and glories of the redeemed. It is that form of speech in which a part is used for the whole. The same is true of the word "lost." When the Lord speaks of a soul being lost, the word *lost* involves all the evils of the state of perdition. The single expression, "second death," involves the same. Lost, destroyed, perished, all mean the same, and indeed come from the same Greek word, and when applied to the wicked in the future state, involves precisely the same as punishment, torment or misery, involving all included in the state of perdition. Any man who undertakes to explain "second death" to mean one thing, "lost" another, "per-

ished" something else, and "destroyed" different from all the balance, will only blind himself, and all who hear him, in the labyrinths of his meanderings in the dark. No matter how many forms of speech, both figurative and literal, may be applied to the punishment of the wicked in the eternal state, the thing they refer to is *one—always the same*. Every expression that refers to that thing, *always means the same*. The same is true of the state of glory. It is no matter whether it is called "life," "eternal life," "immortality," the "joys of the Lord," or "a crown of life," it means the same.

The Lord involves the whole, on both sides, in the two expressions, *"everlasting* punishment" and "eternal life." All that awaits the disobedient, and will ever be visited upon them on account of sins, is embodied in the short, but awful expression, "everlasting punishment," All that the whole Bible means by every expression touching the state of the wicked after the resurrection, no matter what the form of speech, nor whether figurative or literal, is concentrated and embodied in this short but fearful expression, "everlasting punishment." In the same way, all that the Bible means by all the expressions, both figurative and literal, touching the state of glory, is embodied or concentrated in the short but important expression, "eternal life." The latter includes heaven and all that heaven means; the former includes hell and all that hell means.

The passage that we are now Commenting upon is the close of our Lord's discourse. (Matt. xxv, 46.) The first thing we shall observe is the ground of admission, or that which the Lord gives as the reason of the separation of the the two classes. He says, a few verses previous to the one we have been commenting upon, and when drawing his discourse to a conclusion, he will say to the righteous or those on his right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father." His reason for this invitation is, "When I was hungry ye fed me," etc. They inquire of him, When? He answers, "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of these the least of my servants,

you did it to me." He will regard your acts of beneficence to the poor as done to him in person. But to those on the left hand he will say, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." His reason for this sentence is, "When I was hungry ye fed me not," etc. They inquire, When? He responds, "Inasmuch as you did it not to one of these the least of my servants, you did it not to me." He regards their omission of humanity to the poor as done to him in person, and makes this the basis of his procedure in the last judgment. So much for the Lord's reason for his decision. The sentence is, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The next thing to observe is, that the judgment of both parties is *at the same time*. The sentence of both parties is on the same occasion. The entrance of both parties into the respective places assigned them is at the same time. The entrance of the righteous into "eternal life" is not their entrance into Christianity, for the Lord never refers to a man's previous Christian acts of beneficence as a reason for his reception into Christianity; but these had gone through their Christian life, and the Lord refers back to their Christian acts of humanity as a reason why they should enter into everlasting life. If this is not entering heaven and all the joys that heaven unfolds to man, I know not where the passage is to be found that speaks of the entrance into that state. But it is the entrance into heaven itself—into "life eternal." At the same time, then, that the righteous enter "life eternal," or heaven, the incorrigible enter "everlasting punishment," or hell. This shows that the states, the state of glory and the state of punishment, in point of time, lie side by side. In point of time, the parties enter and start forward at the same period.

How long will these states, or that which is received in them, last? Respecting the state of glory, or the life eternal, there is but one mind. Its perpetuity shall be co-existent with the years of God. In the same sentence then, in reference to those who enter their final destiny at the same time,

the Lord used the same word to express the duration of the state of glory that he does to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. That word is *aionion,* here translated *"everlasting"* in one place, and *"eternal"* in the other. As Dr. Clarke says, "It is as likely that the state of glory shall have an end, as that the punishment of the wicked shall terminate." The word *aionion,* here used by our Lord, can mean nothing but duration, and the same duration expressed by it in one part of this sentence is expressed in the other. If it mean endless life, as all admit, in one place, then it must mean endless punishment in the other. It can not be used in a limited sense in one part of a sentence and unlimited in another. Let no man, then, trifle with this fearful, momentous and awful passage, but remember this, that the judgment of all is at the same time; the sentence of all is passed at the same time; the entrance of all into their final state is at the same time; and the duration of the condition of all in their last state is, by our Lord, in the same short sentence of two lines, expressed by the *same word.* As certain as "life eternal" is endless, so certain is the punishment of the wicked endless.

The expression "forever and ever" occurs some twenty-three times in the New Testament, and means unlimited duration, or endless, in every case. It is never used in a limited sense in one place in the New Testament. It expresses the duration of the existence of God, of Christ, of the praises of God, and the punishment of the wicked. It is used in such expressions as the following: "Him that liveth forever and ever,"—"blessing, and honor, and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." That these expressions mean unlimited duration—in one instance, the unlimited duration of the life of God, and in the other, the unlimited duration of the praises that shall ascend to him—no man doubts. This expression is found thirteen times in the single Book of Revelations, and ten times expresses the duration of the life of God, the life of Christ, and the praises that ascend to heaven.

In all these places it expresses unlimited duration, all admit. The same expression precisely is applied to the punishment of the wicked three times in this same book. Twice it is said "the smoke of their torment ascended forever and ever." Once it is found as follows: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." (Rev. xx, 10.) My opponent may make the old Universalian reply that "there is no day and night in eternity." But this is home-made scripture. No passage in the Bible says so. One passage, speaking of the holy city, New Jerusalem, says "there shall be no night there." In the same passage, speaking of the holy city, it is said there shall be no need of the sun, nor of the moon; but the reason given for this is not that day and night have ceased, but "the glory of God and the Lamb is the light thereof." That day and night have not ceased is evident from the statement that "the gates shall not be shut at all by day. (Rev. xxi, 25.) David, as quoted by Paul (Heb. i, 12), speaking of God, says, "Thy *years* shall not fail." Years are made of days, and if the years of God fail not, and if the gates shall not be shut by day, there will still be days in eternity. This is the period when all tears shall be wiped from the eyes of those in the holy city, which my friend has rightly applied to eternity. This is also the same period in which "the devil who deceived them shall be cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall, be tormented day and night forever and ever." The same expression here also that expresses the perpetuity of the state of glory, expresses the duration of the punishment of the wicked. The same expressions used to express the duration of the life of God, of Christ, of the praises of God, and the state of glory in heaven, are used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. What, then, ever put it into the heads of men that the state of glory shall be perpetual, but the state of punishment limited? Cer-

tainly no Scripture, no argument, no reason, nor anything else, only *their desire to have it so.*

I admit the conclusion is momentous, fearful and overwhelming. But it is to be\recollected that the mission of Christ is the last effort to reclaim our race. Jesus of Nazareth in his teachings, life, miracles and death, is the last great exponent of the love of God to man. He is presented as the chiefest among all the ten thousands and altogether lovely, to woo our whole rational nature and bring us to God. lie presents a crown of glory in heaven, with the high and holy inducements of heaven, with all that heaven means, to enlist us and bring us to God. And then, as a last resort, he unvails a judgment after death, a "lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels," and declares to the rebellious, the incorrigible, that "their end is destruction—"to be burned"—to "go away into everlasting punishment"—"tormented day and night forever and ever." Do you say "the thought is awful!" Then repent; flee to God and seek salvation. You can then know what salvation means. It is not an idle bubble about the salvation of a people never in any danger of being lost; but salvation of those already lost—a salvation of their souls from sin now, and both the soul and body from the danger of destruction in hell in the world to come. This does, as no other conclusion ever can, explain the labors, tears, persecutions and sufferings endured by the Apostles and first Christians.

No. XI.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

WE have been satisfied that the main difficulty to be encountered in calling the people of this generation back from the doctrines and commandments of men to the simplicity of the ancient, faith and practice of Christianity, would be found among the professors of religion; that it would be found *in the churches*, and what is vastly more lamentable, among *preachers;* and, still worse, that the difficulty itself is to induce them to love, admire and delight in the ways and works of God more than in the ways and works of man; to have more confidence in and be more willing to be led and guided by the glorious Redeemer; or, in other words, to have more confidence in and be more willing to be led by the Holy Spirit of the living God than poor, weak and erring mortals; to prefer to honor and exalt the wisdom of God above the wisdom of man. Whatever spiritual influences men may believe in and plead for, however much they may contend for an abstract influence of the Spirit, or any influence separate from and independent of the word, it is manifest that the inspired Scriptures are the teachings of the Spirit of God, and that no man is a Christian who does not adhere to and follow the Scriptures. "They who are of God hear us, and they that are not of God hear not us," says the holy and inspired Apostle of the Lamb. No preacher in his revival operations, or any other work he may engage in, has the Spirit of God, or is guided by the Spirit, or is of God, who does not hear the Apostles, both in converting men and teaching the Church. The command of an Apostle is to follow him as he followed Christ. No man who preaches to sinners, who does not preach what the Apostles did when they preached to the same class, need claim that

he has the Spirit of God, or is guided by him; nor need any man, when directing penitent sinners how to come to God, who does not give the same directions the Apostles did in all the conversions under their ministry, claim that he is led by, or has the Spirit of God, for the Spirit of God must agree with himself. If men could prove a thousand operations of the Spirit, separate from and independent of the Bible, all these operations and influences must lead men to obey the Bible, or else the Bible must be set aside.

Some men are guided by reason, others by *providences,* and others by spiritual *influences,* separate from or without the word of God. In regard to all this it is not necessary to make much war upon them, provided *their* reason, providences or influences lead them to obey the Gospel, which we know was preached with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. But it is a sad comment on their reason, providences or spiritual influences, when it leads them to disobey the teachings of the Spirit of God in the Bible. Right reason, true providences or real spiritual influences could not lead any in our day to disregard what the Spirit of God taught in the establishment of Christianity. In one short sentence: "The Spirit of God would not lead men to disobey what lie has clearly required in the Bible." No reason, providences or spiritual influences, therefore, can be of the Spirit of God; to lead men to disobey what the Spirit of God taught ill the Bible, or required at the beginning. The Spirit of God required precisely the same of all persons who sought the way into the Kingdom of God in the days of the Apostles, that he does of all who seek the way now. The Holy Spirit has not changed. It is then a most arrogant and unfounded pretense for any man who now attempts to set forth the way for sinners to come to God, to claim that he is led by the Holy Spirit, while he evades and refuses to set forth the plain and unequivocal requirements of the Holy Spirit as set forth in the New Testament, or attempts to improve on them. Nothing can be taken from those requirements or added to them without incurring the curse of Heaven. The

Spirit of God, if he did lead men independent of his word, could not lead them to incur this awful curse; He, therefore, manifestly does not lead any man who will add anything to, or take anything from, what he required when he spake through the Apostles, of all whom he showed the way into the Kingdom of God. That which he required in one case, he required in all cases. If he required one man to believe, in order to become a disciple, he required all to believe. If he required one man to confess Christ, he required all to confess him. If he required one man to repent, he required all to repent. If he required one man to "be baptized in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins," he required all to do the same. If he promised one man pardon and the impartation of his Holy Spirit, upon compliance with his requirements, he promised all who complied with the same, whether all the items mentioned in one case are found in all or not. No matter if faith is not mentioned in the case of the three thousand on Pentecost, it is not left out; they all believed. for without faith it is impossible to please God. They that come to God must believe.. No matter if repentance is not mentioned in Saul's conversion (Acts xxii, 16,) he repented; for God requires all men everywhere to repent. The same is true of all the items.

We, therefore, are the only people now known who proceed upon the infallibly certain method of collecting and arranging in proper order all the items required by the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners; we mean the inductive mode of reasoning. We have no preference for any particular part of Scripture; it is all precious to us. We have no particular class of scriptures, as Calvinists, Universalists, Unitarians, etc., but we take the whole Scripture; not to prove our doctrine, hut as the perfect and complete system of doctrine itself. When we wish to examine any point of doctrine, we proceed upon the inductive plan, and take all the Bible contains as the mind of God upon that point. When we would ascertain what the Holy Spirit of God requires of sinners in their conversion and admission into the Kingdom of

God, we proceed through all the conversions of the New Testament, collect all the items, and ascertain their order, and insist that the Holy Spirit requires the same now; nothing more—nothing less. Let us, then, take a brief look through the New Testament at all the conversions, and ascertain precisely what is required and what is promised.

We open at the following words of the Philippian jailor: "Sirs, what must we do to be saved?" Here is a pagan whose attention is for the first time called to the subject. What reply does the Apostle make to him? The answer is, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and th) house." (Acts xvi, 30, 31.) Here is an important item in the form of requirement, and one, too, that can not be dispensed with, for the Holy Spirit says: "He that cometh to God *must* believe." It is not only a requirement that he should, but a positive and unequivocal demand is that he *must* believe, and this indispensable demand of him that" "cometh to God." (See Heb. xi, 6.) But now for the order of this item. Is it a first, second, third, or fourth item? It is the first item, for the Apostle says, in the context, "without faith it is impossible to please God." It is in vain, then, to try to do anything else to please him, so long as a man does not believe. It is the first item, because the Apostle required it first of a man who had complied with no other item in such a way as to lead him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ the first thing he did. It is the first item, because "whatever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. xiv, 23.) It must, therefore, be the first item, because everything else proceeds from it and is done by it. The first item in the commission is Faith, and he that sets aside that item will be condemned, let him think and act as he may in regard to all other items. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," says the Lord. The first requirement, then, is to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and without complying with this requirement, or taking this step, no person can ever take another. There is no reaching the second step without taking the first.

Unless the first step is taken, it will eternally stand between any man and the second. This indispensable step was required of, and taken by, all who came to God under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who spoke through the Apostles to the people to lead them to God. Never did one, from the days of the Apostles to the present time, get round or by this great requirement and come to God. It is true, that when the Pentecostians and Saul inquired what they should do, they were not commanded to *believe;* but it was not that faith was dispensed with in their cases, or that the Lord had a different method of conversion for them, but for the good reason that they *already believed,* and their faith caused them to inquire what they should do.

Acts iii, 19, we find the following requirement laid down: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." This requirement was uttered to an assembly that had just witnessed one of the most manifest miracles of the Apostles—one which the enemies mentioned shortly after, admitting that it was known to all who dwelt in Jerusalem, and that they could not deny it; and at the close of a discourse which they had heard and which had convinced them that the work was of God. The Holy Spirit, on this occasion, demanded of, them to repent, reform or amend their lives. This demand, too, is as wide as the actual sinners among men. In the times of ignorance before the Gospel, God did not hold men to a strict account for their sins, "but now he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." (Acts xvii, 30, 31.) Repentance, too, is indispensable. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke xiii, 3.) What does the Lord mean by this word "except"? John ill, 3, he says, "Except a man be horn again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Two verses after this, he says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Here we have the same word "except" again. What does

does he mean by it? At verse seven, he explains as follows: "Marvel not that I said to thee, *Ye must be born again."* You must repent, or perish, then, is the meaning of the words, "except ye repent, ye shall perish." Repentance is, then, required of "all men everywhere," and is indispensable—must be..

But what evidence have you that repentance is the second item? It is the second item, because we have shown that faith is the first, which shows that repentance can not be the first; and because Peter (Acts ii, 3 and iii, 19), addressing people who believed, but had not repented or done anything else, commanded them to repent. He makes it the second item. It is the second item, because a man can not repent till he believes in the Lord, before whom he must repent, and who convinces him of sin, for "by the law is the knowledge of sin," which shows that it must follow after faith; and because there is no other item in all the records of conversions required that he can acceptably comply with till he does repent. An impenitent person can not pray, confess, be baptized, or do anything acceptable to God. The person, therefore, who is a believer in our Lord Jesus Christ can not get over repentance, or do anything else acceptable to God, till he repents. His faith will do no good so long as he continues in impenitence. For his impenitence, if he persists in it, he must perish. In the order of God, it is the second step, and unless taken will eternally stand between him and the third step. No advance can ever be made till he repents. "Except ye repent, ye shall perish." It is true that Ananias did not command Saul to repent; but it was not because it was omitted in his case, for no man ever entered the Kingdom of God without repentance; but he was not commanded to repent, for the good reason that he had repented before Ananias came to him. We are not to expect any historian, in giving records of conversions, and so many instances, to mention all the items in each case.

No. XII.—OUR POSITION AS A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.

IN No. 11, under the above caption, we commenced an induction of all the items contained in a conversion to Christianity. In that article it was ascertained that faith must be the first item, and that everything else must proceed from faith; for "without faith it is impossible to please God," and "he that cometh to God must believe." It was also ascertained that' repentance was the second item. Repentance can not be the first item, for it is "repentance toward God," or in view of God's requirement, and which God grants unto life, which cannot exist without faith. It can not be the third or fourth item, for the believer can not do anything acceptable to God without penitence. The impenitent believer can not confess, call upon the Lord, be baptized, or do anything else acceptable to the Lord. If faith does not lead to penitence, it never can lead to anything good. This is indisputably the second step.

We now proceed to find the third step. This is the great confession. This is not only an item, but, like those we have considered, an indispensable. "Whoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. x, 32.) Even the enemies of Jesus saw there was something important in confessing Christ. Hence, they did not form the issue upon believing in him, repenting, or being baptized, but upon *confessing him.* Hence the statement, that "the Jews agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue." (John x, 22.) The same is seen in the following: "Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also, many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees, they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue." This shows that the issue was made upon the

confession. The Lord required it, and the enemies opposed it. (See John xii, 42.) Let us have a little more light on the confession. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God." (I John iv, 2, 3.) From this it is clear that the Lord makes the confession the *test,* that tries the spirits whether they are of God.

We will hear the Scripture again: "And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds." (Acts xix, 18.) But we must determine what it is that is confessed. We have already seen that John defines it to be that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." But Paul refers us to the period when the Lord made the confession. He says to Timothy, "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession." What Was that good confession ? It was that he was King of the Jews, though his kingdom was not of this world; but the King promised in the Jewish Scripture. In a different form, though virtually the same, he made the confession under oath before the Sanhedrim. He made the confession that he was their King—that he was the Son of God, and confirmed it by an oath. This shows what the confession was. But we will hear Paul. He says: "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that is the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in heart that God hath raised hin from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x, 9. 10.) Here we have precisely what is to be believed in the heart, confessed with the mouth, and the object of it. We must confess with the mouth the *Lord Jesus,* believe in the heart that God *raised him from the dead,* and the object is *salvation.*

But now for the order of this item. Is it the first, second, third, or fourth? It can not be the first item, for we have determined that faith is the first, and there must be faith in the heart before confession can be made with the mouth. It

can not be the second item, for a confession in impenitence is an absurdity. Not only so, but we have found that repentance was required as the second item. It can not be put off till after baptism, because (Acts viii, 37,) it is made a prerequisite to baptism. The eunuch said to Philip, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" And Philip said, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." He believed in his heart and was penitent, and answered, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Here in this confession is where the soul of man yields, bows or submits to the Lord Jesus, and is pledged to him. Here the will assents, yields, and comes under him, as the infallible guide and ruler, and is pledged to do his will. After this step is taken all is easy. His yoke is easy, and his burden is light.

The next item in the Divine arrangement *is baptism*. The heart is changed, purified, or the person is converted in heart, by faith. The person is purified, changed, or converted in character by repentance, reformation, or amendment of life. The confession is the public, open, verbal recognition and reception of Christ. Although the man is changed in heart, changed in character, and has acknowledged his Redeemer, the Lord has not acknowledged him, Nor did the Almighty openly and audibly acknowledge Jesus fill he was baptized. But the moment he ascended from the waters of baptism, the heavens were parted above him, and the voice came from his Father, "This is nay Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." The Holy Spirit did not bear witness to him till this interesting moment. But here he descended and abode upon him, and John says, "He who sent me to baptize said, On whomsoever you see the Holy Spirit descending and remaining, he is the Son of God." If, then, God did not audibly acknowledge his Son, and the Holy Spirit did not bear witness of him till his baptism, we certainly need not look for him to acknowledge us as sons and daughters before baptism. Whether we look for it or not, he surely does not acknowledge us till we yield to him in this institution. If the Lord could say. "Thus it becometh us

to fulfill all righteousness," when he bowed himself to this institution, surely we may say *it becomes us.* "But I can not think that baptism is essential." Well, have you the mind that was in Christ? If you have, it becomes you to submit to the Lord in baptism. Not only so, but the Lord said to persons who refused to submit to John's baptism, "You rejected the counsel of God against yourselves, not being baptized by John." How could persons reject the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by John, unless his baptism was essential?

Let us hear the Lord: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This language he explains to be, you must be born of water and of the Spirit, for at verse seven, referring back to this, he says, "Marvel not that I said unto you, You must be born again." The Lord then defines being born again, being "born of *water* and of the Spirit," and says it *must be.* In the last commission, he makes baptism co-extensive with faith. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Here are conditions and a promise, and certainly no man can reasonably extend the promise any further than the conditions are complied with. But let any man follow the Apostles under this commission, and see if they ever brought any man to salvation who did not comply with these conditions. Where did they ever receive any person without baptism? Nowhere.

Let us hear the Lord's own word in a very important case. When he appeared to young Saul, he said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Acts ix, 6.) He went to the city, and waited to be told what he must do. To fulfill this promise, in telling him what he must do the Lord sent Ananias to him for the express purpose of telling him *what he must do.* He did not tell him to believe, for he was brought to believe when he heard the word of the Lord, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," and that faith led him to inquire what he

must do. He did not tell him to repent, for he had already repented—ceased to do evil—to persecute the saints, and was trying to learn to do well. What then was it he was to tell him that he *must do?* It was precisely what Ananias did tell him, viz: "Arise, and *be baptized,* and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii, 16.)

Why not make baptism a first, second, third, or fifth step the Divine process? We can not make it first, for it is a command, and no command can be recognized without faith. Faith must, therefore, precede all commands. It can not be second, for we have found that repentance is the second item, and repentance was required before baptism. It can not be the third item, for the eunuch, when he inquired what hindered him to be baptized, was required to confess Christ. It was the fourth item, for the eunuch immediately after the confession—the next step he took—was baptized. This is the manner in which they called upon the name of the Lord. They came by faith, with most solemn reformation, confession and baptism, to the Lord. Here his word declares them pardoned, justified, adopted, and saved, and here he acknowledges them children. The next word after baptism, in the commission, is salvation. The next thing on the day of Pentecost, after baptism, is the remission of sins, which is the same as salvation in the commission. The heart is prepared for God by faith, the character by repentance, the state by baptism, the former guilt is destroyed and the power of sin taken away by pardon, and the soul of the new convert is comforted by the Holy Spirit and the hope of heaven. Thus it is that we find, by a careful induction, the items in the Divine arrangement are as follows: Faith, Repentance, Confession, Baptism, Pardon, the Holy Spirit, the Hope of Eternal Life.

That some of the denominations in this country lack some of these items, pervert others, and derange them all, not only admit, but can abundantly show beyond all contradiction. But that any denomination, or any teacher of religion, can show that they have any item of the Divine

arrangement for converting sinners that we have not, or that any other order of the items is of God, we do not nor never expect to believe. We are free to admit that they have items that we have not, and some that we have they have in a different order; but those which we have not are not of the Divine arrangement—not in the New Testament, and those in a different order are arranged without any regard to Apostolic order or reason. To speak of an unbeliever praying for faith, or repenting, is only equaled by the absurdity of baptizing an unconscious infant, which is certainly darkness confounded. It is a piece with men believing who never heard the Gospel, of being born again to enable them to believe, and receiving the Holy Spirit to regenerate them. If we could become sufficiently stupefied and bewildered thus to derange and confuse the Order of Heaven, and call the items, in this confused and distorted form, "the doctrines of the Gospel," "the doctrines of grace," etc., we could be orthodox and not regarded as a dangerous people. But woe betide the man, who must have all the items of the Divine arrangement as laid down in the holy records, no more, no less, and who must have them in the precise order arranged by the Holy Spirit of God at the beginning! We maintain, however, that the Holy Spirit gave us all the items which he requires, in the history of the first converts, and the order in which the items stand to each other, as God had joined them, and let no man put them asunder.

No. I.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

THERE is one difficulty in approaching the evidences of the Christian religion that every writer, who understands the present state of things, must feel. That difficulty is, to secure the attention of those who are now avowed skeptics, or those in danger of becoming such. There is not the least danger of the main body of skeptics thinking too closely, reasoning too minutely, or criticizing too rigidly. No fear need be entertained of their putting our articles into the crucible of investigation and examining them too carefully. The trouble is that they will not think on the subject at all; will not read; will not investigate, or make an earnest and solemn effort to determine what is truth. Our fear is, that they will assume, with out any deliberate thinking, reasoning, or examination, that religion is all priest-craft, the Bible a fable, and Jesus an impostor, and then act upon the assumption as if it were a well known and established truth. It is the easiest thing in the world for the most. ignorant, stupid and unthinking creature living to assume all this, and much more, and in all his coarse and uncouth allusions to the subject, speak of it as a matter of indifference, and declare in both word and action, that it is a matter of no consequence what course a man pursues. This is the reason we dread infidelity. It stupefies men into indifference, recklessness and sensuality. Under its influence, they will risk anything and disregard everything. It stupefies their sensibilities, disqualifies them for reasoning, or any fair and honorable investigation, in reference to the very point upon which, above all others, they may can see that there is no law in this. If they could suc-ceed they should have the most indisputable certainty.

We lament this state of things, for when a man reaches it once, he is almost, if not entirely, beyond the reach of the benevolent efforts of all the good to save him or confer any

religious benefits upon him. A man who assumes a false position in reference to the precise truth designed, and the only truth having power to save him, and proceeds upon that assumption as if it were truth, and peremptorily persists in refusing to open the question for investigation, or to reason or think upon it at all, is in a most deplorable and hopeless situation. It is utterly out of the power of the best and greatest of human kind to do such any good. They are beyond the reach of remedy. But there are many who have not reached this thoughtless, stupid and indifferent state, who can be induced to think, reason, and make an honorable effort to determine what is truth. These we hope, by the Divine blessing, to benefit.

There is, however, an entirely different class of skeptics from those just alluded to; a class always thinking, reasoning, theorizing and scheming in idle speculations; roaming. in immense and fruitless deserts, vast barrens and waste fields where nothing can ever grow. They float in thin ether, if not sometimes in pure vacuum, in vast, unknown and unknowable regions of pure fancy and idle imagination. They roam in everlasting inquisitiveness in the immense realms of intangibles and invisibles. They are variously styled, in New Testament terminology, "clouds without water," "wandering stars," "filthy dreamers," etc., etc. They spend their time, confuse themselves and shatter their brains in explaining "degrees in glory," "degrees in punishment," "different spheres," "the possibility of holding converse with departed friends," "the origin of sin," "how God will overrule evil for the good of man and his own glory," "the origin of the devil, if there be any," or, "who made the devil," or, "whether he is a real being or only a personification of evil," "whether God did not know when he created man that he would sin," *"why* he created man knowing that he would sin," "whether he did not know when he made man, who would be saved and who would be lost, and if he did, "why he created those he knew would be lost," "whether angels are a distinct order of beings from

men," "whether we shall know each other in the eternal state," "with what body the dead will be raised," "whether the righteous and wicked will rise at the same time," "where the spirit is between death and the resurrection," "whether it is conscious or can exist separate from the body," "when the end of the world will be," etc., etc.

We have now an immense swarm of these idle dreamers. Some of these have already reasoned themselves into the hallucination that they are in the New Jerusalem state, and that the Christian dispensation, or the mediatorial reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, has passed away! These idle away their time, in discussing the ascension through the different grades of spheres, which they imagine they shall eternally be attaining and passing through, with other kindred topics. Another class reason themselves into absolute fatalism. With them all the actions of men and the very thoughts that lead to them are of *necessity*, and can not be anything else. There is no praise of one class, or condemnation of another, for all do just what they do from an eternal necessity. Off at another angle, another party is found theorizing upon the whimsical notion of human pre-existence, in which state they think a consistent origin for sin may be found! Yet another class perceive that deep down in the Bible, where until recently none had ever penetrated, the doctrine is found that at the judgment the wicked will be stricken out of existence, thus ridding them of the idea of endless punishment, which had previously given them much distress. Still another class of these have rid themselves of the same distressing and annoying doctrine by making the astonishing discovery that there is no devil, no hell, nor punishment of any kind, beyond the present state, and therefore no danger of any endless punishment! Still another class became perplexed with these metaphysical reasonings, subtleties and theorizings in things they can not help feeling conscious can have no possible beneficial effects upon mankind, and rid themselves of the entire concern by making the discovery that all things come by chance, that there is no God, Savior,

angel, or spirit, and death is an eternal sleep! But we sicken at the effort of trying to describe the vain and idle speculations of all these "wandering stars," and shall proceed to something more tangible.

1. Skepticism has no foundation, no basis, no reality upon which to rest. It has nothing to build upon, no rock, no pillars of any kind. Nor has it any materials or builders. Nothing can be built without a foundation, materials and builders. Skeptics are not builders. Their work is merely *pulling down* old buildings. This is the reason they make so much show; their work is easy, requires but little skill, and no goodness. Anybody can tear down, but it takes a workman to build. Skepticism is a mere negative, consisting wholly of denials. It affirms nothing, establishes nothing, and builds up nothing. It is a natural impossibility to build upon a mere negative. A system can not, in the very nature of things, be built upon a mere denial —a mere negative. If a man would deny, repudiate and condemn all the foundation of all the houses in his city, or if he would go and tear his neighbor's foundations all down, it would give him no foundation for a house, but would-simply put them in the same condition with himself—that is, *without any foundation.* In the same way, if infidels could successfully deny, disprove and overthrow the foundation of every system of religion in the world, it would lay no foundation for them, but would simply put the rest of us upon a level with them—that is, without any foundation. The work of all skeptics has been simply to tear up the foundation of Christians, and not to lay any foundation for themselves. Not a man in all the ranks of unbelief has ever presented any foundation or has any. Their entire clamor is against the Bible, but if they could expunge the Bible from the universe, they are no better off—they have nothing to stand upon.

2. Skepticism has no center of attraction, no gravitation, no great central prevailing idea, drawing everything to one common center. A system must have a common center of

attraction, holding it in its revolutions from flying into atoms. But skepticism has no prevailing idea, doctrine or constitution, in which everything centers, around which everything revolves, with power to attract and bind. It consists simply in denials of what others believe. If the things which they deny were untrue, and should be denied, the denial of them is no foundation or center of attraction. Their denial amounts to nothing in their favor, but is simply unfavorable to others —destructive of the attraction binding others together. A million of the most unequivocal denials of the most absurd and preposterous doctrines the world ever contained, forms no center of attraction, doctrine or constitution, in which is embodied and concentrated any principle of attraction that can bind in a system. Denying simply frees men and cuts them loose, in their own estimation, from that which the), deny, or what others believe, but binds them to nothing.

3. Skepticism has no law, gives no advice, and has nothing in it about the character of men. It does not say that a man shall or shall not have a good character; that he shall or shall not have a bad character. It contains no such words and has no such ideas, or keeps up no such distinctions as good and bad. It says nothing about love or hatred, revenge and pity, covetousness and benevolence, vice and virtue, happiness and misery. It contains not one sentence touching all. the relations in life, providing nothing for individuals, families or nations. It consists of one negative principle, viz: *the denial of the truth of the Christian religion.* Any man can see that there is no law in this. If they could succeed in this denial, and show beyond all contradiction that Christianity is not true, it amounts to nothing. It is no law and accomplishes nothing in any way only to bring Christians upon a level with them—with *precisely nothing!*

4. Skepticism has no rewards for the good. It promises nothing in this world nor that which is to come. It holds out no rewards, no inducements of any kind for the good, in time or eternity!

5. Skepticism has no punishments for the bad, here or

hereafter. It contains no punishment for evil-doers—the profligate, dissipated and corrupt, thieves, robbers and murderers. It knows nothing of crimes, or punishments for crimes of any grade of atrocity.

6. Skepticism has no reformatory power. A denial, or a train of denials, even denials of error, can never restrain sinners nor reform men. The. influence is simply negative. In the very nature of things, it can not act positively. Denials, or negatives, require nothing, give nothing, and, as a matter of course, can produce no reformation. It is a negative system, if we may be allowed to call it a system at all, and in the very nature of things, its influence must be negative. It is like cold, which is simply the absence of heat; for the suffering in the absence of heat is from want of heat. Skepticism is simply the absence of the heat of Christianity. Darkness is merely the absence of light, or it is the negative of light, else it and light could exist at the same time, in the same place. In precisely the same way, skepticism is the absence of Gospel light, or faith. The soul without faith is empty, cold, dark and hungry, suffering and perishing for light, heat and food. Skepticism is no system, not a reality, substance, or entity of any kind, but the absence of all these. To speak in general terms of faith, both Christian faith and all other faith, the absence of it would be the absence by far of the greater part of all we know, or that may be known by man. There is nothing more certain than that a man who knows much, must believe much. Skepticism is not the possession of reformatory principles, but simply the absence of them. There is nothing that a man can be more conscious of than that skepticism never did, and never can, make a man better. Inherently, there is nothing in it. It is the absence of something. The mere absence of faith, of religion, doctrine and principles, most indisputably can do a man no good, and can have no power to save him in any sense. To speak of saving a man from starving by the absence of food, saving him from thirst by the absence of water, or from darkness by the ab-

sence of light, or from sickness by the absence of the only medicine that could save him, is not more absurd than to speak of unbelief reforming man. Skepticism is not heat, but the absence of it; not light, but the absence of it; not faith, but the absence of it; not knowledge, but the absence of it; not medicine, but the absence of it; not nourishment, but the absence of it. The skeptic is a man perishing with cold while he is graciously offered the warmth of Christianity; groping in darkness, while the light of Heaven is as free for him as the rays of the sun; starving, with an invitation to eat of the bread that comes down from heaven; dying with thirst, while God is holding out to him the water of life; a sick man, refusing to take an infallible remedy from the physician, simply exercising the power to reject all that could do him any good, resisting, refusing, denying and dying.

THE DIVINE AUTHORITY FOR OBSERVING THE LORD'S DAY—A SERMON.

BY ELDER J. K. HOSHOUR.

"The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."—Luke vi, 5.

THERE are several absolute prerequisites to animated existence: a substratum upon which it can be located; space to move in; food for subsistence; and *time* for the development of its endowments and the indication of its mission into this portico of being.

But, of all these, time has a paramount essentiality; for there may be substratum upon which existence could be located, means for subsistence, space for action, but if time were wanting for development and perfection, all these would be useless.

Various definitions of time have been given. One philosophic definition is, that time is the general relation of things perceptible to each other, as to their origin, their continuance, and their dissolution; made cognizable by the succession of events. It has been called a narrow isthmus lying between the eternity past and the eternity to come. And one of no secondary place in the domain of poesy sings in the following strains: "From Eternity's mysterious orb, time was cut off and cast beneath the skies—the skies that watch him in his new abode, measuring his motions by revolving spheres—that horologe machinery divine; days, months and years, his children, play around him as he flies!" The divisions of time, natural and artificial, are, under any circumstances, interesting, upon which however we can not now dilate; an enumeration of them must suffice.

The natural division are days, months, years and cycles; the artificial are seconds, minutes, hours and centuries. In this enumeration, you see the week is not included; for the

reason that it is neither, strictly speaking, a natural nor artificial division—it is a *revealed division*. There is no motion in the natural world that indicates a septennary division; and the artificial are all expressed in even, not uneven, numbers.

The septennary division prevailed among the most ancient civilized nations of the globe—the Egyptians, Chinese, Greek, Roman and Northern Barbarian—indicative of one common origin, the primogenitor of our race, who obtained it through Divine instruction.

When the heavens had been garnished with their respective luminaries; when the earth had been founded and made inhabitable; when the sea had been filled with its untold orders of sportive inhabitants; when the dry land had been replenished with its diversified departments of enjoying existencies; when Eden had been hedged in and beautified by the hand of God; when the primitive pair, intact by pollution, had entered upon its luscious entertainments; when a new and unsullied creation had evoked the harmonies of the "morning stars," and elicited the "shouts of the sons of God;" then the Divine hand ceased its creative labors in this department of the universe—then was the seventh day blessed and sanctified, *and the Sabbath instituted.*

According to the instituted arrangements for this occasion, it has been assigned to me to discourse on the Divine authority for Sabbatical rest.

The Divine authority for the Sabbatic, which means periodical rest, can, we trust, be made apparent from the revelation of God, as also from the Divine threatenings against the violators of this institution on the one hand, and from the constitution and wants of man on the other.

To get at the origin and primitive circumstances of this institution, it is certainly, at present, not within my province to expatiate upon the Divine existence, on the great probability that God takes such an interest in the prosperity of his rational creation here, as to favor man with a revelation of his will; nor on the Divine legation of Moses, who furnished the record containing a summary detail of the Sabbath; nor

need I prove that the first three chapters of Genesis are to be taken literally, and not be considered a significant *myth*. The Divine legation of Moses and the literalness of his narrative are looked upon as conceded by you.

I am aware that it has been averred, that Moses spoke in Genesis of the Sabbath by *anticipation,* and that the historian, writing after it had been instituted at Mt. Sinai, there gives the reason of the institution; that it did not exist prior to the egress of the Israelites out of Egypt, twenty-five hundred years posterior to the commencement of our race. This was the opinion of Dr. Paley, as discussed in his Moral Philosophy. It is readily admitted that the references to the Sabbath during the patriarchal periods are not very clear. Moses nowhere gives a professed history of the Sabbath; neither did he of the rite of circumcision. But still there are expressions, scattered through his general narrative, which serve as a way-mark to this matter.

It is said in "the process of time," Cain and Abel offered sacrifices to the Lord; literally, at the *division,* the section, of time—that is, the hebdomedal section. They brought their oblations—they sacrificed, on the Sabbath.

Noah entered the ark *seven* days prior to the flood. In the emission of the raven and the dove, his explorers of the laved earth, especially of the latter, he observed the intermission of *seven* days; and, in all probability, he left the ark on the first day of the Jewish week.

At the introduction of the manna among the Israelites, which was prior to the giving of the Decalogue, which con-rains the injunction, *"Remember* the Sabbath to keep it holy," Moses explained certain phenomena in relation to that food in language which obviously indicates that the previous existence of the Sabbath was a known fact. In that case he did not use the language of injunction in relation to the Sabbath, but of explanation. Nor did he, in any other of his narratives alluding to this matter, speaks by way of *command,* until he furnished the summary of moral laws embodied in the Decalogue; and there the verbiage of the

injunction is such as indicates the prior existence of the institution—"*Remember* the Sabbath to keep it holy."

In speaking, then, of the authority for the observance of the Sabbatical time, we may well pause a little right at this point of its history. We find it here a part and parcel of a code of laws in which the shrewdest jurist have never been able to find a flaw, to detect a deficiency or superfluity—a code in relation to which one of the most profound civilians, who thought he could successfully negative every claim of Moses to a divine mission, observed he could not perceive whence its perfection came, unless from the perfect Governor of the universe.

Is, then, the Sabbatical institution an indispensable constituent of a complete moral code, or system of moral laws? Does it belong to the number of those laws or institutions which are *essential* to human happiness? Certainly. What are moral laws? I reply, such as tend to the elevation and happiness of moral agents. The supreme object of action is happiness, which, however, lies only in the direction of moral actions. Complete happiness implies an easy and undisturbed state and action of all the powers and endowments pertaining to a rational, moral and conscious existence. All laws, then, are moral that have a tendency to lead to such a consummation. Stealing is immoral because it interferes with the means of happiness of others—so is false testimony, adultery, etc.

The Sabbath belongs to the category of moral laws, because it stands inseparably connected with matters entering deeply into the temporal and eternal well-being of mankind; and as all the other laws included in the Decalogue are beyond abrogation by man—are of Divine authority and of abiding obligation, so is that which pertains to the Sabbath.

The authority for the Sabbath is also seen in the Divine admonitions to the Jews in relation to it, and the severe penalties inflicted by the Lord on the violators of it. In Jeremiah xvii, 21-28, we have the following language: "Thus says the Lord, Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burdens

on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day; neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the Sabbath as I commanded your fathers, but they obeyed no neither inclined their ears but made their neck stiff, that the might not hear nor receive any instruction. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken to me, saith the Lord to bring no burdens through the gates of the city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath to do no work therein then shall there enter into the gates of the city, kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, ricking in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and the city shall remain for. ever. But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not bear burdens, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched.

Again, Nehemiah xii, 17, 18: "Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon this city? Yet, ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." An institution, the violation of which induces such fearful visitations as the Jews have and are now enduring, must have Divine authority.

Again, the diversity of our endowments, physical, intellectual and moral, makes it necessary for our happiness to use the means originally designed to keep them in the best condition, and conduct them to an end allied to the great object of our existence; hence the necessity of rest for the body, and leisure and means of improvement for the moral and intellectual elements.

These means are embodied in the Christian Sabbath. That our physical structure needs periodical rest is apparent to the commonest observer, in the succession of day and night. The shade of the night silences the melody of the

grove—hushes the din of active life and allays the fervor of worldly pursuits. "Sleep, natures's sweet restorer," wraps the weary toiler in his mantle of forgetfulness until the birth of a new day. Is this periodical nightly rest adequate to restore the full measure of exhausted energy? A certain amount of nervous fluid is necessary to keep our physical man in a healthy condition. Nightly repose is insufficient to keep up the requisite complement. It has been repeatedly" proclaimed from the tribunals of physiology, that to the nocturnal the super-addition of other periodical repose is necessary for conducting earthy existence to the *good* which Infinite wisdom has allotted to it. And from the same source we are taught no repose is conducive to this end as the septennary, or every seventh day. More frequent would be an excess adverse to the interests of social and civil life, and less frequent inadequate for the proper restoration of wasted energies. France, in the reign of infidelity and terror, abrogated the Christian Sabbath and substituted the "decades," that is, enjoined cessation from labor every ten days. But experience and observation compelled the abandonment of that diversion, and imperiously demanded a return to the hebdomedal or weekly.

Experiments in continuous labor, disregardful of the Sabbatical recurrence, have clearly demonstrated that weekly repose is essential to comfortable and protracted existence. It has been ascertained that among horses and other beasts of burden that were subjected to daily and incessant toil, four times the mortality occurred than among those that had weekly rest.

Of two thousand laborers, who had been induced by the offer of double wages for labor done on the Sabbath, on some public works, the majority became subjects of most afflictive diseases, in many instances issuing in premature mortality. In the late war, it was a matter of common observation, that when the soldiery had to labor incessantly for weeks on some fortification, disease and death were more abundant among them.

Unremitting labor breaks down the stoutest spirits, and extinguishes the most effective motives to exertion. Every individual compelled by the force of circumstances to labor without days of rest finds the effect not only a decay of strength, but also the diminution of the aggregate amount of productive effort. Health, strength, genius, and all the functions of the mind and body are inevitably prostrated by unremitting toil. He that labors faithfully six days and rests the seventh, will, in a given time, accomplish more than if he were to labor without intermission during the whole period. The institution of the Christian Sabbath is exactly adapted to the organism of human nature. Like the recurrence of balmy night, it frees the mind from enervating cares, disenthralls the body from servile labor, and prepares it for returning efforts.

The Sabbath meets toiling man, and exacts rest. The plow must stand still in the field; the hammer must lie silent on the anvil; the hum and din of machinery must cease; the roar of the locomotive must be silenced; the merchant lock up his store; the judge descend from the bench; the politician leave the arena of fierce discussion; grateful stillness prevails in the hamlet, the village and the city. Wherever the Sabbath bell is heard it checks the rush of earth's millions, in their pursuit of the world, and cites them to the sanctuary and to bow in the presence of the Lord their maker. The eager mind is forced to pause amid its selfish plans of pleasure and frantic schemes of wealth and aggrandisement, and is made to think of death and judgment, of God and his commandments.

The law of the Sabbath is not only written in the Decalogue, but also is most legibly inscribed in our physical constitution. But the needs of man extend beyond mere repose for the body. He needs leisure for the improvement of his higher endowments. He is a social being, as such made for social intercourse with his fellows, not in the low grounds of carnal indulgence, but under circumstances highly conducive to the elicitation of his benevolence, humanity, cordiality and

devotion; such social intercourse the Sabbath furnishes. So tar as our social element requires the suspension of worldly pursuits, the Sabbath is adapted to the exigency. The conjugal, parental and filial feelings are all cherished by the observance of the Sabbath. Freed from the cares and the labors of the week, the family collecting around the social hearth, forms a circle in which the tender and delightful feelings are enjoyed in the freshness of a new creation. In this enjoyment, the peasant is equal to the monarch. With his children at his knees, and the partner of his cares and loves by his side, he may enjoy a day of rest, no less refreshing to his heart than to his body.

Man's intellect, also, has wants which the Sabbatical institution can, to a great degree, meet. It has been questioned by some, whether the intellect is ever at rest. Well, suppose it is ever active, it certainly needs a change of thought. He who thinks upon but one subject becomes a monomaniac—whether it be on money, on acquisition, on gratification, or any other of the common interests of life. The recurrence of the day of rest is calculated to recover man from any unbroken influence that may have fascinated him, especially if he is inclined to use the day according to its original intention.

Ceasing from labor, frequenting the sanctuary, placing himself under efficient and scriptural pulpit instruction, he may be disenchanted from earth's influences, and furnished with new subjects for his contemplation. The regular recurrence of the Christian Sabbath, and the benignity of its character, are well adapted to induce a preparation to meet it. Cleanliness, cheerfulness, moral and intellectual improvement, are the natural results of its appointment. The neat and well-arranged apartments of the home, the quiet and cheerful aspects of the family, and the intercourse of congenial and tranquil minds, tend alike to the improvement of the understanding and the solace of the heart. Nor does the intellectual nature of man stand less in need of the periodical recurrence of the Sabbath.

Man is a moral agent—*sinner;"* needs a preparation for the enjoyment of higher and holier circles than earth affords. He is the repository of a religious element which will manifest itself in some shape before its entire suppression within him—will manifest itself, either in blind superstition, wild fanaticism, or in enlightened piety. With the proper culture of this element of our nature the Sabbath stands in close alliance.

Now, an institution that stands so signally connected with interests entering so deeply into the well-being of mankind, has undeniably a *moral complexion,* and must of necessity be included in a complete code of morals, such as the Decalogue, and is, therefore, like all other moral laws, of abiding obligation.

In view, then, of the primeval sanctification and benediction of this institution by the Lord, in view of its inclusion in the Decalogue, in view of the Divine reprehensions to the Jews for their violation of it, and in view of its adaptedness to the physical and higher endowments of man, we can not avoid to collie to the conclusion that it is of Divine authority, to a duration commensurate with that" of time itself. It is undoubtedly within the province of nay' assigned labor, on the present occasion, to speak of the authority for the change of the day of rest from the seventh to the first day of the week. In our text, the Son of Man claims lordship over the Sabbath, and consequently we must look to him for authority for this change. There are about five thousand of our fellow-professors, within the bounds of our Union, who do not admit any authority for this transfer. In this respect, they are extremely unique.

The considerations or arguments for the transfer are such as to command the acquiescence of the great majority Christian profession. It seems to have been included in the prophecies respecting the promised Messiah that his rest, in the original Sabbath, should be glorious. The Psalmist, predicting the rejection of Christ and his yet becoming the head of the corner, as he indeed did by his resurrection from the

dead, says: "This is the day which the *Lord has made*, we will be glad and rejoice in it." (Ps. cxviii.)

The language of these passages indicates a new Sabbath, "a *day made by the Lord,"* hence called the Lord's day. Accordingly, our Lord made special visits to his disciples on this day; on this day he founded his Church; on this day his disciples met for worship and acts of benevolence; and on this day John was in the Spirit.

The authority for this transfer is also attested by the current of ecclesiastical history. Ignatius, a companion of the Apostles, says: "Let us no more sabbatize, that is keep the seventh day, but let us keep the Lord's day, on which our life arose." Justin Martyr, who lived at the close of the first and the beginning of the second century, says: "On the day we call Sunday is an assembly of all who live in the city or country, and the memoirs of the Apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read." Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of John himself, and who lived in the second century, affirms "that on the Lord's day everyone of us Christians keeps the Sabbath—meditating in the law and rejoicing in the works of God." Dyonisius, bishop of Corinth, who lived in the time of Irenaeus, says, in his letter to the church at Rome: "To-day we celebrate the Lord's day, when we read your epistle to us."

Thus, my hearers, I have presented to you some of the points that enter into the reasons for observing Sabbatical time, and for resting on the first instead of the seventh day.

In contemplation of what our predecessors transmitted to us, we come in contact with institutions and interests to which they attached no common importance. Some of these originated, in the course of Divine providence, from the peculiar circumstances of the race; others were the direct and positive institutions of the Deity. In following these up the stream of time, we arrive at their respective origins —some running eighteen hundred years into the past, others fifteen hundred years beyond that period; but when we pursue the Sabbatical institution to its birth, we are brought to

within a few hours of the commencement of our race itself. Venerable institution! Can it be possible that as long as the Christian revelation shall obtain in human Society this Will ever be extinguished? No! It is too replete with benignity – too deeply rooted in the minds of the good and virtuous ever to be supplanted by any other day. The American family will have a day of rest, a day of relaxation, and so long as Christianity is cherished in its bosom, that day will be the Lord's day. But, like all the blessings of a benign providence, it can be abused and prostituted to ignoble purposes. It can be either a curse or a blessing to this great nation—a blessing if heeded according to its intentions—a curse if diverted from its legitimate use. Our population is about twenty-five millions, of which fully one-half are in their minority, and in need of parental control. Let twelve millions of youth lose every seventh day, and go where they please, and do what they please, and who can estimate the amount of evil induced by their hebdomadal relaxation. From early, habitual Violations of this institution have grown the most shocking enormities that have disquieted human society.

In view of this, should I not charge every one of you, from the wealthiest and most influential of you down to the humblest mother in this assembly, to use that influence you have over any of your fellow-pilgrims for the sanctification of this institution! The honor of God, the prosperity of our common country, and the purity and eternal well-being of your families, demand it!

No. II.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

THERE is no man of sane mind who can not believe. It is as natural and reasonable for men to believe, under proper circumstances, as it is for them to think. No faculty possessed by a human being is more readily, frequently and universally exercised than that of believing. For a man to affect that he is so organized or constituted that he can not believe, is preposterous in the highest degree. There is no sane-minded human being so organized as to be incapable of believing. This is not only true, but a large portion of all the important, and even business transactions, pertaining to this life, are based in faith and by faith carried out. The man who ridicules acting upon faith, ridicules a large proportion of all the important actions and transactions in this world. Why does the speculator offer one dollar more to-day than he did yesterday per barrel for flour? Because he believes the news he has received of an advance in some other market. Why does the pork-dealer advance the price one dollar per barrel? Because he believes the news of an advance in some other market. Why does the trader refuse that bank bill? Because he believes the statement in the detecter, that it is under par. Look through the various departments of life, business transactions and all, and see what a vast amount of it is done by faith. All business men are daily and hourly acting in matters where thousands of dollars are involved, upon faith, and acting with great confidence too. Look at that man at the post-office, opening a letter and reading it. In a few minutes you see him stopping quickly and closing an engagement involving thousands of dollars. What is he acting upon? Faith in the letter just received and read. Look at that other man, waiting for a dispatch. Presently he receives and reads it. In a few minutes he is waiting the arrival of

the cars. As the cars approach, you notice him eyeing the passengers as they come out of the train. Presently he rests his eye upon a man. In the next moment the man is arrested! What is he acting upon? Faith in the telegraphic dispatch he had just received. Thus, we perceive men are constantly acting upon *faith*, in all the affairs of this life.

Is it possible that men who are thus constantly and without hesitation acting upon faith, will have the assurance to apologize for their unbelief in matters of religion by saying they can not believe? It will also be observed that the men thus acting are not merely a few credulous and thoughtless persons, but business men of all classes, men of the first order of mind, thus showing that they can believe, and do believe, in matters of great importance, and thus demonstrating that they can believe in matters of religion as well as others if they will but give a candid attention to the evidence. The same faculties of the mind exercised in believing the news of the day, political, commercial, or of sickness, health, or accidents, etc., are exercised in believing the Divine testimonies. The same mind that believes the testimony of men is exercised in believing the testimony of God. The difference in the effect produced upon the human soul by Divine testimony or Divine faith from that produced by human testimony, or what is purely human faith, is not that the same mind or. the same faculties of the mind are not exercised in both cases, nor is it owing to the difference between Divine and human testimony; but the difference is in the thing believed—the difference between Divine and human things believed. Heavenly things believed would, beyond all dispute, make a different impression from that produced by the belief of earthly things, however true they might be. A mere earthly truth, even if proved by Divine testimony, could produce no more than an earthly impression; but a heavenly truth, if proved by earthly testimony, would produce a heavenly impression. The same mind that understands and believes that there is an advance in the flour market, believes that the Lord rose from the dead, but the

effect produced by the faith in one instance is very different from that produced in the other instance; not because different powers are exercised in believing, nor because the testimony differs, but because the things believed differ.

The relation a thing believed sustains to the believer is the main cause of its effect upon him. Robert Owen, who professed to have read and traveled forty years, without being able to find any evidence of the truth of Christianity, has lately become a believer in Spiritualism. How is it that he is so slow to believe in one case, but so ready to believe in the other? The reason is to be found in the relation these two things to be believed sustain to him. The belief in modern Spiritualism involves nothing, requires nothing and promises nothing. It is merely a speculative subject for vain and idle curiosity, placing no man under any new obligation who believes it. It is a very suitable thing to catch a man of a perverted mind and heart, one who has rejected Jesus, resisted the testimonies of the Holy Spirit and despised the Bible during an earthly pilgrimage of many years which God has mercifully and graciously granted him; but the fact that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, that he is Divine, that he is alive and lives forever and ever, is a fact sustaining a different relation to time. It is not a speculative fact for idle curiosity; not a mere theme for empty, cold and unfeeling hearts, for idle, confused and wandering brains, but a fact intimately connected with all mankind; a fact in which the destinies of all men are involved—one, too, bearing upon the lives and conduct of all men. Here is the reason that many are so slow to believe this, the greatest and most important of all the facts presented for the belief of mankind; it *requires a holy life. A* strange feature truly is it in men that they should prefer to believe that which requires nothing, proposes nothing and promises nothing, to that requiring the purest life, most exalted character and ennobled feelings, promising the approbation of the Almighty now, and eternal joy in the world to come!

In entering upon the evidence of Christianity, we are

anxious to determine precisely what it is that skeptics deny. It is not that there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth; for all skeptical writings and conversations abound in reference to him as a real person. Nor is it that he was the author of the Christian religion, for all skeptics refer to him as the founder of Christianity. Nor yet do skeptics deny where Christianity had its rise; nor have they denied the time when it rose. If then they admit that there was such a person, that he was the author of Christianity, that he lived where the Bible says he lived, and at the time when the Bible says he did, what is it that they deny? Nor is it the account the Bible gives of the customs of ancient times, the reference to the governments of the world, their location and boundaries, the different rulers or civil officers incidentally mentioned, the institutions of the various countries alluded to, the cities, town, villages and hamlets mentioned, the "certain waters," rivers, lakes and seas incidentally introduced, nor yet the geography of the country, so far as found in the sacred canon; nor is it the reference to the various streets, lanes, roads and highways that skeptics deny. Nor is it the moral lessons, the purity of life, the uprightness of character, the love to all mankind, love to our neighbor as to our self, the requirement to do unto all men as we would have them do to us, caring for widows and orphans, the aged and infirm, the poor and needy, found in the Bible, that skeptics deny. What, then, is it that they deny? If they admit all this, what is it that they are opposed to?

The trouble is, *its claim to Divine authority*. They prefer to regard the Bible as a good old book of *advice,* in which is a convenient place for a family record, and wish the privilege to quote a proverb of Solomon, an expression of David, or John the Apostle, with the understanding that they receive what *they* think good and wise and reject the balance. Strip it of all claims of Divine authority and they have no further war with it. Hence, the efforts of skeptics have been to strike the idea of Divine authority out of the Bible. But the war upon the subject has been conducted in a most unwise

and injudicious manner, on the part of many who are sincerely and honestly friends of the Bible. At sometimes they have apprehended that it devolved upon them to defend all the views and doctrines that the party to which they belong think can, by some hook or crook, be proved by the Bible. At another time they apprehend that they are bound to understand, fully explain and show the relevancy of every expression of the whole Bible, from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of Revelations, answer every objection, explain every difficulty, and fully clear up and dispense every doubt started, stereotyped, iterated and reiterated, from Paine down to the beardless skeptic of nineteen years who speaks of "contradictions" in the Bible. But this, we undertake to say, no Christian is under the least obligation to do. We are not to infer, because the astronomer does not tell us what gave the earth its momentum as it whirls upon its own axis, or its momentum in its mighty circle around the sun in the first place, that the existence of these revolutions is to be questioned. The fact that these revolutions exist may be believed and confided in rationally by him who can not tell where the momentum comes from, or give the immediate cause of it, or could not answer many other questions of a similar nature. Indeed, many points might be mentioned that he might not only be unable to explain, but that might appear to him contradictory, and he still might consistently believe in the revolutions most confidently. The revolutions of the earth he may know to be a settled matter, but those things he can not explain, or that appear contradictory to. him, he doubts not are things that he does not understand, for the lack of a more widely extended horizon or expanded information. He attributes the difficulty to his want of information—his ignorance—and not to an actual inconsistency or absurdity in the solar system.

The same is true of the Bible. We have never had the vanity to think that we could explain every difficulty, solve every, question, or clear up every hard place, or reconcile every apparent incongruity; but in the place of thinking

that there are real difficulties, unanswerable questions, or real irreconcilable incongruities, we doubt not, if we had the information, every difficulty could be removed, every question could be answered, and every apparent incongruity cleared up. We have such incontestible evidence of a Divine foundation—infallible and immovable bases for the hope of all nations, that we stand upon that as fixed. All besides stands upon this, and till this rock is removed no side questions, irrelevant points or remote reasonings can depreciate our confidence in the everlasting source of comfort and hope for mankind.

But we can not present this rock fully now, and the exact issue between believers and unbelievers; but we must close the present article by inquiring, why any man should be opposed to Jesus Christ, the Bible, and the Christian religion? What reason can any man give for such opposition?, No-man believes that the Lord Jesus Christ ever made any human being worse. No man sincerely believes that the Bible makes" any person worse, or that the Christian religion does any harm to any one of our sinful race. No human being solemnly believes that any harm could result from the universal prevalence of pure Christianity, as set forth upon the pages of the New Testament, throughout the world. All men, upon cool and deliberate reflection, must be satisfied that if all peoples, nations, tribes and tongues of the earth Were fully under the power and influence of the Bible, mankind would be infinitely blessed by it. Not a skeptic in the world can give a reason for his opposition to the Lord Jesus and the Bible. O, that men knew Jesus! O, that they possessed his spirit and temper! O, that they would love him and be blessed by him!

No. III.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

The man who advocates skepticism should, to be consistent, have something more to stand upon than his *doubts* of the truth of Christianity, because his doubts may arise from his lack of information, or his own mere instability of mind. In the very nature of the case, doubts imply uncertainty; and it is preposterous and absurd in the extreme for a man to advocate anything of which he is in doubt and uncertainty. His doubts might be regarded as a reason for neutrality and inactivity, but certainly no reason for advocating the precise thing involved in doubt. Before any man can, with any reason or propriety, advocate skepticism his doubts about Christianity must be removed. He must, in his own mind, come to absolute certainty; because his doubts of the truth of skepticism must be of precisely the same number and magnitude as his doubts of Christianity. While he doubts Christianity, he also just as much doubts skepticism, and he never can know skepticism to be true till he can know Christianity to be false. He must be certain that Christianity is false before he can be certain that skepticism is true, and he must be certain that skepticism is true before he can consistently advocate it.

We mention this point for the purpose of cautioning men how they run into skepticism and advocate it; and we entreat of them to hear a few words before they further go. We insist again, that they should have the most absolute certainty, because if they make a mistake here, they will find it the most fearful and momentous mistake in the power of man to make. In all enterprises where there is great risk, there should be the probability of great gain. But if skepticism be called an *enterprise,* it is certainly one involving the greatest possible risk—the liability, in case of a mistake, to the most fearful and over-

whelming dangers to which man can be exposed. This risk, this exposure to the most dreadful consequences that could result to man, in case the skeptic should find himself mistaken, he ventures, without any possibility of gaining anything if his position should prove true. No skeptic has been able to prove that any good could possibly come to him, or any of the race, even if his doctrine could prove true. It amounts to nothing good for any of the human race, for this world or that which is to come, even if true. The true state of the case is, that if the skeptic makes a mistake he sinks everything in ruin; and if he could prove right, he can not by any possibility gain anything in time or eternity. He risks everything without the possibility of gaining anything. For this cause he should have infallible certainty before he receives or advocates skepticism.

How infinitely different is the position of the believer! No skeptic ever has, or ever can, show that he risks anything. in believing. His faith can not do him any harm; it can not injure either his usefulness or happiness. No skeptic ever has, or ever can, show that by believing he exposes himself to any danger, even if he could be mistaken, in this world or that which is to come. We appeal to all skeptics everywhere to point out to us, even if they could prove right in the end, what danger we are exposed to by believing. Suppose we
persist in believing to the last breath, as well as opposing skepticism with our dying words, what will befall us more than other men? Not a man in the world can show that any dangerous consequences can follow. The Christian risks nothing in any event. If fight, his choice is the richest treasure—the brightest gem in this universe. He gains all things; is an heir of God, and joint heir with Christ. His is a rich and unfading crown of glory and honor. But if it were possible for him to prove mistaken, he is even then as well off as any skeptic in the universe. Skepticism has nothing for the man that believes it, any more than for the man who opposes it. The "fact, then, that the Christian is safe, infallibly safe—that no serious consequences can be-

fall him on account of believing is an additional reason why a man should hesitate, pause and reflect most seriously, and have the most indisputable certainty before he receives or advocates skepticism.

For the sake of reasoning as safely as possible, while looking at the issue between Christians and skeptics, the one class affirming the truth of Christianity and the other denying it,. we start the question whether the certitude on each side can be anything near equal? We claim that the certainty on each side bears no comparison—that on one side the utmost height that can be attained is doubts, misgivings, and distrusts. On the side of unbelief, confidence is destroyed, confusion reigns, uncertainty prevails, and all is thrown into perplexity. "It is a leap in the dark." There is nothing reliable. The soul is left without a support, wavering, wandering and floating without a basis. Hence, in nine cases out of ten, in the decrepitude of old age, in declining years, in dangers, in solemn circumstances and approaching death, skepticism vanishes from the minds of men and they repudiate it. Precisely at the time when, more than at any other period in their history, they need a rock, a foundation, a resting place for the soul, all has disappeared, and they find themselves sinking, hopeless and despairing, in the midst of thick clouds and gloomy darkness. This shows that there is no settled conviction, no established principles in the soul—in a word, *no certainty.*

How infinitely different the state of the Christian! In his declining years, in the decrepitude of old age, in dangers, sickness and approaching death, that which he had believed in health, spoke of, relied upon and trusted in, now that he is evidently approaching his great and solemn change, becomes more deeply and still more deeply fixed in his soul. The solemnities of dangers, sickness and death, impressing him with the certainty that he must soon leave the world, presses the rock of God more closely to his heart, and he more tenaciously than ever holds on to his confidence. Here is something that looks like certitude! That which will com-

fort and support the spirit of the dying, when the world is receding, when all earthly comforts are powerless, when time is closing down the thick curtain, when life is failing, and eternity, with all its solemn realities, is heaving into view—is unquestionably that of which the soul is certified, if there can be certainty in anything in this universe. No man who believes Christianity through the main career of life, so far as known to us, ever denies and repudiates it in death. It is, however, we claim, a fact, on the other hand, that nine-tenths of all skeptics, some time or other before they die, repudiate and renounce their unbelief. But no man who believes Christianity, through the career of his life, at death renounces it. An instance of this kind we have never known nor heard of. This shows that there is a certainty on one side that does not exist on the other. No man, with this before him, can think the certitude on each side equal. The certitude preponderates infinitely in favor of Christianity.

In the very nature of things, upon their own hypothesis, skeptics never can prove to a *certainty* that they are right—that Christianity is false. Upon their own principles, they never can *know* Christianity to be false. The reason why they never can know this, or prove it, even if it were so, is that in order to escape the arguments of Christians, they repudiate the only testimony to which they could appeal as evidence in the case. They discard the testimony of history, the testimony of books, the testimony of men, and all records that reach back far enough to be witness in the case. The only means of information by which any question "of antiquity can be known, any point decided, or anything shown to be true or false, they repudiate and discard; thus not only placing themselves beyond the reach of any argument to convince them that Christianity is true, but equally beyond the reach of any argument to prove it false. They dread the books of antiquity, such as histories, biographies, and commentaries. They shun and spurn the writings of the ancient fathers. Indeed, they have but little relish for old books, written either by friends or enemies of Jesus, for they all,

of every grade and date, are interwoven with statements, dates and admissions of one kind or other, militating against the unbeliever, causing him to totter and reel, but rather strengthening the believer. If they open the records, books, histories, biographies and commentaries of ancient times, with those of more modern date, as well as the writings of the fathers, they find the testimonies all on the other side; hence they repudiate all testimony of this kind. To what, then, can they refer for evidence to prove that Christianity is false? They acknowledge no source of information by which they could know Christianity to be false, if it were false, and therefore, in the very nature of the case, they never can know it "to be false or prove it to be false. The most they can attain to is doubts and uncertainty, for two reasons: 1. They reject the only testimony that can throw any light on the subject, 2. It is an utter impossibility to know anything to *be so* that is *not so*. The Christian hypothesis is the only correct one; Christianity is true, and no man *can know it to be false*. All skeptics are in uncertainty, doubts and confusion. They never can, in the very nature of the case, attain to anything more than wavering, want of confidence, fears, apprehensions and distrusts. They can neither know themselves to be right nor others to be wrong. Their whole course can only destroy confidence, create distrust and confusion in the public mind. Their advocacy simply unsettles, darkens and involves the world in hopeless uncertainty, without clearing up or establishing anything. Their's is a system of darkness, confusion and uncertainty that can benefit no one of the human race in any event, and, if they are mistaken, will involve all under its influence in ruin.

Is there no certainty in history? in ancient records? in ancient books? in all books? Is there no certainty of any fact in antiquity? Certainly there is. We are as certain that there was such a man as Alexander the Great as that there was such a man as General Washington, and as certain of either as that there was such a man as James Buchanan. We are as certain that there was such a man as Nero as we

are. that there is such a woman as Queen Victoria. Who feels any doubt that there was such a man as Pontius Pilate? Such a man as Julius Caesar? No one ever thinks of doubting that there were such men. Who doubts that there were such cities as Jerusalem, Rome, Corinth, Ephesus? No man who has ever read. Why has the world come to such a unanimous agreement in reference to these places and men? Because the unanimous statement of all writers, in all books. both ancient and modern, furnish a chain of concurring and corroborative testimony, from ancient times to the present, which produces as much certainty in the mind as we have of anything we know. We are not more certain of what we have seen with our eyes. Nor is there anything of which we can he more certain than we are of numerous things which have come to us upon testimony of this kind.

We have simply mentioned this kind of testimony, not to elaborate it now, but to set the mind of the reader in motion, and to open the channel of evidence to him that we are about to enter into. In our next we shall define the proposition more explicitly, and show how the truth is to be applied to it. We never can appreciate evidence without the exact issue before the mind. The whole Bible bears upon one single proposition, which it has been pointing to from the first prophecy ever uttered to the final amen of the sacred canon. That is the proposition that men are required to believe, and which we shall endeavor to develop and sustain in these papers.

No. I.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diabolos.—It is truly fortunate that we have thus met in this deep, dark and secret cavern, that we may have an opportunity to discuss, plan and arrange our mode of operations, in our efforts to paralyze and defeat the word of God and the mission of Christ. No time should be lost now that we have met, and I am ready to hear any suggestions.

Lucifer.—I heartily agree with you, sir, that no time should be lost, and that immediate and most effectual action should be had. I therefore propose that we, without delay, fall upon some stratagem by which we can take the Bible and keep it from the masses of the people. As long as they have the Bible, we can never have complete success in affecting their destruction.

Daimonion. I am, sir, favorable to that suggestion. We can never succeed with the Bible in the hands of the people at large. I, therefore; suggest that we set on foot some scheme by which to engage men, and raise liberal salaries sufficient to induce them to do this work for us. The men are to be found; we can, and we must obtain them. The money will bring them.

Apollyon.—How are these men to get the Bible from the people? That statement of Chillingworth, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," has now become stereotyped in the minds of the people pretty much throughout the civilized world, and I see no way of counteracting it.

Lucifer.—The men we employ to do this work must teach the people that they are their spiritual guides and

expounders of the word of God; that they care for their souls, as those who must give account, and the people will soon and readily yield most tamely to them the right to read the Bible for them, and decide in spiritual things for them. Many now would rather give some spiritual guide a large salary for reading the Bible, thinking and worshiping for them, than to do it for themselves, as the first simple-hearted followers of Christ did. The thing, sir, can be accomplished easily.

Diab.—You must be a great set of simpletons! Have you no memories, or were you all sound asleep for the space of a thousand years during the Dark Ages? Or have you read no history, or are your heads so thick that you can never learn anything? Have I not tried that scheme to perfection during the space of more than a thousand years? I had the Bible once taken from the "common people," as I taught the clergy to call them; and I thought at one time the plan was successful, but I was defeated.

Apollyon.—How could you have been defeated in so admirable a plan? You know that, as prince of the bottomless pit, I was not present; but I can not see how such an admirable plan could have proved a failure?

Diab.—Well, sir, I never could make it work precisely to my notion. When I would think I had the work accomplished, the first thing I would know, in some corner or other of the earth, some man would be found with a copy of the Bible, or portions of it, proclaiming to the masses of the people, at the top of his voice, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." This would create uneasiness and anxiety to hear what the Scriptures say. To counteract this state of things, I had my faithful and dutiful son at Rome, the Pope, whom I had appointed general superintendent of my affairs on earth, to authorize all the agents he had appointed to assist him in accomplishing my work, to give them power, or rather to make the people *believe* that they had power, by virtue of the keys of the kingdom, to forgive sins. This succeeded admirably for a time.

Daim.—I can not see why it should not have succeeded to perfection. In the first place, I should have supposed that it would exactly have suited those who had no personal holiness; and in the second place, it was a source of much gain to the priests, which would certainly have secured their hearty aid.

Diab.—Well, here was a difficulty; many would die without pardon, and the people were anxious to look into the Bible to know what had become of these, and a continual inquisitiveness was in some place or other springing up **to** find out what was in the Bible. To meet this difficulty, and give all my agents an opportunity to lay their hands on a sufficient amount of gold and silver to secure their devotion to my work, I ordered them to make the people believe that if any should die without pardon and fall into purgatory—as all most certainly would who die in that condition—for a sufficient sum of money, by virtue of the aforesaid keys, purgatory could be unlocked and their souls released. This satisfied many and aided me very materially.

Apollyon.—I think, sir, you managed with great skill; but I can not see how any possible failure could have attended a scheme so wisely arranged and well executed.

Diab.—It may appear strange to you that the success of my plans was not complete; but such was the case. I even extended my plans beyond what I have mentioned, for the sake of securing the aid of a large and influential class. I arranged, advocated and established the doctrine of indulgences, and carried the matter to such perfection that I had many of my most devoted servants selling indulgences at public auction, which you all know means pardon for sins which the purchaser intends committing. I carried this matter to such an extent that I had one of my most devoted servants to declare publicly that he had saved more souls by the sale of indulgences than St. Peter had by the keys of the kingdom.

Daim.—Most noble Diabolos, you have acted most admirably in this matter and wisely; all that I am led to wonder

it is that your success should not have been most complete. Perhaps you should have appointed some severe punishments for all who should be found with a copy of the Scriptures, except the priests.

Diab.—I am astonished at your ignorance! Are you now to be informed of the inquisition, the gibbet, the scourge, chains, prisons, fagots, stakes, banishments, confiscations of goods, etc., etc., that I employed for more than a thousand years to deter men from reading the Bible? If you are, you are unfit for a seat in this council.

Daim.—I ask pardon. I was not ignorant of your having employed these instrumentalities; but with all due deference to your superior wisdom and position, I think you do not give full credit to the efficiency of these means.

Diab.—Were you asleep in the time of Luther, Melancthon, and other co-workers with them? Where were you in the time of Tyndale, young Frith, Coverdale, Calvin, Huss, Servetus, etc., etc., who, though they did not agree among themselves, were all vociferating aloud, the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants, and no more regarded their lives and property, or the thunders of the Vatican, than the mild breezes of a summer's day. Are your eyes closed to the result of the operations of these men? If they are, as I said before, you are incapable of being of. any advantage in this council. It is useless to speak of schemes of this description now. I have tried them to perfection; and, though they answered my purpose well in their day, their time has gone by. They may serve for a time yet for stereotyped people and antiquated countries, but Other expedients must now be resorted to. Look at their free governments, free speech and free presses; missionaries, Bible societies and Sunday-schools spreading the Scriptures everywhere! These operations must be counteracted.

Lucifer.—I am convinced, most wise Diabolos, that you are in the right, that you have made full and fair experiments, in the effort to take the Bible out of the hands of the "common people," and that that plan will not work now.

We must resort to something different, if we effect anything in these times. I think the time has come for a bold push, and I suggest that we now, as such vast numbers have the Bible and are scattering it all over the world, come square out and deny its divinity and the divinity of Christ. Thousands of men will fall in with this at once, and can be enlisted in our work.

Apollyon.—I am pleased with that idea. I should like something bold and daring, and therefore am in for striking one mighty blow, and think we can thus finish the work at once.

Daim.—Gentlemen, I like your suggestion. I think the time has come for us to sweep everything before us. All that is now wanting is to strike the blow in a bold and decided manner, and success will follow.

Diab.—I am astonished at your ignorance! You talk with as little judgment as inexperienced children. You never stop to reflect upon what has been, or you are wholly ignorant of all the past! Are you all ignorant that I made one push of that kind once, when there was an opportunity, and when I employed some of as bold and daring men as I can ever expect to find again, and that the whole thing proved a failure? I once had the great Gibbon, Voltaire, Hume, Bolingbroke, and Paine employed in an effort just such as you suggest, both with the tongue and pen.

Diam.—Wherein did the plan prove a failure? I can not see how it could have proved a failure.

Diab.—It proved a failure in this way. It immediately called out such men as Paley, Watson, George Campbell, etc., and set the whole ministry to investigating, and almost the whole civilized world to thinking on the subject, which resulted in reaction. The matter lies here: we all know that Christianity is true, and that Jesus of Nazareth is a Divine person, and any move that we make to induce men to look directly at the question of the truth of Christianity, and the Divine mission of Christ, must ultimately react upon us. It did react in this way when I made just such a push as you

now suggest; and, in the place of putting the Bible down, Bibles have been multiplied upon us thicker since than ever before. There is no policy nor good sense in our coming out boldly and denying the Bible. We shall only defeat ourselves if we try that method.

Lucifer.—Well, I am at, a less what course to pursue. You appear to condemn ail our suggestions, and I see no general plan of operation that we can hit upon.

Diab.—If you will all come here and sit down at my feet and confess your ignorance, I will instruct you. It is useless to speak of any "general plan." Truth is an *unit*—it is one. Anything else is error. There is but one right way to anything. Everything else is wrong. Now, that we be successful, we must not be scrupulous what we advocate, provided it is not the truth, and does not aid the truth. It is not material what the people hold, provided it is not the truth. It is no matter what way the people go, provided it is not the right way; it will answer our purpose.

Apollyon.—Thank you, most noble Diabolos; your suggestion is full of wisdom, and opens a wide field for operation. I see now how we can make immense improvements in our work of ruin.

Diab.—Improvements in our work, most certainly! What is the use of experience if we learn nothing? We must not even deny all truth. In accomplishing our fiendish designs, it is frequently more wise to admit certain truths than to deny them. When Jesus cast out demons, it would only have subjected us to ridicule and derision to have denied it. I therefore admitted that he cast them out, but explained that he did it through Beelzebub the prince of demons. So far as this, my explanation of the matter, was received it accomplished my malignant designs as effectually as if I could have succeeded in making men believe that he did not cast out demons at all.

Lucifer.—Most wise and worthy Diabolos, you have now Opened a world wide field to us. I can see now wherein we may take great advantage. It is not necessary that we should

oppose all truths, and thus show all men that our cause is manifestly wrong, but merely subvert the truth so as to ruin its force.

Diab.—Certainly; you now speak like one who begins to understand his business, you all well know the truth that has given us more trouble than all the balance, the truth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. This truth we must evade somehow, or our cause is gone. But you must recollect that we are not to deny this right out. I have not for the last century thought it expedient directly to deny this. The only manner in which I have thought of success has been in tacitly admitting the divinity of Christ, and seeking to call off the public mind from that fact by engrossing it upon other subjects.

Lucifer.—I am truly delighted with that thought. In that manner we can put forth many of our plans under the name of *orthodoxy*, by inducing speculative questions, side-issues and delusive reasonings; infusing feuds, strife and hatred among the followers of Christ. In this way we can induce them to love their views, their partisan peculiarities and organizations; preach them, try to prove and defend them, and they will soon set their whole affections upon them, and become a church founded upon these peculiarities, and not upon Christ at all. In this way, Christ will be forgotten by them and his religion will be as effectually defeated as if they had denied him.

Diab.—Most excellent Lucifer, you now begin to talk sense. I hope you will mature these things, till we have an opportunity to meet again next month, when I propose to set out my views more fully, and show you the immense agencies I have now in lively operation, and if my success is not complete, it will certainly be very great. It is useless here, where we are not seen *by men*, and as we know God will not hear us, to adjourn by prayer, we therefore adjourn, without any prayer, to this night one month.

REPORTER.

No. IV.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IN all controversies there must be some point where the issue is formed, so that all may see precisely what it is, or they never can know whether they believe or not. There is nothing men have such vague and indefinite notions about as religious faith. Before any person can be a believer, that person must know what it is that is to be believed. In the same way, before any man can, knowing what he is about, declare himself *a skeptic*, he must have distinctly stated in his mind, so that he may know precisely what it is that he does not believe. Many persons are strongly committed to a Church, supporting it, defending it, and enraged if any person should utter a sentence against it, who know nothing of the doctrine and never saw the creed. Such persons know nothing about what they believe, or rather, they do not believe anything. They have no faith. If you hear them giving their reason for their preference for their Church, you most likely hear them speaking in idealizing laudation of the preacher, his pleasant manners, his eloquence, learning, talents, or what a great man he is; or probably of the service of the Church, the class of attendants, their respectability; or probably their preference is founded upon the simple circumstance that their friends belong there. All this class have no faith at all, nor should they ever be ranked with believers. They are merely worldly church-goers.

We can not let this class pass with a single paragraph. There are too many deceived and deluded in this way for us to let it pass in silence, or with a single touch of the pen. How can any man hold the faith of a Church without knowing what that faith is? It is a self-evident truth, that no person can have a faith without knowing what it is. Yet it is as manifest as the noon-day sun that nine-tenths of the popular church members could not tell what their own articles of

religion are, if their salvation depended upon it. Many of them, who make loud professions and are so bigoted that they will hear nothing but their own party, never saw their own articles of religion or their own faith, and know nothing about it. In Popery, where the clergy are keepers of the faith, this will do, but in a Protestant Church, where personal justification is by faith, it is absurd in the extreme. If the declaration of Protestants, that justification or salvation from sin is by faith, or as the New Testament has it, "without faith it is impossible to please God," for "he that cometh to God must believe," it is evident that faith is for all—for the masses of the people. All must have faith or be lost, for "he that believeth not shall be damned." What shall we think of church members who never saw their articles of religion, or the faith of their Church, and who do not know what either is? Are they justified by faith, without knowing what faith is? or are they believers without knowing what they believe?

Here, if we are not widely mistaken, is the ground of much unbelief Many sensible people have friends in the Church; and they hear them talk, but from all they say they never can learn what they believe, or, indeed, in many cases, they become satisfied that after all their professions they do not know what they believe, or do not believe anything. From conversing with many of this kind, and becoming satisfied, as any sensible man would in a short time, that they are in confusion and do not know anything about it, they jump to the conclusion that all professors are in the same condition, and that the whole matter is an unintelligible delusion, and that there is no reality in any of it. The sooner the woad is rid of all this kind of religion the better. It is deceiving those involved in it and preventing them from ever becoming rational believers, and driving away others unto skepticism. We claim something more rational than this, and we shall, therefore, proceed to show what it is precisely that God requires a man to believe. When we shall determine this from the New Testament, we ascertain the exact point

where the issue between the believer and unbeliever lies.

There is one alleged fact in the Bible that the whole volume points to, centers in, and stands upon. This fact is referred to in a great variety of forms, but all these references to it amount to the same. All depends upon it. It is referred to as the rock, the foundation, the way, the truth, the life, the beginning, and ending, the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, etc., etc. This great fact was preached on all occasions, presented to the people as that which must be believed, that upon which they were justified or pardoned, which they believed and by which they were saved. It was not some. thing in a lengthy train of written articles that the masses of the people never saw, that none but preachers knew any. thing about, but it was the first thing presented to every man, woman and child for their belief, before they could be permitted to an ordinance or received as members. It was that great truth that the soul had to act upon, either in receiving or rejecting, on the very first interview with the primitive preacher. No man under the wide heavens can come to God, without receiving, from the heart, that great truth. Upon it the issue of life and death turns. The soul that receives it shall live. The soul that does not receive it shall die. Over this truth the mighty battle was fought during the first age of the Church. The disciples believed it, loved it, and suffered all things for it. The enemies did not believe it, hated it, and persecuted all who adhered to it. Every person in the Church knew the faith of the Church, believed it and defended it. Those out of the Church knew what the faith was and opposed it.

Let us take one look at the New Testament, and See if it reveals anything tangible for one to believe. Let us see if it reveals any great truth, person, or foundation principle upon which the minds, hearts and souls of men can take hold and rest with unshaken confidence. At an early period, when our Savior enters upon his public movements, we see him approach John the Baptist and demand baptism of him. On account of his superiority, as a man, John, being an humble

man, excused himself, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" He did not excuse himself on the ground of his Divinity' or Messiahship, for in this sense he says, "I knew him not"; but he at this time looked upon him as a superior man to himself. But hearing the Lord's requirement, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," he walked into the river Jordan with his Savior and Redeemer by his side, when he took the Lord in his hands and gently lowered him down till he was buried in the water, and then raised him to his feet. As they quietly walked up the bank of the river, they lifted up their eyes and saw heaven opened, and saw the Spirit descending and resting upon him. While attention was thus directed to him, a voice came from the Almighty Father announcing, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." This announcement contains the proposition over which the battle is to be fought. Here is the question of life and death. Here is the issue for the nations of the earth to act upon. Those who receive this proposition, that he is the Son of God, the beloved, and act upon it, shall be saved; but those who reject it shall be lost.

In the Mountain of Transfiguration, the Father repeated the same again, adding, "HEAR YE HIM." We shall only develop a sufficiency of passages to show that this oracle is the one upon which everything rests, in which everything centers, and which forms the issue between the infidel and the Christian. Paul says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." In telling the Corinthians what he first delivered to them, which was certainly laying the foundation, he says, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel." What was the Gospel, or what did he first declare unto them? He says, "I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried and that he rose again according to the Scriptures." This is the Gospel, not in promise, nor in detail, but in its great foundation fact. The fact contained in this

announcement, as presented in one form or other, was that which all believed, to which all were converted anciently, which is called "the faith," and the fact upon which the great battle was anciently fought. Hence John the Apostle says: "Many other signs truly did Jesus, which are not written in this book, but these 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." Here is the same proposition in different form. The entire controversy is over Jesus Christ. Is he the Christ, the Son of God? He asked the Apostles on one occasion, ,, Who do you say that I, the son of man, am?" Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The Lord responded, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto you, but my Father who is in heaven." Here, then, is the inevitable issue between the believer and the unbeliever. The New Testament claims that God revealed from heaven the sublime oracle, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus himself said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church." John says he wrote that we might believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." That is what the opposers denied and what the disciples believed. This is what the controversy with skeptics is about. Every objection they make must bear against Jesus.

Our position is simply, that *he is Christ, the Son of God*. There may be things in his teaching, in the New Testament or the Old Testament, that we can not explain, or possibly that no man can explain, but that may be simply owing to our lack of information, and no evidence against his mission. There may be things that appear to us unreasonable or "contradictory, but which may be entirely reasonable and consistent if we understood them. There was a time when the Pope thought it inconsistent and unreasonable for men to teach that the earth revolved upon its axis, but its apparent unreasonableness and inconsistency to him did not disprove the fact. His difficulty existed wholly in his ignorance, and not in any real difficulty. In the same way, difficulties of

skeptics, existing wholly in their ignorance, and not in reality, are not to be taken as objections to the mission of Christ.

We wish skeptics to understand that we do not propose to examine the Bible, verse by verse, and argue every verse in it, nor do we ask them to invalidate each separate verse; but they must come down to the bottom corner-stone, and if they invalidate that, we will give up all the balance without controversy. Their objections must be against Jesus. In what, then, do they object to him? Let us inquire distinctly and in separate items:

1. Do they object to his life—his example? Was he not good and exemplary in all his life?

2. Do they object to his teachings? Did he not teach good morals? Were not all his teachings, in the various relations in life, good?

3. Were not his works of a good and benevolent character? To which of these do skeptics object?

4. Do they object to the claim that he was the Son of God? We presume that this latter is the trouble. It was for this claim he died. It was for this claim the holy Apostles suffered and died. It was for this claim all the ancient martyrs died. This is the claim we intend to vindicate in these articles. Jesus of Nazareth is a Divine Person!

No. II.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diabolos.—It is common in distinguished deliberative bodies like this to read the minutes of the previous meeting, but we will dispense with that old form, and hear reports of success.

Diamonion.—I have been out practicing among the people, most worthy Diabolos, upon your wise suggestions, made at our interesting meeting a month ago, I am truly astonished at the results of following your sage counsels. You suggested, you know, that it would be silly and imprudent in the extreme to oppose many things that we know to be good and true, and in cases where the truth and goodness of a position are well established and popular, we must not deny it, but subvert it by means of some insidious stratagem. Well, sir, I have been experimenting in a case of this kind, that I will state, if it be in order.

Diab.—It will be in order. Proceed.

Diam.—Well, sir, the sons of God assembled, with a great multitude, and I also was in the midst, though no one saw me, or knew of my presence, and—

Lucifer.—How did you avoid being perceived?

Diam.—There is not the least trouble in that. The image or picture-makers have invariably represented devils "with frightful horns, terrifying tusks and fearful claws, with dangerous fangs in their tails. So long as nothing of this kind is seen, the people never suspect that a devil is near enough to know anything that is transpiring.

Apollyon.—There can not be any trouble on that score, for many people do not believe there is any such being as the devil in the universe.

Diab.—True, there are men who talk so, but you will perceive that they have not been led to this state of mind by directly denying that there is a devil. The way I have effected this state of mind was to lead some men to put on as much appearance of sincerity as possible, and in the place of denying the existence of the devil, preach that Judas was a devil, Peter was a devil, the Roman government was a devil, and all violent diseases were devils—that devil is the mere personification of evil, as men call it. But while I have gulled a certain class of men thus to preach, and thus to believe, and have seen such preaching produce tremendous laughter among ignorant and wicked men, there are many that will never be caught in the meshes of such a net.

Apollyon.—You are right, most worthy Diabolos; and there are some few who will suspect a devil of being present, if in the sleeve of the most saintly-looking worshipper in the assembly, though wrapped in silks and satins, and a gilt-leaved Bible in hand, or if hid in the folds of the prayer-book, or under the black robe of a clergyman. Rest assured you must be on the lookout for these, for they will suspect you, unless well secreted. Indeed, these are apt to call upon the name of Jesus to disarm and cast out every unclean spirit, fearing that some devil might be present, though they have not the slightest hint that one is about.

Diab.—You had as well be guarded, for you will find many that will suspect you, unless you are well concealed. Respecting those who preach that there is no devil, and believe it, you need give yourself no trouble about them. They are certainly sufficiently blinded and surely enough deluded, and will inevitably precipitate themselves, with all who can be influenced by them, into perdition, without any further attention from us. If you please, Diamonion, proceed with your report.

Diam.—I was going on to say, that I attended a great meeting, where a simple-hearted, plain man preached to an immense concourse of people. I tried to divert his course, distract his attention, or in some way defeat his power. His

theme was the love of Christ. He dwelt upon the ruined and lost condition of man—his helpless and irrecoverable state without a Savior. He then proceeded to dwell upon the great love of God—that he so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. He showed here that *perish* is the opposite of *life,* and that Jesus came to save man from perishing and give him life. He dwelt much upon his suffering, and with great effect upon his audience, as many were in tears. I trembled and fled, but resolved to defeat this preacher. But how was this to be done? The preaching was not only good and true, but what perplexed me was, that *everybody knew it to be good and true,* and I could not deny it. Many were almost ready to confess Christ. What was to be done to defeat this work? I, therefore, resolved upon my plan. As I walked away, no one suspecting me to be anything short of a saint, I joined in with the general opinion and expression touching the sermon—that it was good and true, though I hated it from the bottom of my heart, if such miserable things as we are can be supposed to have any hearts; and determined to make an effort to defeat it. In a few days I found a preacher to my liking, and had an agent of ours to engage him to preach at the same place, on the same subject. The time came; the preacher was present, and the audience large. I was in a conspicuous place, not to oppose but to aid; not to tremble but to laugh;" not in my proper character and name, of course, but as a *Christian!* All eyes stared at the preacher, while he put on as sacred and solemn an appearance as was possible for such an one, and read the sublime words, "God is love." He now looked over the audience with such an air of consequence, wisdom and piety, that I feared he would overdo the thing; but I saw presently that it was an old art with him, and that he had full confidence that he could conceal the sophistry and do the work effectually. He set out by extolling the love of God to man. He eulogized the love of God, wrapped the subject in a great multiplicity of high-sounding

words, and soared aloft in most eloquent strains and touching heights. I never heard so many eulogies upon the love of God and upon God himself, nor such a combination of words and phrases from any man. He appeared unable to satisfy himself in language in describing how good God was, and when he had come as near as possible making his hearers believe that the only attributes the Almighty possesses are love and goodness, he raised to his tiptoe and emphasized at the top of his voice, that so *good* a God—a God who is *love*—could not inflict upon his creatures endless punishment! When he had concluded his sermon, he offered a tract I had engaged him to prepare for occasions like this, containing "One Hundred Reasons for Being a Universalist," for five cents each. In a few moments all the pious part of the congregation, in deep mortification, appearing confused and defeated, walked away. Some twenty wicked men and boys crowded round the preacher and bought his tract, and walked away laughing. Some infidels, as they walked away, said, "Anything can be proved by the Bible, and religion is all priestcraft." Thus, you perceive, I have succeeded in defeating the word of God and mission of Christ, without directly denying either, in this case.

Diab.—*You* have acted your part admirably in this instance. This case illustrates the great principle of operation for mischief in these times. These are days of progress, and we must keep up with the times. But you must remember this: no stratagem will accomplish the work in all cases. This one that you have adopted, that has been so efficient, and that you have reason to be proud of, will only delude a certain class; and what you are bound to admit, too, a class very little disposed to be religious. But you will find that many will see the sophistry and the deceitfulness of the agent you employ to use it, and turn from both with the utmost disgust and contempt.

Lucifer.—What shall we resort to when this proves a failure?

Apollyon.—I have been acting upon a principle for many

centuries that works admirably. Ever since Wickliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Chillingworth, Luther, Calvin, Huss, Wesley, etc., have made such an ado about "the Bible and the Bible alone," I have been engaged in an effort to defeat them, and had great success. I, therefore, beg leave to set forth my plans of operation.

Diab—Proceed, sir; that is the great matter to be accomplished, and anything promising success in that work is precisely what we want.

Apollyon.—Well, sir, one move I have made, with delightful success in that direction, was to infuse the idea into the minds of the clergy, that their doctrine should be set out explicitly, in a brief epitome, or series of articles of faith, declaring wherein they protest against Rome, wherein they protest against heresy, and precisely what they believe.

Daim.—I do not perceive how you ever succeeded in introducing a position in such direct contradiction to that popular sentiment exhibited by the clergy with such great power against the Church of Rome, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.

Apollyon. –I had but little trouble in accomplishing that work. I had those I employed to do this work, to maintain that the brief, or epitome, was the Bible doctrine, condensed and concentrated into a small space, so that it might easily be comprehended. In the second place, to make the masses of the people believe that there was no innovation and no danger in the adoption of such a creed, I had them to insert at an early period in the creed, that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man as an article of faith, or requisite to salvation. This, they thought, covered over everything and made all safe.

Diam.—But did they not perceive that these briefs, or epitomes, did not contain a tithe of the Bible doctrine? and did they not perceive that every argument you could invent for this epitome was founded in the wicked assumption

that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is not sufficient? and that this attempt was to supply this deficiency, thus clearly implying that their leading position against Romanists was in their estimation, false?

Apollyon.—I kept this out of view pretty much, and covered it up with many fine words touching the usefulness of such a brief to promote unity, peace, harmony and love, as well as to show all men what they believed, and covered it all over by saying these articles are all taught of God, even in his written word, which, as Mr. Wesley said, "is the only rule and the sufficient rule both of faith and practice."

Lucifer.—But could they not see, that if "God's written word was the sufficient and the only rule of faith and practice," that your epitome was a fifth wheel, that it was useless, nay worse, that it contradicted the statement that the word of God was sufficient?

Apollyon.—No, sir; they never saw this, but supposed it was a most benevolent and wise arrangement, and would be a great advantage to the cause of God? You must not forget that I did not employ ignorant men to do this work, nor wicked men, but the wisest and best men in the world; and I induced even these to think that this arrangement would be a great blessing to them. When I had once established the precedent that one class of good and great men had the right to set forth such a brief or epitome of what they understood to be the doctrines of the Bible, the way was clear for another and another set of men to do the same, until the land is filled with these briefs or epitomes, set forth by bodies of men, both learned and unlearned, of the most contradictory nature, and thousands of men engaged in trying to prove the one which is the center of the little party to which they belong, and trying to disprove all others, by the Bible. In this method, I have succeeded in setting them at war, variance and hatred, thus engrossing their time and energies in proving *their* doctrine, pulling down and devouring their neighbors, while infidels laugh at their silly efforts to prove so many contradictory theories

by the Bible. In the meantime, the Lord Jesus is not preached, the word of God is not maintained, and the world thrown into confusion upon the whole subject to such an extent that a man is considered ostentatious who will attempt to tell what the truth or the right way is.

Diab.—Gentlemen, these are interesting reports, and I am sorry that time fails to furnish an opportunity to hear all of you; but it is now time for us to adjourn for another month. Meantime, let us profit by these suggestions and make an effort, knowing that our time for working ruin is short. By the way, there are new influences at work, of a most powerful and overwhelming nature, that we must counteract or our cause will suffer. A new set of Bible men, Bible revisionists and Bible translators, with more learning, greater facilities, more zeal, more power and influence than any we have ever dealt with before, in a country of free institutions, free presses, free speech and all other facilities for filling the world with the Bible and calling the attention of all mankind to it in a new and most powerful manner, have appeared. That silly laugh, attributed to us, supposed to be written by Dr. N. L. Rice, which we never had, is all turning the other way, and all the agencies we have yet employed to oppose revision have proved abortive and fruitless.

REPORTER.

No. V.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Our happiness does not consist in possessing senses or faculties, but in exercising them. They are simply avenues through which enjoyments are obtained or benefits conferred. Merely possessing the sense of seeing is no enjoyment, and confers no benefit. The enjoyment is found and the benefit derived by the *act of seeing,* or by exercising the sense of seeing. But it should be remembered that a man might have the sense of seeing in its utmost perfection, and never see anything. He might be born with good eyes in a dungeon, be kept there, and die there, without ever seeing anything. In this case, the sense of seeing would afford no enjoyment, and be a source of no good to him. He had as well have been born without eyes. Three things are essential to seeing: 1. Eyes, or the sense of seeing. 2. Objects to see, or that which the sense of seeing can take hold of. 3. Light, through which the eye communicates with the object, or reaches it. But even after the Lord has created eyes to see, and light, as the telegraph wires through which vision may be transmitted, and all the innumerable objects to be seen, a man may never see much, because the *will* has a vast deal to do in his seeing. He may live to an old age and die without ever seeing a tenth part of what is inscribed in his own mother tongue upon the pages of the Bible, simply because he *will not read it. H*e may never see the principal rivers, lakes and seas, the villages, towns and cities, counties, states and territories, not because these objects do not exist, nor for the want of light, nor because the Lord has not given him eyes capable of seeing all those things, but because he does not *will* to bring himself in the proper proximity to them to see them. Having eyes does not compel him to see; hence the Lord speaks of some "having eyes, but see not." The will has a mighty control over what a man shall see, and

what he shall not see. He who sees much must make an effort to see. He must not deny the existence of objects that he never saw, when the reason he never saw them is simply that he would not go where they can be seen, and look at them.

In precisely the same way, three things are necessary to hearing: I. There must be an ear, or the sense of hearing. 2. There must be sound to be heard. 3" There must be the medium of the atmosphere to bear the sound to the ear. As in the case of seeing, the enjoyment is not in possessing the sense of hearing, but in exercising it. A man with a perfect ear, kept where there is no sound, would no more enjoy hearing than if God had endowed him with no such sense. The will, too, has an immense deal to do with hearing. It determines what the man will hear and what he will not hear. The will decides where the ear shall go, what sound it shall come in reach of, and what it shall not. The will just as much determines what a man shall hear as it does what he shall eat. A man can decide that he will swallow deadly poison, and the result is that it will kill him. A man can decide that he will hear the light, chaff),, simple, foolish, or the devilish, and the result of the poison he swallows is not more inevitable than the result of what he habitually hears. He will!, in the very nature of the case, inevitably partake of the nature of what he hears. Show the books a man reads, the conversations and addresses he habitually hears, and you can read what kind of a man he is. He is just like what he hears and reads, and delights to hear and read, and he is that, by choice, or because he wills it.

As in the cases above, there are three things necessary to believe: 1. The faculty of believing, or credulity, 2. That which is to be believed, or the truth. 3. The means to convey the truth to be believed to the mind, to the understanding, or the faculty of the soul that accredits truth. There is no enjoyment in the mere possession of credulity, or the ability to believe, nor is there any benefit derived from it. The enjoyment is in, and the benefit derived from, the exercise of

the faculty. The speculator may have a large amount of produce in market; the truth may exist that there is a splendid advance in price, and he may have the faculty to believe, but he is too negligent to procure and read the news, and therefore remains ignorant of the advance. His having the faculty to believe did him no good, nor was the fact of the advance in price any use to him. Why? Because he decided not to seek the information, not to put himself to the trouble to know the truth, and this, as a matter of course, deprived him of both the enjoyment and benefit. The ability to examine testimony, to accredit it, or confide in it, must he exercised or it affords no enjoyment and confers no benefit. Here is precisely where accountability arises in reference to faith. We have, in our previous articles shown that all men of common endowments, or common sense, to speak more plainly, possess the faculty of credulity, or ability to believe, and daily exercise it in reference to a thousand things all around them. We have sufficiently demonstrated the great fundamental, foundation, or central truth, in which is embodied all other religious truth, and that upon which everything else rests—the greatest of all facts ever revealed to mortals in the flesh —that Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified and laid in the tomb of Joseph of Aramatheia, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, is seated upon the throne, a Prince and a Savior, to grant repentance and forgiveness of sins—that he is Divine. This is the grandest, most stupendous and benevolent of all facts in this universe. In it is our all for all the countless ages that lie beyond the narrow limits of this short lifetime.

This overwhelming fact comes not within the reach of any of the five senses. We did not see Jesus rise from the dead. We did not hear him speak. We did not handle him. Nor did he ever come in reach of either of the other senses. How, then, is the fact of his Messiahship, his Divinity, or his resurrection, to reach the soul? How is the soul to be assured that Jesus rose from the dead, or, which is the same thing, that he is Divine? There must be means of communication from that which is to be believed and the human

heart or understanding which believes it. There must be a telegraph wire, with one end connected with the fact to be believed, and the other end with the heart that is to believe, through which the fact can be conveyed. The wire is the Divine testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth. That testimony reaches from him in whom we are to believe and to us who are to believe. Through it the fact comes to the soul, and becomes a part of ones consciousness as much as what we see and hear. But notwithstanding all this, the human will has much to do. Although God has endowed one man with credulity, or the ability to believe, just as much as any other man around him, given the same fact to believe and the same evidence, he may refuse to use iris eyes in reading it, his ears in hearing it read or spoken of, his understanding in considering it, or his heart in believing it. Every man has the power to hear nothing but what is idle, fulsome and worthless in itself; and, as nothing can rise above its fountain, the effect upon the heart must be of the same nature of that which he hears. If a man determines that he will spend his time in a dungeon, he will never see, though God gives him good eyes, creates beautiful objects to see, and plenty of light. If a man prefers darkness to light, he can find dark and dreary recesses, where he can no more see than if God created him without eyes. God does not force him to go where the light is, nor to open his eyes and see.

God has created man with credulity, or the ability to believe; he has graciously given us the truth, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, to believe, with the Divine testimony that incontestably proves the truth. But he does not compel any man to read the testimony, to hear it read, to examine it, try to understand and appreciate it. He lays it before the world, and demands of the nations to hear it. It is like all the other blessings God has afforded man, it must be sought, inquired after and received, or do men no good. Men may be none the better of its ever entering into the World. It may be that God has created a rich mine of gold in some part of the earth. One man seeks all the infor-

mation he can obtain in reference to it, becomes satisfied of its richness and accessibility; he makes a proper effort and obtains a fortune. Another man, with equally as good endowments, treats the whole question with indifference to it. Without examining the testimony, he pronounces it all delusion, humbuggery, a chimera, and ridicules it, and the man who seeks information or inquires into it. What good will the gold mine do him? None whatever. So far as he is concerned, the gold mine might as well never have been created.

But it fares infinitely worse than this with him who treats with indifference the pearls of Jesus Christ. He who prefers the darkness of this world to the light of the Son of God, turns away his ears from the holy and lovely lessons of the benevolent Redeemer, refuses to inform himself in reference to HIM to whom God requires all nations to be attentive, incurs a responsibility for which he will certainly answer at the most solemn tribunal. He who turns his back upon the Lord of heaven and earth, when we would call attention to him, not only loses or forfeits the benefits proposed through him, but incurs censure for indifference, ingratitude and disrespect, if not contempt of his Creator and merciful Benefactor. God has created him with a heart to believe, given the truth and furnished the testimony to convey it to the understanding, and holds him responsible for the exercise of his abilities. Come, then, dear reader, and let us fix our minds upon Jesus of Nazareth, and carefully consider, his claims upon our attention. The whole question is about him. What do you think of him whom we claim as the Savior of the world? Do you love him and those like him? Or are you opposed to him?

No. III.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diabolos.—Let us now proceed with our reports, suggestions and counsels as rapidly as possible. We must be the alert.

Lucifer.—Most worthy Diabolos, permit me to give you a short account of my procedure. You know we have been annoyed and harassed exceedingly ever since Luther's time, with a class of people who seem to think of nothing but pushing the Bible upon/the people. This, you know, exceedingly annoying to us, for therein we not only find an account of the condemnation of the wicked men, but devils. Well, sir, I determined that I would defeat not only these Bible men, but the Bible itself. But the question was how this was to be done. The people all believed the Bible, and any man that would question its truth or its goodness, would be called a simpleton or a devil. I had a deep and settled hatred of the Bible and all its friends, as you know we all have; but I did not dare to say it was not good and true. I therefore chimed in with the general expression, that the Bible was good and true, and that all should believe it. I discovered, too, that I could find no men who would deny its truth right out and boldly oppose it, as an old legend, fabulous dream, or Pagan imposition, except men of miserable lives, no influence, and no responsibility. I, however, engaged a few of this class to stand about the doors of drinking and gambling saloons, attend balls, theaters, and many other such places, and, in their broad and vulgar manner, make the Bible a jest; but I never counted much on these, for they are so repulsive that demons would almost shudder at them.

Diamonion.—That is a fact, most worthy Lucifer. I have myself been almost repulsed and ashamed of some of the class you allude to. These overdo the thing to such an extent, that men shudder at their enormities. Still they do their work, do it effectually; and not only go themselves, but send multitudes like themselves down to hell. But, sir, there is a different class of skeptics from this, that are doing us good service. This class are moral, respectful, and still. They are more sensible than those, and manage with more discretion. Many of them are not known to be skeptics. They generally have "Paine's Age of Reason," keep it secretly, read it when they are alone, or when one or two of their own sort are present, and laugh over it. These scarcely ever mention Paine, or the name of any infidel writer, or that they ever saw an infidel book. But occasionally I have led them to profess a great desire to become Christians, but in reading the Bible and meditating upon it, they have found this difficulty, that difficulty, or the other, which, when stated, is nothing but a retailing and peddling anew something from Paine's old infidel book. These will occasionally give some preacher one of his *serious* difficulties, about which he cares not one farthing, and request him to "clear it up to his satisfaction." The poor preacher and Some of his unsuspecting brethren are delighted, thinking that he is inquiring to know his duty. A sermon is preached to convince him, but, alas, he coolly walks away, saying, "He never touched the case!"

Lucifer.—I concede, sir, that these do us much service in the way you describe; but not one tithe of the work is done by them that is done by others whom I have employed. I have engaged many good men, well-meaning men, and made them think they were doing the work of the Lord, and and at the same time had them rendering us the most efficient aid we ever had.

Diam.—How did you accomplish that?

Lucifer.—Well, sir, you know what trouble that despisable New Testament doctrine that "the Gospel is the power

of God unto the salvation of everyone that believeth," has given us. You know what trouble we have bad with that old doctrine of the prophet of "hearing with the ear, understanding with the heart, and being converted." You know well how we have been perplexed with the language of the New Testament, such as: "Understandest thou what thou readest?" "The good ground is the man who receives the word into a good and honest heart, understands and obeys it." "As I wrote before in few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to those that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the mind of them that believe not," etc., etc. Well, sir, I employed a class of men, believers in the Bible and preachers, to assist me in defeating the doctrine contained in these and all similar passages, thinking at the same time, as those who persecuted the Apostles, that they were "doing God service."

Diam.—I do not see how that was possible.

Lucifer.—I am aware that it looks incredible, but I nevertheless did it; and I have succeeded to such an extent that I now have thousands almost daily preaching that the "word of God is a sealed book," "a mystery," "a secret," and that it can not be understood by any only the especially illuminated!

Diam.—But do not they know that the Scriptures say, "These things are written that ye might believe" ?

Lucifer.—Certainly, they know the Scriptures *say* so, but if they can not understand them they do not know what that means any more than other passages.

Diam.—But did they not see that when the Apostles preached to men, they heard it, understood it, and submitted to it?

Lucifer.—No, sir; I made them believe that all the effect was produced by some other agency, and not by the Gospel at all, and in this way have induced many to lose all interest in the Gospel, and pretty much cease reading it. Indeed, I have succeeded with this deception to an incredible degree. I have positively had preachers quoting Scripture to persons

whom they declared could not understand the Bible at all, to prove to them that it was a sealed book, a mystery—to prove that they could not understand it, as if anything they could not understand could prove anything to them! I have thus led them to turn their ears away from the truth, and turned them into fables; and thousands of them now that will not hear the Bible at all will shout over a dream, a "spirit ray," a trance, or a wrestle with the devil.

Diab.—But what do you do with those who will not believe your preacher who says the Bible is a sealed book? You know there many of this kind.

Lucifer.—Well, sir, I have preachers employed who tell such that it amounts to nothing if they do understand it, for it "is a dead letter," that it is powerless; that it is simply lamp-black upon paper; that they must have some other power to turn them to God. In this way, I lead the preacher to cease preaching the Gospel, which we know to be the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and induce him and the people to unite in calling upon God mightily to "send down converting power." In this way, I have set the Gospel aside as "the *mere* word," and lead many thousands to practice human substitutions and traditions in the place of the clear requirements of Heaven.

Diab.—But there are some that will believe neither of these. They will maintain that they can understand the revelation of God; that it would not be a revelation if they could not understand it; and will maintain that it is the power of God. What will you do with these?

Lucifer.—Well, sir, I have a preacher standing ready for those who declare they can understand the Bible and that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, who preaches to them the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, that they are so dead in trespasses in sins as to be entirely powerless, and that they can not do anything till they are quickened by irresistible power, many will believe this, and, as a matter of course, wait for irresistible power to quicken them, so that they can repent and believe. This I find very effectual. It

lulls to sleep in carnal security delightfully. The process is sure and the reasoning simple. The sinner led into the duplicity of this net says to himself, *"I* can not do anything, but simply wait the Lord's own good time, and if I die in my sins it is not my fault, as I could not do anything."

Diab.—But you will find many who will believe none of this. What are we to do with them?

Lucifer.—Well, sir, I have engaged preachers who tell them that God unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, that a certain number are foreordained to everlasting life and a certain number to everlasting death, that the number thus unchangeably foreordained and predestinated is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished. This doctrine I have them argue from Scripture, and I induce many to believe it. This, too, answers the same purpose as either of the former doctrines. It rocks men to sleep in carnal security delightfully. They say, "If God, by the decree. of election before the world, has made me one of the elect I am safe; do as I may, I will infallibly be brought in and saved. But if I am of the non-elect, no matter how much I read the Bible, pray and cry to God for mercy, I can not be saved." In this way, I keep thousands from attempting to serve God.

Diab.—But there are many who will not he caught in any of these Snares. Is there any other stratagem for them? I want all the wisdom you have now. Our time for deceiving is short, and we must employ every moment.

Lucifer.—About the next stratagem is to find suitable instruments, such as I could name, with no conscience, no faith, and faces of brass, to preach that all will be saved, no matter what their lives in this world. All who will believe this will soon set aside every ordinance of the New Testament, and turn the most fearful, solemn and momentous matters in the revelation from God to man into ridicule, and soon despise every attempt to keep the commandments of God. This answers as a kind of whirlpool to suck down the lukewarm, cold, backsliding, negligent, prayerless and godless

professors, to whom the yoke of Christ is a burden, spiritual things are insipid and the good things of the kingdom of God are loathsome.

Diab.—You are an apt scholar, most noble Lucifer; you are getting into the work pretty effectually. These have been most efficient agencies; but there are new phases of things appearing that I am scarcely decided myself in reference to. The Bible Union is giving me much trouble. I thought when I engaged Mr. Judel, and succeeded in getting the influence of that good old man, Dr. MacClay, against it, I would crumble it into atoms; but in this I was disappointed. I thought when I employed the five, clergymen at Louisville against the Revision Association, I should most certainly succeed; but here I have been most sadly foiled. My instruments in this case, too, proved most inefficient and unsuccessful, and are now exposed to the derision of the masses of the people.

Apollyon.—I hope you are not disheartened, most noble Diabolos. I think I see some indication favorable to our cause. I am employing some agencies among these Bible Union men, that I think will set them by the ears, burst them up, and defeat them. I have alarmed some of the Baptists till the hair stands on end upon their heads, with the idea that if they do not kick Mr. Campbell, and all identified with him, out of the Bible Union they will loose their precious name, *Baptist,* lose their identity, and be swallowed by the Disciples. This" I am working to a charm. I have already worked the alarm on this score into Sirs Graves, Crowell, Ford, Sands, Jeter, and a host that move at their bidding, till they are deciding in all directions that communion with Disciples and all fraternal communications must be broken off.

Diab.—Do you think the great, good and wise men among the Baptists can be moved by such a simple panic as this? Why, you must be ignorant of your work! Do you know that the Baptists out-number the Disciples three to one, and they be alarmed for fear the Disciples will swallow them

down! Why do not the Disciples become alarmed for fear the Baptists will swallow them down?

Apollyon.—With all due deference to your superior knowledge, most worthy Diabolos, I beg leave to say the reason why the Disciples are not alarmed is obvious. You know, and we all know, that the Disciples care for nothing in religion only what is contained in the clear revelations of God, when correctly translated. Thus you perceive that the Bible Union secures and maintains all that they are aiming at; and that they can not lose anything. The men I have alluded to see this, and all that distinguishes them, as Baptists, from the Disciples, is in danger of being lost. The Disciples have nothing to distinguish them only what is clearly found in the Scriptures, when correctly translated. In the Union, therefore, they not only maintain and hold on to all they have ever contended for,'but get the Baptists to help them. Why, most noble Diabolos, Sirs Graves, Ford, etc., have reason to be alarmed, when they see their own brethren in friendly "alliance" with the Disciples, and aiding them in translating the very name "Baptist" out of the Bible! There is not one thing about "Baptist principles" in the Bible Union. "Baptist usage," too, is not mentioned nor is there anything there to secure anything but truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, correctly translated into all languages, for all people; thus embracing all that the Disciples have ever contended for, and nothing more, and the Baptists aiding them in the work! Baptists, sir, have reason to be alarmed, and they will be alarmed, and break up the "alliance" sure. I have already set the work in motion.

Diabolos.—Most worthy Apollyon, your reasonings are weighty. I do believe there is something in your suggestions. I see now the meaning of "resetting the old landmarks," maintaining "close communion," and the doctrine set forth by Mr. Crowell, on "the Order of Conversion," in the February number of the *Christian Repository,* that love to God is first, repentance second, and faith last. I think

you are right; that a muss is coming and the "alliance" will be broken up. Let us keep an eye to these matters till our next meeting. Meantime, leave no stone unturned in an effort to set the Disciples and Baptists at variance.

REPORTER.

THE CONTROVERSY ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT.

IT appears more difficulty at the present time to induce men to be content with simple Christianity, in spirit and practice, without any mixture with humanisms, than at any former period. The people have become so accustomed to leaning upon the human that they can scarcely conceive of the possibility of trusting wholly in the Divine. We, as a body of people, have made wonderful strides in showing our neighbors of the sects the schismatical tendency of all their creeds, the necessity of abandoning the whole of them and of committing ourselves wholly to Christ as our leader and instructor. But some of the controversies now going on show a wandering disposition, dissatisfied with the simple belief and practice of Christianity, as inconsistent with the unity of the Spirit and bond of peace as the adoption and maintenance of a human creed. After preaching the plain gospel of Christ, as the Disciples have done for more than thirty years, gathering some, three hundred thousand souls to the fold of Christ, many of them from the contending parties around us, and uniting them in the bond of peace and union, thus making ourselves felt as no other people have done in this century, a brother perceives where a slight mistake may have occurred. He becomes alarmed, looks upon all that has been done as nothing, and declares that nothing great and good be will accomplished fill the evil is corrected. He just now perceives that there is danger of men resting their faith in *the word*, and not in the Divine and glorious *person* revealed through the word. He thinks many are deceived in relying simply upon the word in the place of relying upon *Him* who gave the word. He now perceives the secret of there not being devotion, piety and zeal. It is found in the stupid mistake of believing *the truth,*

in the place of believing in *Him* who is revealed through the truth.

This pretty little distinction is elaborated in many sermons, upon many pages, and upon a thousand tongues. The whole phalanx of *word-alone* men are now called to an account, and shown at great length, with profound learning and philosophy, that their stupid mistake has been that they have believed the word, trusted in the word, relied upon the word, and preached the word, but lost sight of the glorious person of Christ revealed through the word, and the Holy Spirit sent to be the Comforter of the saints. But no change follows all this wonderful discovery and very profound distinction. No increase of piety, zeal, love or good works follow. No conversion of sinners follow any more than before, nor anything different, except contention, strife and confusion. On the other hand, here come the word-alone men, accusing the former class with infidelity, or at least teaching doctrines tending to a rejection of the word, looking for something beyond and above the word, thus ignoring the word. These, too, now stand in defense of the faith, suffer for the truth, and sound the warning voice of dangerous doctrine! Some of the Disciples are on one side and some on the other, but the greater portion do not know what the controversy is about, but think there are good brethren on both sides. The only wonder with them is that the patties should manifest so much irritability, use such severe and harsh language and appear so much alarmed. They can perceive no occasion for all this.

Where is the necessity of all this? When did an attorney ever find it necessary to 'inform the jury that the testimony was not the thing to be believed, but that that which was revealed through the testimony was what was to be believed. In what, except in religion, did any man ever think it necessary to caution the people that the *truth itself is* not what is to be believed, but that which is made known through the truth? Of what possible use can such metaphysical distinctions be to any human being? Did any man ever believe

the truth of the Gospel and not believe in him whom the truth of the Gospel sets forth? Can any man believe the word and not believe him who uttered it? Can any man have confidence in the word and not have confidence in him who spoke the word? Is there such a thing as trusting in the word and not trusting in the author of the word? Can any man believe the word and not believe that which is revealed in the word? If you believe the testimony of a witness, do you not at the same time believe the witness and that which is communicated through the testimony of the witness? Can any man receive the word the Father gave Jesus, the word Jesus gave to the Apostles, and the word which the Apostles by the Holy Spirit preached to us, and not believe the Father who gave the word to the Son? not believe the Son who gave the word to the Apostles? not believe the Apostles who gave the word to us? Can a man confide in the word the Father gave the Son, which the Son gave the Apostles and which the Apostles have given to us, and not confide in the Father, the Son and the Apostles? Can a man confide in Jesus and not confide in his word? or confide in his word and not confide in him? Can a man confide in the Holy Spirit and not confide in his word ? or confide in his word and not confide in him? Can a man receive the word of Jesus and not receive Jesus? Can any person believe the word of the Holy Spirit and not receive the Holy Spirit? Can anyone obey the word and not obey him who uttered the word? Can a man follow the word spoken by the Spirit and not follow the Spirit? Can a man be led by the word spoken by the Spirit and not be led by the Spirit? Are not all those led by the teachings of the Spirit inscribed upon the pages of the Bible, led by the Spirit?

We put it to all those brethren engaged in this controversy, to produce an instance of one human being led by the teachings of the Spirit in the Bible, and not led by the Spirit; or, one led by the Spirit not led by his teachings in the Bible. "These things, says the Spirit of all wisdom, who guided the Apostles or spoke through them, "are writ-

ten that you might believe." Believe what? "That Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." They are not written that you may have a peculiar view of spiritual influence, but that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. What are we to believe that for? "That you might have life through his name." Here is the straight-forward work —no metaphysics nor speculations, but the plain truth to be believed and the object of believing it—that the believer might have life. The Holy Spirit comes not asking you to believe on himself, or some peculiar mode of his operation; but as a witness bearing testimony of Jesus. Hence Paul says, "The Holy Spirit also is a witness," and that no man can "call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Spirit." At the Jordan, when the Lord was baptized and introduced to Israel, the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form and rested upon him, thus indicating that all attention should be directed to him. When the Lord ascended to heaven, he sent the Spirit to the Apostles, to bring all things to their remembrance, guide them into all truth, inspire them, and thus through them spread out his entire testimonies upon the sacred pages as left us from the hands of the four Evangelists, that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name. All this the Holy Spirit has done that we might believe, or to *enable us to believe.* Can we receive his testimony and not receive the glorious person of whom he testifies? or can we reject his testimony without rejecting the glorious person of whom he testifies? Certainly not.

Shall we, then, confide in these Divine testimonies of the Spirit, spread upon the sacred pages of the New Testament, that we *might believe,* and set them before the world as sufficient to enable all men to believe, or shall we declare these testimonies of the Spirit insufficient, too weak and imperfect to enable the sinner to believe, and maintain that the Spirit must come to the sinner and give him further evidence that his testimony, published eighteen centuries ago, believed by so many thousands and confided in by the holy martyrs even

unto death, is true, and thus enable him to believe? Let any man who wishes to fall, question the all-sufficiency of the testimonies of the Spirit set forth in the New Testament—testimony which we affirm to be complete and perfect—to which the Spirit himself forbids anything added or taken from. He who undertakes to depreciate this testimony, whether ignorantly or in unbelief—we care not what his design — weakens the Gospel argument precisely to the amount of his influence, apologizes for the unbeliever, excuses him in his infidelity and strengthens his hands in sin. In the place of his being himself a believer in the testimony of the Spirit, he is trifling with it, creating distrust in the minds of others, and subverting that which all admit to be the testimony of the Spirit of God.

There is but one safe course, and that is to follow the Apostles, preach the same truth preached by them, relying upon the same testimony upon which they rested as all-sufficient, and maintaining the self-evident truth, that *all men can believe it,* when it is *preached, and* that *they will be lost if they do not believe it.* This we are authorized to do, and this is all we can do. Even this can only be done by believers. Skeptics can not do it effectually. But men who believe in Jesus with all the heart can preach Jesus to others, with full confidence that they can believe in him also. They can bring all the testimony furnished by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament before the mind of the unbeliever. But if these are not sufficient to enable a man to believe, they can do no more. The preacher may turn and preach to the sinner that these testimonies are not sufficient, and he must have assistance from some other source; but he can not give that assistance, and preaching does not make it come. If it does not come, who is to blame? Not the sinner; for he could not bring it. Not the preacher; for he could not bring it. Where lies the blame, then? The testimony the Spirit has given is not sufficient to enable the sinner to believe. He can not obtain power to believe. The preacher has preached Christ and presented the testimonies of the Spirit as found in the Scrip-

true. But the sinner can not believe till the Spirit comes and gives his testimony efficiency. The Spirit does not come. The man not only does not believe, but he can not believe. Who is to blame? The Spirit, according to this very pious and spiritual theory, is to blame, because he did not come and do what he left undone when he gave his testimony, what neither the preacher nor the sinner could do, viz.: give his testimony *efficiency.*

The difficulty in these times is not that the testimony of the Spirit, inscribed upon the pages of the New Testament, lacks efficiency, nor does the Spirit himself lack efficiency, nor does the Lord lack efficiency, the Lord, the Spirit and the testimony are efficient, and do their work. The lack of efficiency is on the part of weak-minded and unbelieving, or skeptical preachers and church-members. Let them become efficient, strong in faith, giving glory to God, and preach Jesus with great power, present the Divine testimonies with full assurance of faith, and the work will go on. The Lord will do his work. The Spirit will do his work, and do it right. The testimony will do its work, and sinners will be saved. The trouble is to get the preachers to do their work, do it right, and thus operate rightly upon the world. Let us turn our attention more especially to men, and try and induce them to *operate right,* and all the balance will operate infallibly right.

No. IV.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diab.—Gentlemen, I am delighted with your ready adherence to. my suggestions and the success that has attended your movements. If you please, proceed immediately with reports, suggestions, or whatever lies in our course, that can in any way aid in our work.

Apollyon.—I have a device that I desired to lay before this honorable body, that I have succeeded with admirably. I find that I can turn it to good account, in the propagation, maintenance and perfectuation of any false doctrine I wish to infuse among the people. My plan is simply this: I select my men, always, as a matter of course, the best, most talented and influential I can command. I impress them, by dreams, visions, apparitions and imaginations, to believe that they are immediately called and sent, as the Apostles and prophets, to preach; that they are inspired to speak under the infallible influence of the Spirit of all wisdom. I now have many of this kind, to which I have added another large class, consisting of men who make the same pretensions, but know it to be a base pretense; and after keeping these two classes of men in this train of thought, and training them for their work a few years, they will not regard anything in the Bible—any utterance of prophet or apostle, of the Holy Spirit, nor of the Lord himself.

Lucifer.—How do you turn these to account in our work?

Apollyon.— Well, sir, I send them out with the zeal of Apostles, one class honestly thinking and preaching, "Woe

is me if I preach not the Gospel;" and the other class repeating the same for a pretense. I have them all to proceed as follows: 1. They set forth and establish, as far as possible, their Divine call to minister in holy things, under the direct, immediate and infallible influence of the Holy Spirit. 2. That any man who is not thus called and sent has no right, nay, that it is sacrilege for any such to preach, and that no man can hear such without being partaker in their presumption and sin. 3. That the "common people" can not understand Divine things—can never know the meaning of the Bible, or obtain the inestimable blessings therein contained for man, without hearing his called and sent ministers. 4. That, as a matter of course, all who do not hear these men, thus specially called and sent, will be doomed to bottomless perdition. 5. That when they rise to speak they are merely the instruments in the hand of God that they have not meditated what they will say; nay more, that they do not know what the Lord will utter through them, but whatever the Spirit shall reveal to them, they will honestly proclaim.

Daimonion.—But, sir, how do you induce any man of common sense to give the least credence to such preposterous, unfounded and bare-faced pretensions?

Apollyon.—There is not, sir, the least difficulty about that. I have these men to assume a solemn appearance, at suitable intervals turn up the eyes toward heaven, and quote the words, "How beautiful are the feet of them who preach the Gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things"; and again, "How shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall he preach except he be sent?"

Lucifer.—But if they can not understand the Scriptures, how do they know what that proves when he quotes it to them ?

Apollyon.—That is perfectly easy and simple. They know what he is aiming to prove, or what he quotes it for, and when he "who was called of God as was Aaron," who can "discern spiritual things," unfolds the mysteries and reveals the deep things of God, touches a passage of Scripture, it

becomes perfectly transparent, clear as crystal, what the preacher means, and it is easily and readily taken for granted that such is the meaning of the Lord! It would he preposterous to think the Lord meant anything different from his ambassadors whom he had sent!

Lucifer.—I admit, sir, that if we can procure such men as you describe, and beguile the people to believe them, admit their claims and hear them as speaking for God—as God's ministers, his witnesses and rulers—that they would be good instruments through whom to infuse whatever ruinous and destructive errors we please. But will not some of those men, of whom you know there are still a few, whom we never could control, deny their claim, show that no other Gospel can be preached without incurring the curse of Heaven, that revelation is complete, that nothing can be added or taken away, that if a man can not understand the inspired prophets, apostles and the Savior uttering the precise language of the Spirit of all wisdom, he could not understand any man now, however called and sent?

Apollyon.—It is easy, generally, to repel these. Those I employ, claiming to be specially illuminated, claim to discern spirits, and they pronounce all such unregenerate, not born again, and quote the words, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither indeed *can he know them,* for they are spiritually discerned"; "The wind blows where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it comes nor whither it goes"; that "we have the Spirit of God, and the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God"; "How can he preach except he be sent"? In this way I confound the people, and keep them listening to my called and sent preachers, preaching all the errors and ruinous nonsense imaginable.

Lucifer.—But what is to he done when a man, as one I have heard, points out the conflicting doctrines, wranglings, disputings among your "called and sent preachers," and shows clearly that God never sent men who have not the unity of the spirit and who speak not the same thing? that

God is not the author of confusion, but of peace? that God is one, and that there could not be but one doctrine from him?

Apollyon.—When men such as you mention, and I know there are a few such, who give us great annoyance, start such reasoning as you allude to among the people, viz: that if they were of God they would all speak the same doctrine, be of the same mind, in love and union, I am aware that it is a little perplexing; but I open a way for escape as best I can. At one time, when a little pressed I suggest, to quote the words, "Judge not, that you be not judged," and proceed to admonish them that all this argument, investigation and talking about the mere letter of Scripture is wrong, and confront them with the words, "Where is the wise?"—"the disputer of this world?"— "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God"; and again, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain,"—"he taketh the wise in their own craftiness" — He hath chosen the weak things of this world to confound the mighty," etc., etc.

Lucifer.—But some of these men you have thus deluded preach that Christ died for all, and others maintain that he only died for a part. Now, when such clear and manifest contradictions are preached, I should think the people would see it.

Apollyon.—Well, sir, I admit that there are some few who occasionally see such palpable contradictions. But I have managed to repel the mass of these. I aim as near as possible always to have some one present, or to follow in a discourse soon after, and maintain that we can not see alike; that we differ in our features, our customs; that we are better off separated and do more good than we could do united; that it is a wise providence of God that we are divided; that division has the same happy influence as competition in business; and that the Scripture says, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," and again, "As your faith is, so be it unto you," that "we all have the right to worship God according to the dictates of our consciences," etc., etc.

Lucifer.—But, how do you get the people to receive such

palpable absurdities? Will they not see that you contradict the Bible in the most explicit terms? Do they not know that Jesus prayed that *"they* all may be one"—that he taught them that "by this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another," and that Paul most solemnly beseeches all Christians to "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and that there be no divisions among them"? Do they not know that Jesus taught that if even Satan's kingdom be divided against itself it can not stand?

Apollyon.–There are some few who know this, preach it, and give me much trouble; but I manage to keep their influence down to a considerable extent. You must bear in mind that when the people once grant that those employed by me are "called and sent of God" the trouble is over. These preachers only have to pronounce anything false, and the question is settled. They have only to declare a man not orthodox, and he is defeated, though he preach like an angel of God. If they know of a man quoting the prayer of Jesus, that *all who believe may be one,* they raise the cry that he denies the Divinity of Christ, does not believe in the influence of the Spirit, and is not sound in the faith; that his doctrine is dangerous, destructive to piety, and that he is unregenerate and wholly unenlightened in Divine things. This, with many people, is an end to all controversy. Besides if we can induce people once to depart from the truth, divert their minds from it, and lose the love of it, God will give them up to believe a lie—give them over to strong delusion that they may be condemned. When they reach this point. they require no more attention from us, but will pursue the even tenor of their downward course to impenetrable night. They will not hear Jesus nor the Apostles, neither holy men of ancient nor modern times, nor would they hear if one would rise from the dead. I have thousands of these so under my influence, their hearts so separated from the love of God, and their souls so callous to all that is contained in the Bible, that they would sooner their children, or dearest

friends, would live and die without any profession of Christianity than that they should believe in Christ with all their heart, repent of their sins, confess the Savior with their lips, be baptized solemnly in his. name, thus simply submitting themselves to God as they did in the days of the Apostles. They will be more excited, manifest more opposition and hostility to see their friends become Christians according to the New Testament than to see them become infidels.

Daim.—You are right, most noble Apollyon; I know this to be so. This not only can be, but is carried out with mighty success. Why, sir, I know of scores that will leave the house, in rage and fury, if they hear any man insist that men must believe precisely now what they did in the days of the Apostles to become Christians, that the faith must have the same effect upon their hearts, lead to the same acts of obedience, the same promises, and inspire the same hope. I know thousands that we have so blinded, that nothing makes them more miserable than to hear a man maintaining that we should be Christians as they were in the days of the Apostles—simply Christians, no more, no less—that we must be the same, be called the same, and nothing else than as found in the New Testament.

Apollyon.—Now you talk sense. Why, sir, I have many now under the influence of this delusion so far that they believe in this supposed call to the ministry, and believe every word of those supposed to be called, and will pay no kind of respect for anything in the word of God. I have had these men, professing to be called, preach to them things not mentioned in the Bible, and for which they could give no more authority than a Romish priest can give for counting beads or worshiping relics. Why, sir, I have actually had them to stand up on the Lord's day, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, sprinkle water upon the face of an infant, for a religious rite, and not a man mention that there is no such rite in the Bible, from first to last, nor anything like it! This I consider decidedly the greatest achievement in all our efforts at deception. In

this way we get them into the Church before they know anything about the Church, God, the Savior, the Holy Spirit, or anything divine. In this way, we get rid of regeneration, a change of heart and the love of God, and get them into the Church without conversion, being born again, or any reconciliation to God. In a short time, in this way, we shall have a church of sinners under the delusion that they are in the kingdom of God! These we keep, in many instances, under this delusion to the day of their death without any conversion to God.

Lucifer.—That is doing our work finely, unquestionably; hut I am not sure but I can mention some things that excel that in defeating the Bible and the mission of Christ. Why, sir, I have lead some of these "called and sent preachers" to leave the pulpit, close the Bible, leave it behind them, declare that they never knew a sinner converted by preaching the Gospel—that the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life—and that they were going into the work to convert sinners. In a few minutes, sinners who desired to be converted were called for and commanded to bow their knees. The Gospel—"the power of God unto salvation"—the "incorruptible seed, the word of God," by which men are born again, with preach-lug to sinners and pleading with them to turn to God, are all thrown aside, and in a few minutes I have the whole assembly, both preachers and people, in one united clamor of deafening cries to Heaven to send down converting power—to send down grace—to pour out the Spirit and convert sinners! Thus I have, on numerous occasions, had them set aside the word of God, the plain cases of conversion recorded in the New Testament, all the examples God had spread before them, and in their prayers face the God of all grace and tell him that the Church was willing, anxious and laboring for the conversion of sinners, and that the sinners themselves were *seeking G*od with all their hearts; and the pleading now appeared to be to get God willing to convert and save them!

REPORTER.

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE SPIRIT.

THESE are emphatically *fast* times, and the people in them *are fast* people. In former ages men moved slowly, and it required years to produce much change in them. The general aspect of society did not change materially in a space of ten years; nor did ten years' time generally produce much change in individuals. But how different now! With what tremendous rapidity individuals and communities now change! When men now commence to change, especially "for the worse, they pass with the rapidity of an express or lightning train. Six weeks' regular attendance and close attention in a "spirit circle" will pass a person, in apparent ordinary good standing and fair Christian character, down to the icy regions and gloomy despondency of all the doubts and uncertainties of infidelity. The next thing yon hear from such an one is clamoring about the "incongruities," "absurdities," and "contradictions" in the Bible (the book they never ready declaring that "geology contradicts the Bible," and ranting about the "incredibility of the account of the ark containing all the different species of animals said to have been saved in it," etc., etc. In a few weeks, he who once appeared the sound and consistent Christian, fully satisfied with the revelation of Heaven contained up the Bible, confidently believing the word first spoken by the Lord and afterward confirmed by them that heard him, God also bearing them witness both by signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit according to his own will,—runs beyond Jerusalem. beyond all evidence, gets into the idle delusion that he is in some way inspired, and thinks that when his delusion, which he calls "faith," becomes a little stronger he will do miracles. Both the classes alluded to, with man), others now operating, are loud in their clamor about *new light,* progression, advancement, and even talking

of reformation. Some of these, who have said all they can say, but find that they can not induce the people to believe their stupid theories and empty professions of supernatural illumination, complain sorely of "proscription," "tyranny of opinion," "unwritten creeds," and "iron bedsteads." These do not recollect that religions, toleration has *two sides*—that their opponents have the same right to speak as themselves, and that the people have "the right of private judgment," the right to believe that which they consider according to the oracles of God. It is no proscription for the people who have heard a man, know what his doctrine is and all he can say in favor of it, to refuse to believe it, to hear him.. or employ him as their teacher. The people have rights—sacred rights—as well as public teachers, and one of these rights is to decide who shall be their instructors, who they will hear, and what they will believe. He who imposes upon these rights and tramples them down, disrespects the dearest right. We would not proscribe a Mormon, Universalist, deist or atheist; but while we grant all such the same toleration we enjoy, we claim the right to decline hearing them, accepting them as our instructors or believing what they teach.

The threat of some such, that, upon certain contingencies, they might "bolt," alarms no one. That is a matter entirely dependent upon their allegiance to Jesus. They are under no head but him who sits upon the throne—"the Way, the Truth and the Life." They have subscribed to no law but the law of God. They are identified with no Church but the Church of God, and have taken no name but that after which the whole family in heaven and upon earth is named. They have professed to be Christians, disciples of Christ, children of God, and nothing else. They have nothing to "bolt" from but the Lord, who purchased them with his own precious blood, his holy name that fills heaven and earth, his infallible law, his Church and their own solemn profession. The Lord has graciously received them, saved them from their sins and freely bestowed upon them all he promised them. They have received him, and in him all he has for

the children of men in this world and the blessed hope of eternal life in the world to come. Whether they will depart, or, to use one of their own expressions, "bolt," depends wholly upon their integrity to the Lord, their allegiance to the great King. The people of God are not bound by to hear them preach, nor to believe them when they speak not according to the oracles of God; and if, on this account, they depart or "bolt," upon themselves falls the responsibility. It is too late now to make us believe the plainest matters in the Christian religion are unsettled—that nothing is decided, fixed and immutable. To be set back now, "ever learning," and leaving everybody else ever learning, and never able to come to the "knowledge of the truth," by men who have never carefully read the New Testament once through, comprehend its structure, nor the labors that have been done in the last thirty years in simplifying the whole subject and rendering it plain and appreciable to the public mind,—is out of the question. We are not now to become "clouds without rain," "wandering stars," nor "raging waves of the sea." "The faith formerly delivered to the saints"—the "one faith" of Paul—is something settled, fixed and immutable. It will stand when the present heavens and earth shall be no more. The children of God do not admit that all things are fluctuating, evanescent and changing. They know what it is to be established in the faith—rooted and grounded in the truth. With them everything is not open to philosophizing, metaphysicizing and speculation. The plain truth, believed by so many thousands, on the first hearing, of all classes, anciently, is not now to be again entangled in the labyrinths of mystery, after the mighty struggle of this generation to make it again accessible to the whole people. Love to their opinions, their views and reasonings, with the Disciples of Christ, is not the bond of union. Love to the Savior of the world, respect to his authority, and love to one another, binds them all in one delightful band.

"Love is the golden chain
That binds the happy souls above.
And he's an heir of heaven,
That finds his bosom glow with love."

The children of God can conceive how they can consecrate themselves to their glorious Redeemer, devote their entire being to him, and make it the great matter in their lives to glorify him. They love, admire and adore him who washed them from their sins in his own blood, and expect to ascribe their praises to him when they shall walk the streets of the New Jerusalem. They glory in him and walk hand in hand with those who love him. They delight to come after him, having found his word verified to them, that "his yoke is easy and his burden light." They are so enraptured with their leader, that they sing as they follow him,

"Through floods and flames,
If Jesus leads I'll follow where he goes."

They have no taste "for theories, philosophies, metaphysics and speculations of opinionated, vain and puffed-up men. After feeding upon the bread that came down from heaven, and drinking of the water of which if a man drink he shall never thirst, they have no relish for human theories, idle abstractions and cloudy mysticisms, that never were and never will be understood. All these ever preached never saved one soul of our race and never will. The truth is, we have a few speculators aboard that have never read nor studied the investigations that the principal men among us have gone through, nor matured the topics contained in them. They are, we presume, in many instances without knowing it, dipping into some modern works that have appeared, such as Beecher's Conflict of Ages, Cousin etc., which are nothing under the shining sun but the resuscitation of the main gist of the delusive vagaries discussed and exploded in the days of the *Christian Baptist.* This work contains a refutation of the whole train of mystics, that never was, and never will be, answered. Not a man now among all the mystics, theorizers and philosophizers,

agitating sundry communities, has advanced a single idea not advanced by the mystics of the days of the *Christian Baptist,* and exploded beyond contradiction in that work. Let any man name his item and demand of us to produce it.

But our readers wish to know what the new doctrine is. We shall, therefore, try and set it forth. It is not, then, in our estimation, that those who hold it are, in reality, more spiritual than other brethren, but they contend more for being spiritual. It is not that the); really have more of the Spirit than their brethren generally, but they contend more for having the Spirit. It is not that they really believe any more than their brethren generally that Christians have the holy Spirit, but they contend more for believing it. It is not that they really have more of the influence of the Spirit than their brethren, but they contend more for the influence of the Spirit. It is not that they really have more of the power of godliness than their brethren whom they oppose, but they contend more for the power. It is not that they do the work of conversion more effectually than their brethren generally, but they contend for doing it more effectually. It is not that they have more illumination of the Spirit than their brethren, but they contend more for illumination. It is not that they do any miracles, or come any nearer doing miracles than other brethren, but they contend more for doing miracles.

Now, be it distinctly understood, that we have no war with any of these brethren in reference to the truth that Christians are spiritual, that the Church is a spiritual building, a holy temple, an habitation of God through the Spirit; but we deny that Christians, or people of the world, were ever made spiritual by preaching the abstract theory that *they should be spiritual*. There is neither philosophy (true philosophy), sense, nor Bible in such a course. The Holy Spirit is not given by man. Theorizing on being spiritual has no more tendency to make a man spiritual than theorizing on the effects of medicine has in curing the sick. A man as carnal as carnality itself, and evincing his carnality by his constant

wrangling, can argue as stoutly as anybody that we must be spiritual. The very lack of being spiritual, in some such instances, is the ground of their contention. If they were really spiritual, evincing the fruits of the Spirit, "love, joy, meekness, gentleness, fidelity, long-suffering," showing that their souls were under the dominion of the Son of God, all the brethren would he delighted. No Church of Christ would have any aversion to this, but empty theories about being spiritual from men evidently contentious, who obey not the truth and have not the spirit nor the love of Christ in them, is disgusting and loathsome.

We have no controversy with any man for *having* the Spirit. There is nothing new nor different from what we have understood from the day we received the faith in Christ in the teaching that the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in Christians; that because they are sons, he has sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father; that if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his. But the Holy Spirit is not argued into men, reasoned into them, nor preached into them. Theorizing upon the Spirit, the manner of his reception, or the mode of his operation, never imparted the Spirit to a human being. One clear oracle of God is worth more, on a subject of this kind, than all the blind and stupid theories in this universe.

We are not left in the dark as to who receive the Spirit, where they are to come and what they are to do that they may receive it. On the day when the keys of the kingdom of God were first used and the kingdom opened, in answer to the penitent seekers, who inquired, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" the Holy Spirit of God answered, through Peter, "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."* Here is plain teaching how these came to the point where they received the gift of the Holy Spirit. They heard the word preached by Peter, believed in Him revealed through the

word, were pierced in their hearts, and inquired the way of salvation. The answer opened to them the way to pardon and the impartation of the Holy Spirit. They received the directions given, confided in them, followed them, and the Lord saved them from their sins, and he will do the same for all who come to him in the same way.

In Acts v, 32, after declaring that Jesus is highly exalted to the right hand of God, a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins, Peter says: "And we are his witnesses of these things, and so also is the Holy Spirit, *whom God hath given to them that obey him."* It is not man who gives the Holy Spirit, nor is it by preaching the. Spirit, theorizing upon the Spirit or his influence that gives the Spirit, or entitles a man to that gift. God gives the Spirit, not to the man who argues about the Spirit, theorizes upon him or his influence or the manner of his operation, but to *"them who obey him."* This blessed promise is worth worlds upon worlds. It is worth more than all the nations of men on this earth. It is not a promise to those who believe a certain theory about the Spirit, his influence or operation, but his promise is to give the Holy Spirit to them who obey him. They ask him, obey him, come to him, in his own appointments, and he gives them his Spirit, and he continues his Spirit with those who abide in him. No preaching the Spirit, believing in the Spirit, contending for the Spirit or wrangling about the Spirit, can be any evidence that a man has the Spirit who asks not according to the will of God, comes not to God in his appointments, obeys not the Savior and abides not in him. The Holy Spirit himself is received by "the hearing of faith." (Gal. iii, 2.) "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x, 8, 9.) Here is "the word of faith" preached by the Apostles, believed with the heart, confessed with the mouth; by the

hearing of which the Holy Spirit has been received by everyone who has entered the kingdom, since the Lord ascended to heaven. The Spirit is not sent into the hearts of unbelievers to make them believers, but they are sealed by the Holy Spirit after they are believers. Hence the following most explicit statement from Paul: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, *after* that ye *believed, ye* were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

The commission we are under says, *"Preach the Gospel."* Paul says, "I determined to know nothing but Christ and him crucified." Again, say he, "Preach the word." Our commission is to preach Christ. He who believeth on him hath everlasting life. Christ is to be preached. Christ is to be believed on. Christ is to be obeyed. Christ is to be loved. If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, he will be accursed when the Lord comes. O, brethren, let us keep our eye on him, confide in him, love him and obey him; for when he comes in flaming fire, he will take vengeance on them who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. Let us pray more, be more devoted and fervent in the service of the Lord, that we may be accepted of him at his coming.

No. V.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diabolos.—Gentlemen, it has been two months since we met, and I am anxious to hear what you have been doing, or any suggestions you have to make.

Apollyon.—I must confess that I am miserably confused. Some of our best devices are likely to prove a failure, and I fear our whole work will suffer an immense defeat.

Lucifer.—I am of the same opinion. As an instance showing this, you all know how many suggestions we made and the special aids we afforded Mr. J.B. Jeter in getting up and putting in circulation his *"Review of Campbellism."* You know, too, that we thought something grand was achieved for our cause when we secured so many favorable notices of this book, and obtained such an extended endorsement from eminent men for it.

Daimonion.—I am aware that we all aided in this work, and I thought were succeeding well, nor do I see any reason still to doubt. The book has been in circulation more than two years, and I think the general opinion is that it is unanswerable.

Diab.—Have you been asleep, or idling away your time, without giving any attention to what is going on? Are you not aware that Moses E. Lard, of Liberty, Missouri, a graduate of Bethany College, has issued a volume, reviewing the book of Mr. Jeter?

Apollyon.—I am aware of this, and this is what I alluded to when I spoke of being confused. I know not what we are to do with this book. It exposes the sophistries we have induced Mr. Jeter to employ, disperses the mists, and refutes

his positions with such a master hand, that the people will certainly perceive it.

Diab.–You are right, most worthy Apollyon. The people will perceive that Mr. Lard's book contains a clear. masterly, most manifest and obvious exposure of Mr. Jeter's entire effort. I know not what is to be done about this book! I thought Mr. Jeter, had covered up, mistified, obscured and involved conversion to Christianity in such confusion and darkness, and that such a number of ministers and writers had accepted and endorsed his effort, that the nearest approach the balance of mankind would make to Christianity would be to become *seekers* or *mourners.*

Apollyon.—That was my mind precisely. I thought that he had obscured the doctrine that "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"—that " we are begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever"—that "of his own will begat he us with the *word of truth*, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures," and that men are "sanctified through the truth," as clearly taught in Scripture,—so that men would discard it, repudiate it, declare it ineffectual, and from this time forward seek for and pray God to send down something better. But I despair of this now.

Lucifer.—I thought Mr. Jeter put on such an air of candor and sanctimoniousness, that he would succeed with our former scheme of delusion, and that we should still be able to defeat all efforts at finding the way into the kingdom of God. But even the obscure passages, not clearly translated, quoted by Mr. Jeter to mystify and darken counsel, Mr. Lard takes hold of with a master hand, clears away the mysticisms, disperses all obscurity from them, harmonizies them with the other scriptures, and shows that they teach precisely the same. Even the passages, "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God," "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and

thou hearest the sound thereof and canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit," (which you know we have had every ignoramus in the land quoting, without knowing what it meant, to blind the mind and obscure the way into the kingdom of God,) Mr. Lard has taken up, purged the obscurities in translation from it, shown that it perfectly harmonizes with other scriptures, and teaches the same doctrine. I know not how we are to counteract this book.

Diab.—I thought when Mr. Jeter came out, that through him we should succeed in leading the people to deny that statement of the Apostle Peter, that "he (Christ) hath given us *all things* that pertain to life and godliness," and that we should completely subvert that old question of Scripture"What more could I have done that I have not done?"—and that we should have the people in thousands, as in former days, seeking, mourning, grieving, and failing to find. I thought, and intended to have the preachers blinded to all the answers the Apostles ever gave those seeking the way to God. I intended then simply to exhort seekers to seek on, mourn on, and agonize mightily unto God—that if he did not bless them now, he would soon or at some future. time. In this way I intended to keep the fact out of view, that God had ordained any definite, explicit and clear steps for men to come to God. To invalidate all that God has done, keep it out of sight, I have advocated and had Mr. Jeter advocate in his book, the doctrine that God must do something over and above his word to save sinners. In order to do this, the most successful method I have found is to set both preachers and seekers to praying for *something over and above the word,* and absorb them so in it, that this something over and above the word would become the all in all. The word is forgotten, or looked upon as of very little consequence; and the great struggle for this something over and above the word, without which no one can be converted, and which none but God can bestow, would become the all-absorbing matter. All would then cease warning sinners to

receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save their souls. No one would admonish them that "God has commanded all men everywhere to repent," to "repent and be converted, that their sins may be blotted out," “to save themselves from this untoward generation." The entire current would then be changed. The warnings, reasonings and. expostulations with sinners would cease. The sinners, in this case, are represented as willing, seeking, thirsting and panting for salvation. The preachers are doing their utmost for their salvation. The whole struggle now is with God, to get him to do what he has not done, what he appears unwilling to do—something over and above the word. This sets the Gospel aside thoroughly, with all that Jesus has done, and leads the mind to something he has omitted to do, and which, if he does not do, sinners must be lost. In this case, if sinners are not saved, they are not to blame, for they are willing and seeking. Nor is it the fault of the preacher, for he is willing and doing all he can; but the fault is on the part of the Lord, who can do this something over and above the word, but will not do it.

Apollyon.—I supposed that the Disciples were discomfitted and defeated by Mr. Jeter's book, as they remained comparatively quiet for some two years, seeming to let the matter go by default. But I now perceive they felt no alarm about it, but had the fullest assurance that they had men perfectly able to expose its sophistries, refute it throughout, not only to their own satisfaction, but to the satisfaction of all men of sense, and were simply waiting for it to obtain a good circulation, responsible notices and endorsement, and then gain a complete triumph in refuting it. Now, the question is, what is to be done with this book? What course shall we direct the Baptist preachers, scribes and editors to pursue!

Lucifer.—I have directed an article or two to be published touching Mr. Campbell, his reception in New Orleans, and Mr. Lard's book, that I think precisely the thing. By some means, Mr. Campbell was called upon to address the Young Men's Christian Association in that city. His great

name called out a great audience, and in the notices of it in several Baptist papers, I have had them state that the audience was completely taken in—that his address consisted of an effort to show the catholicity of the name *Christian,* and thus justify his sectarian course in reference to the name Christian. In the stone notices, I have directed them to hold out the idea that Mr. Campbell is superannuated, and that he no longer thinks for his followers, and that the party have put foremost Mr. Lard to answer Mr. Jeter's book. This, I think, will defeat the whole thing.

Diab.—I have seen the notices you mention, but think you have done much worse for our cause than if you had said nothing. You present prominently two points decidedly favorable to Mr. Campbell, and Calculated to give him conspicuity. In the first place, in one of those notices you mention that the great name of Mr. Campbell and his widely extended fame as a lecturer drew out the largest assembly ever convened in that hall. This of itself tells mightily in his favor. The opinion of the writer of the notice that the audience were taken in amounts to nothing, only that the lecture did not suit *him.* This is no evidence how it suited the audience. In the second place, you mention that he dwelt upon the *catholicity* of the name Christian. Now, this is a matter I dread. He made this tell with great power upon that great audience of intelligent people. How came the association to be called the *"Young Men's Christian Association"*? What is the name Christian in such a conspicuous place for? Why was not the name Baptist, Presbyterian, or Methodist inserted, instead of the name *Christian.*—For the simple reason that the name Baptist, etc., is sectarian, but the name Christian is not. The name Christian is *catholic,* or what is worse for our cause, it is *Divine,* and all can agree upon it. Nothing could have been more unwise in you than to have called attention to the name.

Apollyon.—I agree with your wise suggestion, most worthy Diabolos, and further, the notice of the fact that Mr. Camp-

bell did not respond to Mr. Jeter himself, but confided this work to the hands of the graduate of Bethany, is all against our cause. The refutation is unanswerable, yet from a man measurably unknown to the world, and it must do infinite damage to our cause.

Diabolos.—I am ashamed of the notices of this hook, to which you allude. They are calculated to make bad worse. My policy is to keep Baptist scribes from saying anything about it. Such notices as you say you have instigated are precisely calculated to lead everybody to seek the book and read it. This is all wrong and unwise. The true policy is to keep still about it, and not let the good among the Baptists scarcely know there is such a book. If they see their preachers excited about it, referring to it in their sermons, find editorial notices full of excitement and vindictiveness, they will never rest till they see it, and this will be ruinous to our cause.

Apollyon.—I agree with you; but then, how are preachers that are really excited, perplexed and confused to keep it penned up in their breasts? Do you expect Mr. Jeter to keep silent, with a book before him showing, his sophisms, false issues, manifest perversions, passages of Scripture quoted falsely, important words left out, as we know, *designedly, to* cover the true import? The thing is impossible. The truth is, we have led on Mr. J. R. Graves, Mr. Crowell, Mr. Ford. Mr. Sands, Mr. Jeter, and many others, to make the attack, to enter the arena of war, and thus called out an expose of them, and now to command them to be silent, is out of the question. You might as well think of fastening up the fires of AEtna or Vesuvius.

Diab.—I know it is a little humiliating to compel them now to hold their tongues, but it is the best that can be done. and they must submit to it. They must put on a sufficient amount of affectation, to say they are engaged in a great work, and can not come down. We must get them out of this debating, or our cause is ruined.

Apollyon.—I would not regard the matter so much if none

but the Baptists were to be affected by the new impulses set upon foot by this book and other kindred books. But the whole arena is again thrown open. The whole question of conversion, remission, union, and all matters with which we were so annoyed years ago, are now to be discussed anew and our cause is bound to suffer immensely. I know not what is to be done.

Diab.—I am now sorry that we instigated the Baptists to commence this war, yet I do not see how we could have done better, for if we had allowed them to proceed united in the Bible Union, and communing with Disciples, till all bitterness and party feeling have been done away, they would have carried everything before them. But probably we had better now let them proceed, for we had the lips of many preachers among the Disciples pretty much sealed, and they measurably ceasing the illustration, elucidation and full development of the great principles lying at the bottom of their movement.

Lucifer.—That is true; but the course we have pursued has simply aroused them, and I find they have men in immense numbers, of splendid information, great talent, and any amount of resources; that they are now entering the arena, and no power that we can command can stop them. After instigating this new war as we have done, I know not what is to be done. To require the Baptists now to be quiet, not notice this book, and affect that their work is too great to come down to it, can not be made to take with the people they will declare Lard's book unanswerable.

Diab.—That may be, but it is the best that can done for our cause. Let us try that expedient, at least till our next meeting.

REPORTER.

THE NECESSITY OF REGENERATION—A SERMON.
BY THE EDITOR.

TEXT.—"Blessed are the pure in pure in heart, for they shall see God."

DEAR HEARERS:—I have not selected the words just read as a text in the ordinary sense, but merely as a starting point. The theme I have selected is the *Necessity of Regeneration;* or, simply, the necessity of conversion. I shall not attempt to discuss regeneration or conversion minutely; but shall simply argue the indispensable necessity of it. The Sermon on the Mount, as it is commonly called, being delivered some three and a-half years before the full development of the Gospel, or of Christianity, mainly contains general principles, to be more fully unfolded and literally detailed at and after the reign of Christ, then only at hand, should usher in. One of the great principles found in this preparatory discourse of our Lord to the commencement of his reign, is found in the expression, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The word "blessed," found here so repeatedly, is not considered by the learned as good a representative of the original as the word *happy*. Hence, in several versions of modern date we have it, "Happy are the pure in heart." The Lord, then, in this preparatory and truly elementary discourse, lays down the Divine law, "Happy are the pure in heart." This expression, to a man who understands language, equally explicitly declares, "Unhappy are the impure in heart." The principle is, that purity of heart and happiness go hand in hand. Impurity of heart and unhappiness go hand in hand. No man can be happy with an impure heart. A man must be made pure in heart before he can be happy. Men may try to evade, cavil and equivocate as they please, but still the law of Jesus will stare

them in the face and thunder in their ears, "Happy are the pure in heart."

But, so far as we have now looked at this passage, it only relates to the present time. "Happy *are* the pure in heart." For a man's present happiness, peace and joy, he must be pure in heart. Those meditating fraud, blasphemy, corruptions, etc., are the impure in heart. Their designs, desires and aims are impure. Their thoughts, meditations and impulses are corrupt. How transcendently are those whose hearts are pure above these! Their intentions are pure; their desires are pure. Their aims are holy. They have an abiding consciousness of the purest, holiest and highest designs. They are not perfect and do not think they are, but they know that they *desire to be*. They are *trying* for perfection. These are "pure in heart," and happy *now*. But the latter part of the clause looks beyond the present—beyond what the pure enjoy, to what shall be in the future. It says, "for they shall see God." The word "see" here is used in the sense of *enjoy*. It does not mean to look upon; for in that sense there is another passage that says, "Every eye shall see him." Even his enemies who pierced him shall look upon him in a coming day; but the pure in heart shall not only look upon him, but they shall enjoy him.

To those who carefully think, this passage establishes a connection between purity of heart in this life and enjoying God in the life to come. The law of the Lord is, "Happy *are* the pure in heart," now, or in the present state, for, or because, they shall, in the future state, *enjoy G*od. We have listened, not only by the hour by the day, to those who maintain that all shall see or enjoy God in the future state, whether they are pure in heart or not in this life; and we have noticed that they have immense trouble in explaining those passages that speak of hell, the second death, punishment, torment, misery, lake of fire, the devil, Satan, etc., in the Bible, but were to find, as we do, in this solemn preparatory discourse of our Lord, the words, "Happy are the pure in heart, for they shall enjoy G*od,"* we should understand distinctly that

the impure in heart were not to enjoy God. If Universalists could annihilate the devil and hell, still this passage eternally settles the matter, that the impure in heart are not now happy and shall not in the future enjoy God. No reasoning in this universe can recover them from this dilemma.

But that we may not seem to suspend too much upon an isolated case, we invite attention to another passage: "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." (Heb. xii, 14.) This is a broader expression than the one we have been commenting upon. It not on]), includes the purity of heart, but the practice flowing from it, without which it unequivocally declares that no man shall see the Lord. The word "see" here, is used up the same sense as before; that is, "without holiness no man shall *enjoy* the Lord." Proving that there is no hell, no-lake of fire and no devil, if it could be done, but which no sound-minded man will attempt, does not evade this passage. It exhorts to the following of peace with all men, and holiness in this life, without which it declares no man shall enjoy the Lord in the future. No evasion, caviling or sophistry can get round this. It' now stands, and will stand to the day of judgment, testifying that men must follow peace and holiness in this life, or they shall not, in the future, enjoy the Lord.

Being made "pure in heart" amounts to the same thing as being made holy; for it leads to following peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man can enjoy the Lord. No man is regenerated, born again or converted, according to the New Testament, who is not made pure in heart or holy; so that an argument in favor of being made pure in heart, or holy, is an argument in favor of regeneration, the new birth or conversion; or a law requiring purity of heart, or holiness, is a law virtually requiring that a man be born again, regenerated or converted. We do not claim that these terms are precisely synonymous; but the man made pure in heart will follow peace with all men and holiness. In the same way, though being made pure in heart is not the whole process of conversion or regeneration, it will

lead to it. Hence the faith of Christ begins with the heart, corrects it—this leads to overt acts in correcting the life—resulting in righteousness and true holiness. But no reasoning on a subject of this kind can be as satisfactory as an example. We, therefore, invite the attention of our auditory to an example—to an actual conversation between our Lord and unregenerate man. We allude to a no less distinguished personage than Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, who came to the Savior by night to have a personal interview. We admit that the circumstance of his coming *by night* shows a little want of manliness and boldness. We know not precisely the cause of his coming by night, but think probably that he was a little ashamed for it to be known that he had this interview, on account of the popular prejudice; or else he was under that precautionary policy so often seen on the part of religious rulers, or spiritual guides, that makes them careful about setting an example that might lead their weak brethren to hear something that might lead them from their wonted pasture and shepherd. We have frequently seen these cautious spiritual guides, who really desired to hear and could not rest without hearing, after advising their poor, weak and unsuspecting flocks not to hear some doctrine which they pronounce dangerous before they hear it, slip into the meeting-house after the speaker had commenced, sit down in some dark corner, listen to every word to the close of the speech, and then leave, evidently desiring not to be seen. These valiant shepherds want to hear, but do not wish to lead their brethren to hear lest they should be led astray. It may be said, that is not very polite. That is true, but we are not to expect politeness, or even common civility, from a man who becomes a blind devotee to party. Such men will do things that they would reprove an infidel for, if he were to do the like in their assemblies.

We do not know that Nicodemus was under so low and unworthy a feeling as to this, but think very probably that some such influence caused him to make his visit at night. Be this as it may, he put on the best address he could com-

mand, and approached the Lord in what he considered the most respectful terms he could employ. He approached with the following address: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher from God." He used the title *Rabbi* in about the same sense as they do the titles, "Rev.", "Rt. Rev.", "Dr.," etc., as prefixes and affixes to names that have not sufficient weight to go without them. He thought the Lord would be pleased, as the Jewish rabbis were, to be addressed Rabbi. Hence he said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher from God." This was probably making a broader concession than he was aware of. He not only speaks for himself, but for himself and others of the rulers, saying, *"We* know that thou art a teacher from God." He does not, either, speak in any doubtful terms, such as *"we* think," "we trust," nor even that "we *admit,"* but "we *know* that thou art a teacher from God." Not only so, but he was in advance of many in our time, for he could tell *how* he knew, or give a reason why he knew; "for," says he, "no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him." Certainly this was a good reason.

The Lord looked upon this man, upon the position which he occupied, and the very first sentence he uttered struck from under him his entire religious foundation. Hear his words: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be bona again, he can not see the kingdom of God." This is all new to Nicodemus. He understood nothing of it, but in confusion inquired how a man would be born when he was old, thinking simply of a natural birth, or birth of the flesh. The Lord responded in language a little fuller, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The man stands in marvel, wonder and confusion. The Savior says: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." Why did the Redeemer address this man in this style? Why did he say, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man he born again, he can not see the kingdom of God?" See how emphatic he is. "Verily, verily" is *most assuredly.* "Most assuredly, I say to thee, except

a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." The word "see," here, is used in the sense of *enjoy*—"Except a man be born again he can not *enjoy* the kingdom of God." Why, we ask again, does the Lord thus address this man? For the best reason in the world, viz.: because Nicodemus was basing his church-membership, or his citizenship, in the kingdom upon the flesh and not upon the Spirit—upon a birth of the flesh, not a birth of the Spirit. It had never entered, into the mind of Nicodemus that he must be born again, regenerated or converted before he could enter into the kingdom of God or the Church of Christ. From his earliest recollection, his fleshly birthright, which gave him membership in the Jewish Church, was that to which he had been directed as the basis of membership. He had never heard of a spiritual qualification for Church membership, a spiritual, or a moral condition. He had never heard of a condition of Church membership that had anything to do with the heart. The only condition he knew anything about was fleshly.

The basis of Church membership among the Jews, the only basis he knew anything about,, was fleshly. It looked to the flesh; and not to the Spirit. The descendants of Abraham, according to the flesh, were all Church members, by virtue of a fleshly relation, and not by virtue of a spiritual relation. A fleshly birthright gave them membership without respect to the heart or character. This fleshly birthright was the basis that Nicodemus was resting upon. He considered himself a member of the Church of God, the true Church, and the only true Church. All this rested upon the mere circumstance that he was born in Abraham's family, or upon a fleshly birth. This had to be dispersed from his mind the first thing. He had to be shown that he was unconverted, a man of the world, out of the covenant, out of the the Church, or kingdom of Christ, and that he could not enter it by virtue of a fleshly relation, his fleshly relation to Abraham, his first birth of the flesh. Hence the Lord placed before him, at the beginning, this hard point, saying,

"Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." This was a startling point to a Jew—setting his membership aside, putting him upon a level with the Pagan world, and demanding of him to be born again before he could enter the kingdom of God. This Was a main point, wherein Christianity was offensive to a Jew. It set aside his Church membership, his birthright, genealogy, as all nothing; admonished him not to say, "We have Abraham for our father," nor to depend upon the law. It declared that by the deeds of the law no flesh could be justified in the sight of God, and the advocates of Christianity said "we have no confidence in the flesh," that though we did know Christ after the flesh, or our fleshly relation to him, "yet now henceforth know we him no more" after the flesh; we know him now by our spiritual relation to him, by being begotten of him and born of the Spirit.

When Christianity came in its full glory, it set aside the fleshly basis of Church membership, and disregarded a man's nationality entirely. It made no difference what nation, tribe or tongue a man was of. It had no respect to the blood that coursed a man's veins, but declared to all alike, that "except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." It set aside the virtue of all fleshly birthrights as a basis of Church membership, declaring that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh." A birth of the flesh can only bring forth flesh; and, to be a citizen in a spiritual kingdom, a man must be born of the Spirit—born again, born from above, born of God. This doctrine is true yet, whether men believe it or not. No matter whose Church membership is affected by it, it is nevertheless true. When the Lord says, "Except a man be born again, he can not enter the kingdom of God," it is no use for preachers to argue. No matter what it cuts off, there is not a human being in the Church of God proper that has not been born again. There is not a greater cheat kept up on earth than the deception that a fleshly relation or birth can secure membership in the Church of Christ. Thousands upon thousands of poor souls

to this day are resting upon this same delusion, who would be converted if they had some honest teacher to assure them, as the Lord did Nicodemus, that except they be born again they can not see the kingdom of God.

Lift up your eyes to-day, and cast your mind over Russia at the innumerable swarms of men, women and children. What are all these? All Church members! How came they all to be Church members? By a birth of the flesh. The same birth that brought them into this world, brought them into the Church. Not one in a thousand of them know what a birth of the Spirit is, or, indeed, that there is any such thing. Look, again, at the long line of Jews, scattered among every nation under heaven. What are all these? All Church members! How came they to be Church members? By being born again? by born above? by any preparation of heart? by an spiritual influence? No. By what means, then? By a birth of the flesh—the same birth that brought them into the world. The same birth that secures their interest in their father's inheritance, secures their interest in the Church. Lift up your eyes again, and look at the long lines of Romanists spread over the world, men, women and children, and inquire how all these became Church members. Not in one case in a thousand by their own choice, their own action, any preparation of purification of heart or life. Not by being born again—horn from above—born of God,—nor by any influence of the Spirit of God or divine impression of any kind, but by the same birth that brought them into this world —a birth of the flesh! Nor is this all—would that it were. Look, again, at that quiet, peaceable and orderly people, called Friends, or Quakers. How came they in the Church? Not by any act of their own, by their own choice, nor by any influence of the Spirit; not by being born from above; born of the Spirit, born of God. No Friend would think of mentioning that he had been born again, as an evidence that he was in the kingdom of God. Nor would he think of referring you to the light within, or any preparation of heart, as an evidence that he was in the kingdom of God. To what

would he refer to prove that he was in the Church? To his birthright—his fleshly birthright—to the old family record—to show that his mother was in the Church when he was born. How many thousands of poor, deluded souls are made to believe that they are in the Church, entitled to ordinances and privileges by virtue of a birth of the flesh, who have not had the slightest preparation of heart, or influence of the Spirit!

No Church that subverts regeneration deserves any consideration, any regard or respect, as Christian purification of heart—preparation of heart and life, and not a birth of flesh —prepares for induction into the Church of Christ. The. qualification for the ordinances of the New Testament are spiritual, and not fleshly. A *"believing parent"* is not a New Testament qualification, but a *believing heart*, on the part of the applicant, is the qualification for an ordinance of Christ. Christianity is a *profession;* hence, we speak of "professors" and "non-professors." Professing is something the person does. The profession is chosen by the person, entered into and maintained; and not something we are initiated into before we know anything about it. Hence the Apostle says: "To whomsoever you *yield yourselves* servants to obey, his servants ye are." It is utterly useless to tell a man that he must be born again, unless he can *yield himself to* be born again. There is no regeneration, new birth, being born again, entering into ordinances, into the Church, into a profession, etc., without the heart, the soul, the spirit of the person being in it. A religion that begins with the fleshly birthright, followed by ordinances and ceremonies, without the heart, the soul, the Spirit, the consent or knowledge of the person, is as perfect a subversion of Christianity as the man of sin can devise.

It is useless to debate infant baptism with persons under the influence of such a system. The simple matter for them to decide is, whether any religious rite can be acceptable to God unless the heart of the person is in it; whether any person can enter a profession acceptably before knowing that

there is a God, a Savior, a Holy Spirit, a Church, a profession in one word, before knowing anything, having any preparation of heart, change of heart, feeling on the subject, spiritual influence or holy impulse; without the heart, soul, or Spirit having anything to do with it. The main trouble is about the *heart*, and not about the *baptism.* Show me that the heart, the soul, the spirit of those inducted into a Church, a profession, and admitted to ordinances before they knew anything was right, and I will not trouble them about baptism. The heart not being in it, not being right, not prepared, nothing else avails anything. All the ordinances of the New Testament, and the Church to help, can never save one soul not right at heart, or whose heart is not in the work. All those, therefore, put into ordinances, Churches, or professions, by somebody else, before they knew anything, had any heart in it, or could even consent to it, had better, for themselves, yield to God, make a profession, be baptized and enter the Church, believing with all the heart, and from that time forward, from the heart, serve God. Their profession will then be unquestionable.

We have advanced beyond the time in the world for the continuance of a system of infant proselytism, inducting infants into Churches before they know anything—before they are accountable. This system takes from them the right of private judgment. Indeed, it originated with people that do not believe in any such right, for their children or anybody else. It is a stealthy, insidious and cunningly devised scheme, for a ministry who know they can not maintain their cause by fair argument before intelligent and responsible people, to entrap, draw into their grasp and bind down under their power the unconscious infant before it can decide for itself. The device is to capture the souls of infants before they hear of Jesus, steal away their hearts from him, and fasten them down in the shackles of some miserable, human system. Of all the wicked devices in this world, under the delusion of religion, there is not another equal to this. In the place of allowing the child to stand free, as God made it, an

agent, and as soon as possible place the Lord before it, that *it may decide for itself, from the heart,* to serve God, there stands a priest, as soon as it is born, to throw a loop around its neck, bind down its soul and rivet the chains of party upon it, before it can think, act or know for itself. In the place of standing before the people, capable of thinking and acting for themselves, presenting their cause, arguing the case and appealing to the hearts of the people, and thus inducing them voluntarily to receive their doctrine, they are watching for the unconscious infant as soon as it is born, to involve its eternal future in a system, before it knows anything! What is all this based upon? Upon a fleshly relation—a fleshly birth of a believing parent!

All this our Lord sets aside. He sets aside the first birth, or the birth of the flesh, and suspends the entrance into his kingdom upon the second birth, or the birth of the Spirit "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The *Spirit* is not to be set aside and persons enter by a few drops of water, nor by any quantity of water. "Marvel not that I said you must be born again," says the Lord. How born again? "Born of water and of the Spirit," says Jesus. How is this done? Almost every preacher of *every* party, for the last fifty years, quotes, "The wind blows where it lists. and you hear the sound, but can not tell whence it comes nor whither it goes, so is every one born of the Spirit." What do they quote that for? "To explain the new birth," says one. Does it explain it? Who in this audience knows what that passage means? Not one in fifty, unless they are much more fortunate than we were for many years; nor do we believe it is generally quoted to explain the new birth but to mystify it. No man who has read nothing hut the common version, we presume to say, can understand this passage. To start out, the common version turns the SPIRIT out of the passage, from the Greek *pneuma,* translated *spirit* near four hundred times in the New Testament, and inserts "wind" in its place; and then to make it correspond, they

make the wind *blow* where it pleases, or lists, instead of "the Spirit *breathes* where he pleases." If any man inquires how "the Spirit *breathes* where he pleases," we simply ask how Saul *"breathed* out threatenings." The answer manifestly is, that he *spoke* them. In the same way, "the Spirit breathes where he pleases," the words which the Father gave Jesus, Jesus gave the Apostles, and which the Spirit breathed through them, or uttered through them.

Then. to keep up consistency with the idea of the *wind blowing* where he pleases, they give us "and you hear the *sound,"* instead of hearing his *voice*. The Spirit speaks or breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice, or his words, but can not tell whence he comes nor whither he goes, so ,is every one begotten, who is begotten of God. The Spirit breathed or spoke through Paul, and enabled him to say, *"I* have begotten you through the Gospel." These were begotten by the Spirit, through Paul and through the Gospel. Thus Peter was justified in saying, "Being begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, *by the word of God,* which liveth and abideth forever." All begotten of God are begotten by the Spirit, who spoke through the Apostles, by the preachers of the word and by the Gospel. [For this we are indebted to Brother Lard's "Review of Jeter," though we have it not at hand, nor other works necessary to elaborate the subject. His book contains the first *interpretation* of this passage we ever saw.] The amount of the matter is, that God, by his Spirit, through the Apostles, has spoken the word to man. When he hears it, receives it into a good and honest heart, and so confidently believes it as to repent and confess Christ, he is begotten by it, or begotten by the Spirit, and thus induced to be baptized, or born of water. Except thus born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. Setting aside all dependence upon the first birth, or a birth of the flesh, the Lord says, "Marvel not that I said, You must be born *again.*

Having now seen that our Lord, when speaking of the

process of turning to God, as a whole, declares it to be something that must be, we desire to spend a few minutes in looking at some of the parts of the process, to see if he speaks in the same unequivocal maturer. Faith is a part of the process, the first part, that which makes the first impression upon us and that which leads to everything else. How, then, does the Lord speak of faith? Is it, to use a Babylonish phrase, indispensable? Let us hear the word of the Lord: "Without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." (Heb. xi, 6.) He does not say it would be well to believe that men ought to believe, or that he should believe, but that "he that cometh to God *must* believe." That which *must be* can not be set aside. Let us look at another item. Is repentance indispensable? "Except you repent," says the Lord, "you shall all likewise perish." "It does not say, you *must* repent," says one. Do not be too certain of that. What does he mean by the words, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish?" He says, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." A few words afterwards, referring to this same expression, he says, "Marvel not that I said unto you, You must be born again." He interprets his expression, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God," to mean that he must be born again. In the same way, when he says, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," it is the same as "You must repent or perish." The Lord does not trifle with men, but informs them what they must and what they must not do. There is no dispensing with repentance any more than with faith. "He who comes to God must believe;" and it is equally true that he must repent. There is no coming to God without these indispensable pre-requisites. Without these a confession, baptism, joining a Church, prayer, the Lord's Supper, giving of alms, etc., would not be acceptable to God, would not avail anything.

"Well," says one, "I am glad that it does not say you

must be baptized." In that, my dear sir, you may be glad too soon. We think it does virtually say, "You must be baptized." Turn, if you please, to Acts ix, 6. Here you have an account of the Lord appearing to young Saul. The young man falls upon the ground, and calls out, "Who art thou?" The Lord reveals himself to him in the following words: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." When Saul heard this and believed it, he said, "Lord, what will thou have me to do?" The Lord answered, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." He does not say it shall be told him his duty, or what would be well for him to do, or he might do, if it accorded with his way of thinking, or *if felt like it,* but what he *must do*. The Lord then appeared to Ananias, and told him to go to him and tell him what he must do. Ananias says, "We have heard of this man, and learn that he is persecuting the saints," The Lord explains to him that he had appeared to Saul, called him to the ministry, and shown him how great things he should suffer for the name of Jesus, and that he was praying to him. He had prayed to Jesus, saying, "Lord, what will thou have me to do?" When Ananias heard this explanation he did not hesitate to go to him, to tell him, as the Lord said, what he *must do.* Acts xxii, 16, we learn what he told him to do, in the following, "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here he told him what he *must do,* and in the midst of what he *must* do, he is commanded to be baptized. Baptism is something, then, that *must be done.*

This is no stranger than the Lord's own language—" Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." "Born of Water," here, undoubtedly is baptism, and is quoted by Wesley and the Methodist Discipline, and applies to baptism. The same is true of all the principal authorities. The Lord gave significance and authority to this institution when he came to John the Baptist and demanded baptism of him. John excuses himself, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and

comest thou to me?" when the Lord said, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." John yielded to this exposition of the matter, and baptized him. The Lord still further shows the importance attached to baptism—even the baptism of John—when he said, "You rejected the counsel of God against yourselves, not being baptized of John." If, in refusing to be baptized of John, they were rejecting the counsel of God against themselves. what is it to reject the greater baptism, "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?"

But we shall detain you no longer to discuss the importance of baptism now. We have now seen that a man must believe. The reason of this is, that faith changes, purifies or prepares the heart for the service of God; and unless the heart is prepared nothing good can follow. We have seen that a man must repent. The reason of this is, that repentance changes the life of a man makes him right in life, or prepares him in character, or life, to serve God, When his heart and character are prepared, he is ready for induction. We have found that when Saul was informed what he *must do,* that he was commanded to be baptized. The reason that a man must be baptized is, that it is the initiation or induction of the person, whose heart has been previously prepared by faith, and whose life has been prepared by repentance, into the kingdom. Faith and repentance do not initiate or induct into the kingdom, but prepare the person for induction. Baptism does not prepare either the heart or life for induction, but initiates those already prepared in heart and life by faith and repentance. Nor is baptism the evidence of a previous pardon, or salvation, but the last step in the way to it. The pardon, or salvation, follows baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God," or enjoy the salvation, justification or pardon of God. "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," or into a state of justification, pardon or salvation.

"That doctrine is *unreasonable,"* says a man. No, sir; it is not unreasonable. There is nothing more reasonable than that a man must be born again before he can enjoy the kingdom of God, enjoy God himself, or Jesus Christ. That the unregenerate, the unconverted, the man of the world can not enjoy God is as evident as any proposition. Let us look at it for a few moments. Here is a gentleman who is moral, truthful, honest and honorable, as a man of the world. We admit that he stands far above the immoral, lying, corrupt, debased and dishonest. This man says, "I am as good as many in the Church. I speak the truth, deal honestly, live morally, and would not do many things that professors of religion do, and if I should die, I think I should be “saved." Well, sir, suppose you come up here in front of the Lord's table, and take the front seat, as you are already so good, and join with us in celebrating the Lord's death. You, no doubt, will be happy in contemplating his sufferings for our sins, and partaking of the emblems of his body and blood. Come, and view him with an ignominious crown of thorns upon his head, great iron spikes driven through his hands and through his feet into the tree of the cross. Look at him, while his face is all in a gore of blood, all his muscles in a quiver, and he in the very agonies of death! View him, O! I view him, till you see him breathe the last breath and silently expire. See the thick darkness lower down over the whole land. O! I try and realize that mighty throe of the earth when he expired. See the vail in the temple split in twain, and fall back against the wall! See the rocks rent asunder! Come here and sit with us, and commemorate this scene. Your heart responds, "No." Again you say, "No; I can not enjoy such a scene; I can not come." You know your heart would revolt and shrink at the thought. You are as conscious as that you exist, that you would be miserable to attempt participation in such a scene. Your soul shrinks at the idea. You say, "No; let me have a seat more remote, or allow me to walk out of the house."

Every man who has never been converted or born again

knows this to be the case. Such an one is uncongenial with the whole spirit of Christianity, and could not be happy in singing the praises of God, the exhortations, the prayers, the reading of the Scriptures, the ordinances, or the immediate mingling with the worshipers. Hence, you will always-see those of the class alluded to, in a remote part of the house, or remaining outside. They feel much better at a distance. Suppose such an one were carried up into heaven :rod seated among those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. He lifts up his eyes, and runs them along the ranks of those who loved Jesus, worshiped him, talked about him and served him in this life, and bears them crying, "Blessing, and glory, and honor, and power, and dominion, and thanksgiving unto him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever." Again he looks, and sees Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Enoch and Elijah, Job and Daniel, Isaiah and Jeremiah, with all the ancient worthies, arrayed in white, praising God and the Lamb. Again he lifts up his eyes, and beholds the Apostles of Jesus sitting upon twelve thrones. Still he looks, and beholds immense ranks of the holy martyrs of Jesus, as they walk the streets of the New Jerusalem. Once more he looks, and beholds long ranks of angels, in profound awe and subordination, praising God. He turns his eye to the throne, and sees Jesus seated upon the throne, his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet as burnished brass. Yet once more \ he lifts his eyes, and beholds the face of the Almighty! Could he who could not come to the Lord's table, who took no pleasure in the worship of God, reading his word, associating with his saints, singing his praises, or calling upon his name, during a lifetime, now turn round instantly, and chime in with the praises and joys of heaven? All that is rational says, No. The thought of never having loved Jesus, never having confessed him, nor made the least effort to serve him, would then thunder upon the soul with awful force. The reflection, then, that Jesus died for me, that he loved me, that he gave himself for me, that he most kindly, affection-

ately and earnestly invited me to come to him, would thunder home upon the conscience. When such an one would look. upon him, all his kindness in his gracious invitations, would rush into the mind. Such language as the following would then rush upon the soul: "Come to me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"; "He that cometh to me, I will in nowise cast out"; "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! how oft would I have gathered your children, but ye would not"; "The Spirit says, Come, and the bride says, Come, and whoever will, let him come and partake of the water of life freely." When these invitations flash through the mind, and the unregenerate think of having rejected all, disregarded and withstood all these kind and pressing invitations; when he would reflect that God loved him, but the love of God could not move him; that Jesus died for him, but the death of Jesus could not move him; the Lord poured out his blood for him, but the flowing blood of the Redeemer could not move him; that preachers reasoned with and exhorted him, but all their preaching and exhortations could not move him; that good people wept over him, and prayed over him, but could not move him; in one word, when he reflects that no charms that the kingdom contains could move him to love and serve God, can any man conceive of such a ridiculous idea as that he would immediately turn round and unite in the anthems of heaven!

No; such an one would look for an oblivion in which he could cover up and be hid forever. Such will call for rocks and mountains to fall upon them, and hide them from the face of him who sits upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb. We need something more to make us happy than bare admission into a place of happiness. There are many in our glorious and happy union who are not happy. They have as free admission here as anybody; but they are not prepared for happiness. They are not congenial to the country and people. They carry the seeds of misery in themselves, and could not be happy in paradise, unless they were changed. A man who has no love to God, no relish

for the things of God, for the people of God and the praises of God, could not be happy if in heaven. Indeed, we can not conceive where such an one would be much more miserable than in heaven. The reason is, he is not prepared for it. He must be changed, made acquainted with Christ, enlisted in his cause, a partaker of his Spirit, and united with him. The cause of Christ must become his cause, so that he is happy in doing the will of God. He must be so transformed that he delights to be in the company of the Bible, the ordinances and the work of God, the people and worship of God, so that he can be happy with the people of God in this world, and he will be prepared to enjoy them in the world to come. But, without being thus transformed, there is not a more idle chimera in this universe than to thing of enjoying God and heaven and the people of God in the world to come.

"Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish," says our blessed Lord and Master. "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said, You must be born again." O, that men would turn to the Lord! O, that men would serve the Lord! Let us praise the Lord, that he has given repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus. God help us to honor and serve him!

No. VI.—DIALOGUE OF DEVILS.

[Present, DIABOLOS, APOLLYON, LUCIFER and DAIMONION.]

SUBJECT:—The most successful method of subverting and defeating the word of God and the mission of Christ.

Diabolos.—Gentlemen, it is now over three months since we have had a meeting. I have no doubt you have all been busy, as I have been myself, and I trust not without effect. I hope you will, therefore, proceed at once with any reports of success, or suggestions, you may have to offer touching our work.

Apollyon.—I have been out preaching since I saw you, and, I think, have done a vast amount for our cause.

Lucifer.—I should like to know what you have been preaching!

Apollyon.—I have been preaching *charity.* My mission has been, first, to preachers; second, to hearers. I am preaching the doctrine that all men should have more charity. I lay down the doctrine that there are good and bad in all Churches, and that it is no difference what Church a man belongs to so that the heart is right. I maintain that whatever a man thinks right, that is right to him. The doctrine I advocate is, that the preacher should declare his honest convictions of truth and let other people alone. I also teach the people that when a preacher makes any allusion to other Churches, or the doctrines of other men, they should refuse to hear him, discard him and try to put him down.

Lucifer.—But, I should think you would have them preaching every kind of doctrine and establish nothing!

Apollyon.—Certainly; that is precisely what I aim at. It matters nothing what errors men imbibe or maintain, so that we can keep their minds off from the truth. There is but

one right way, but many wrong ways. We must not be choice about the wrong ways. It is but little difference which one of them a man follows, so that we keep him from the right way. It is but little difference what doctrine a man holds, provided he does not hold the truth.

Diabolos.—You are right, most worthy Apollyon, and there is wherein our work is easy. We need care nothing what a man believes, so that it is not the truth. Our work is to throw everything into doubt and uncertainty. To do that effectually, we must show that one way is as good as another, that almost any doctrine can be proved, and that nothing can be proved, and that people must have charity for all.

Apollyon.—That is the principle precisely. When disputes arise between erroneous systems, we must be indifferent who gains the victory, be a little on both sides, declare both *evangelical* and *orthodox!* But if ever an issue between error and truth is formed, which we should avert as far as possible, we must be on the part of error and ever on the alert, with all the friends of error, declaring that it *is truth* and triumphing.

Daimonion.—Gentlemen, what think you of debates? Do they serve a good purpose in defeating the truth?

Diabolos.—They do in some instances, when they are the right kind and in the right places; but most frequently they do our cause harm.

Lucifer.—How can that be? Can the same thing be in favor of our cause and against it?

Diabolos.—It depends entirely upon *the kind* of an issue, the *debatants* and the *place* of debate. I have instigated some debates that have done our cause great service, and others again I have known that did our cause much harm.

Lucifer.—Can you give us some examples? Where would it be prudent in us to instigate a debate?

Diabolos.—Any place where truth and righteousness prevail—peace, love. order and prosperity abound; provided, you start the *right kind* of a debate.

Lucifer.—What kind would be the *right kind?*

Diabolos.—Well, sir, I will give you an example. In a church, in peace, harmony, love, prosperity and rejoicing in the truth, if I could, I would instigate a debate upon some unlearned question. I would lead Elder A. to propose the following: Is it right for Christians to join the Masons? Let him, then, remark that it must be either *right* or *wrong* for Christians to join the Masons. If it is wrong, those disciples who join should be excluded from the Church. It is, ,therefore, an important question, and the time is come when it ought to be settled. I have settled the question in my mind, continues he, that it is *wrong*—a crying sin—for a member of the Church to join the Masons, and that it is nay duty to rebuke this sin, to speak out. I can have no fellowship with error. Mr. B. agrees to meet him and debate the question. He, too, is in favor of speaking out, but he lifts his voice in favor of his brethren. He maintains that it is not only no harm for members of the Church to join the Masons, but they have a perfect right to do so, and can do much more good by joining the Masons than by remaining isolated from them. Let this controversy continue for a short time, between two of the influential members, and the Church will divide, probably, about half and half. Some of the zealous opposers of the Masons will finally make a motion to exclude all the Masons from the Church. In the course of this scramble, they will probably fill the members with hard feeling, wound each other by hard and offensive remarks, divide the Church, and call down the indignation of the Masons upon them.

Lucifer.—I thank you, most worthy Diabolos, for your suggestions. I see now how we can work ruin in Churches beautifully. We only have to divert the attention of the church from *her head* and from *her own mission,* and induce the members to think that the Church is an engine to be used as a kind of battering-ram to be brought to bear upon the evils that preachers may desire to put down.

Apollyon.—That is the idea precisely. In one community, we must induce the preachers to bring the Church to bear

against Masonry and batter it down. No matter how insignificant the Church may be, nor how uninfluential the preachers, we must induce them to form a direct issue with Masonry and try and batter it down. Where we have this kind of work going on, we must keep Masonry before the eyes of the preacher, keep him battling at it, till it recoils upon him and strikes from existence every particle of influence he had. in his zeal to put down a foe of his own choice, he forgets Christ, forgets the mission of the Church, converts no sinners, makes no impression upon Masonry, only to repulse all under its influence. This is a beautiful plan of opposing the truth.

Diabolos.—We must be a little judicious, if we intend to be successful in our work. We must consider the place where we start mischief, and employ the most effective agents we can employ. The one you have alluded to, as an example, must not be resorted to in every instance. It will do the work effectually only in certain communities.

Lucifer.—That is a fact. I never thought of that before. In a community where there are but few Masons, and where Masonry is unpopular, it would not have the effect. In a community of this description, we should look round and perhaps we may find a large body of Odd Fellows. The members of the Church are few, feeble and uninfluential. The preacher is an humble, ordinary and uninfluential man. If he loved Jesus, had him before his mind and *his* cause upon his heart, and at the same time would take into view the humble, sincere and honest persons before him, and preach the simple Gospel of Christ, he might convert some honest souls and bring them into the kingdom of God. Now, to be successful in our work, we must lead such a man aside, decoy him into some inhospitable region where his ship will be wrecked and sunk. Tot his end, it is good policy for us to make him feel that he is called and sent to preach against Odd Fellows. We must make him feel that to be an Odd Fellow is the next thing to the sin against the Holy Spirit—that it is the *sin* of the age—that he must rebuke this sin,

that he must bear his testimony against it, and the whole Church must bear her testimony against it.

Daimonion.—That is the doctrine for us. I always know that I have a preacher safe when I can decoy him off to engage in some such strife as that. It is easy, then, to bring the Odd Fellows to bear upon him, and they will soon extinguish him and his little party. A division will probably commence among the members, strife will ensue, and general death and desolation will be spread all around. I have frequently amused myself, when I have had some poor fellow thus gulled, to see him struggle and toil for nothing. He would open the Bible, no matter where, and almost the first thing his eye falls upon is something directly opposed to Odd Fellows. Nothing else comes before his mind, his mission is for nothing else, the Gospel appears to be for nothing else, and, if one could believe him, Christ came into the world for but little else besides to oppose Odd Fellows.

Diabolos.—That is the plan for our work. We need not be particular nor scrupulous about the means we employ. If there are no Masons in a community, or Odd Fellows, there may be Sons of Temperance. It will have the same effect, and do the work of ruin with equal success, to lead the preacher into an issue with these. Lead him to think that a Christian who joins them perjures his soul, forfeits his standing, and should be excluded from the kingdom of God. Magnify it before his eyes, till he can see and think of nothing else. Lead him on till he thinks the whole Bible was written, the Lord sent from heaven, the Apostles sent into all the world, the Gospel preached to every creature, the Christian ministry given and the Church established on earth to oppose the Sons of Temperance. Many preachers have I lead on in this way, thinking that they were the only men in the world that had any sense, and everybody but themselves and a few carried away with the same delusion could see at a glance that they were crazy.

Lucifer.—I have a few men under my influence that are beautiful examples of this kind. I have lead some on till

they act as if they thought the only thing the Almighty had in his mind from the beginning of the world, the only design of the Bible, the Christian religion, the ministry and the Church, was to prove that man is a material being—that he consists wholly of flesh, blood and breath, and when he dies he ceases to exist, and no more has a being than before he was created.. I have frequently laughed to myself to see one of this class of men start out to preach. He would no more perceive the Son of God than if he were not in the universe. He would no more think of converting and saving sinners than if there were no such work. His center of attraction is not the Lord. The Lord is not his ruler, nor his theme. His theme is soul-sleeping, and soon will he put the souls to sleep under his influence, or, what is worse, he will put them *spiritually to death.* I want no better instrumentality than such a man as this, if I can get the people to hear him, to kill religion in any community.

Apollyon.—I have another class of men that do our work equally well. I allude to Universalists. I have many of these poor, ignorant dupes under my control so absolutely that I frequently think they conceive the whole Bible designed to *prove that all will be saved.* Indeed, they appear to think that the eternal purpose of God, the promise to Abraham, the predictions of all the prophets, the preaching of John the Baptist, of Christ, and all the Apostles, was intended to establish *the one idea that all will be saved.* Wicked men listen to a preacher of this description, laugh at his wit, sometimes at his want of sense, but appear to say to him, as a drunken man did to one in the midst of his argument, "Make it out if you can, for I am a gone sucker if you do not." Universalists administer the best opiate to sinners, to make them comfortable in their sins, of any class of men we have found.

Lucifer.—Infidelity serves the same purpose. *Diabolos.*—You are widely mistaken, sir. Universalism paralyzes all desire to serve God much better than open infidelity. It professes to be religious, and many of the vain

talkers under its influence work. themselves into a partial security. It professes to reveal something good for man in the future. But infidelity lacks this. It simply involves all in uncertainty. For anything an infidel knows, or professes to know, there may be a hell and a heaven. A sinner can not feel as secure, indifferent and unconcerned in reference to the whole matter, if all the future is left in doubt, as infidels have it, as he can under the soothing influence of a system that leads him to deny all punishment in the world to come, and partly to believe that all will be happy in the future state.

Apollyon.—You are right, most worthy Diabolos. Universalism serves our purpose in putting down religion and easing the consciences of ungodly men better than infidelity. Even Tom Paine left sinners in trouble; for he admitted that there were future rewards and punishments, thus leaving the abominable and corrupt under the awful apprehension that they might, and he said he believed they would, suffer for their sins after death. This difficulty caused many to fall out with him and his doctrine and to seek repentance. But Universalism takes away all this, and leaves a man without anything to lead him to repentance. Hence there is no repentance among Universalists.

Diabolos.—I amuse myself frequently in throwing a firebrand among professors of religion. I find a Church pretty much departed from their first love, where the members have somewhat lost their attachment to Christ, only occasionally meet, never pray at home, and consequently are prepared for a bone of contention. In an instance of this kind, if some man should come along, with his heart full of the love of Christ, of the Spirit of God, love to the brethren, and perceive their condition, and preach them a few affectionate discourses concerning Christ, his cross, his sufferings for our sins and their eternal allegiance to him, others would be added to their number, and they would all be renewed in their minds. But in all cases of this kind, if I can command a man whose sou] feeds upon strife, whose element is contention, whose cold heart has not contained one spark of

the love of Christ for years, whose soul is not congenial with the cause nor the brotherhood among whom he prowls, whose mind Is taken up with hobbies, and who is of so little consequence that he could gain no notice in any other way, I send him to preach to them Against "the sin of our day,"-"the giant sin of this generation,"—" the great national sin of the American people." In a few months' wrangling they fall out, abuse each other, and cease to meet or worship. I have many examples of this kind now, and they are doing our work effectually.

REPORTER.

DISAPPOINTMENT, DELUSION AND DECEPTION.

IT is amusing to see with what self-complacency, inflated conceit and arrogance our opponents can talk of "dangerous doctrine," "delusion," "deception," etc. They appear to think that they have but little to do but stand and make objections to our procedure, interpose difficulties, and throw obstructions in the way. They appropriate to themselves. in a very comforting way, the appellations, "evangelical," "orthodox" and "popular denominations," and assume that all is right with themselves. The policy is to put us, and keep us, in the defensive. This saves them from many severe examinations, exposures and mortifications, which they would otherwise suffer. All the opposing parties around us have shielded themselves in this way. No skeptic could ever have made anything of a defense had his position been brought into examination. But allow him to make the attack, demand of the Christian to defend, explain and answer difficulties, and quite an ignorant and stupid skeptic, that has never read the Bible once through, nor ten other books, in his life, can make quite a show and bluster. He can inquire where Cain got his wife, how you account for the people of God making slaves of those taken in war, or how you justify the command to destroy the Canaanites, etc. But put him in the defensive, and demand of him to account for the creation of the world, and he is dumb, or, if not entirely dumb, one man says, "It came by chance." Another yet says, "I do not know anything about it." Demand of him whence came man, and you obtain a similar answer. He knows nothing about it. Inquire of him whence came death, and he is dumb, or, which is the same thing, or more perplexing, he says, "It is natural to die." But who made such a nature? He knows nothing

about it. Demand of him whence came murders, robberies, thefts, adulteries, etc., and he is again dumb. He knows nothing about it, and can give no satisfaction to anybody. Inquire of him, Is death the end of man? He is again speechless; or if he speaks, it is without knowledge. He knows nothing and answers nothing that can afford any relief. Shall he, then, who can answer nothing, has nothing to stand upon, nothing to offer, and can make no explanation of anything, stand and interpose difficulties and make objections? Turn the matter upon him, and demand of him to answer his own stupid questions, and you will find him dumb. The man that thinks he can never be a Christian till he can understand all these matters, if he acts upon the same principle, will starve to death before he will sow seed or plant.

In the same way, our opposers can stand and demand of us, in reference to the New Testament plan of pardon, this doctrine be true, what will become of all the good people who did not understand it and did not come to God in that way? This is not a matter for us to account for. If we have the New Testament way of it, all we have to do is to maintain and practice it, and leave those who have not understood and practiced it in the hands of a wise and merciful God. But turn the matter round, and demand of them if their practice of calling persons to the mourner's bench, to pray and be prayed for, is the right way, what will become of those good people who died without coming in this way, and they are dumb. Coming to the mourner's bench to pray and be prayed for, as a part of a process in conversion, is a modern invention. The whole thing is unknown to the Bible. Not a man in the world can quote a reference to it from all that God has said to man. If the Lord were to come down and stand before the preacher engaged in the practice alluded to, and demand of him, Where is your authority for this? he would stand speechless. Not a man on earth can give any more authority for it than a Romanist can for counting beads. Not a preacher among all who now engage in

the practice thinks of finding a reference to it in all history till the present and the century before if. If this mourner's bench process is the way of coming to God, what of all in the days of the Apostles and all others down to John and Charles Wesley? They never came to the mourner's bench, and never heard of such a thing. Are they all lost? "No," exclaims a good friend to the mourner's bench, "we do not claim that *there is no other way*. We believe that thousands have lived Christians, died happy and gone to heaven, who never came to the mourner's bench." That can not be, if this mourner's bench way is the way of the Lord; for he says: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me,"or by the "way which I teach."

No man can come to the Lord only by the way of the Lord. When it is, therefore, admitted that a person can come in some other way, it is granted that coming by the mourner's bench is not coming by the way of the Lord, for it will not be pretended that any one can come only by the way of the Lord.

But we are not done with this mourner's bench practice, or calling sinners forward to pray and be prayed for, as a part of the process in their conversion, or bringing them to God. It is not only without one particle of authority from God, from Scripture, or any precedent in all antiquity, which should forever set it aside, but there are other objections to it which we demand of its friends to answer to, or admit that they can not. It is a fact that all who came to the Apostles, inquiring the way to salvation or pardon, were forthwith shown the way, and submitted to the appointments of God. Not a single inquirer, so far as we are informed, ever came to the Apostles, or any preacher of Christ, in their day, without being forthwith shown the way; and not one, that we have any account of, that followed their directions and did not find pardon or salvation. But the practice at the mourner's bench is as different from this as day is from night.

Look at the honest souls that come there seeking pardon or salvation! Hear the preachers give them directions what

to do! See them, in deep contrition, solemnly and honestly do all the preachers require; and what is the result? Do they find pardon? No; not one out of ten professes to have obtained salvation! What are these to do, who have come inquiring the way, been directed what to do, have done it, and have not found salvation? What, we demand of all who maintain and countenance the practice, are these to do who have come—who know they have come honestly, sought earnestly and solemnly, received directions, followed them sincerely, *but failed to find'* been disappointed, deceived and deluded? What are these to do now, after being thus disappointed once? What does the preacher then tell them to do? Why, he hardens his face, and tells them to come again the next night, or the next day, as the case may be. They go away mourning, disappointed and discouraged, but determine to try again. -A-gain they come; but only again to be disappointed. They pray, seek, mourn and agonize. The preacher comes along, but without any light upon the subject. He knows no more how to solve the problem than the mourner. They are all in the dark together—the blind leading the blind. He repeats over the same directions, like the doctor who has prescribed the only thing he knows, saying, "Try again; it may be that you will obtain relief."

These honest souls come again and again, night after night; -hear sermon after sermon; go to the mourner's bench time after time, but are disappointed again, and again, and again. They are received into the Church as *seekers,* and continue to seek, week after week, meeting after meeting, month after month, and, in a number of instances, year after year, without one ray of light, or one additional encouragement. We have known them to continue in this condition for years. We have known many as well disposed, honest, sincere and desirous to serve the Lord as the world contains, thus to seek and fail, seek and fail—thus to suffer one disappointment after another for many years, and die without even professing to find salvation! The whole land abounds with persons who have, to a greater or less ex-

tent, been thus treated, disappointed and discouraged, as sincere and honest souls as are to be found in this world. Who is to answer for these poor souls, thus disappointed, disheartened and discouraged by being kept seeking, mourning and striving in a blind way, not having a promise of God in it, for years, and in many instances dying, without finding God? Thousands upon thousands, if they were so disposed, could say to those who practice in this way: "We came to you with flowing tears, broken hearts, inquiring what we should do to be saved. You told us what to do. We did what you told us, honestly, solemnly, from the bottom of the heart. You told us to come and try again. We came again and again, inquiring and seeking, solemnly, and did all you told us to do, but did not find. We have thus continued for years, but have not found, and can not find salvation." Some that are dead can meet these teachers, and say: "We came to you, seeking God, followed your directions for years, and died, trying yo our way, but *failed to find."* Who is to answer for all this? Who is to account their disappointment, discouragement and failure to find salvation.

GOD TO BE FOUND IN HIS APPOINTMENTS.

WE have two distinct classes of men now-a-days. Indeed, we are not certain, but there have long been the same two classes, viz.: 1. Those who believe God may always be found in his appointments. 2. Those who believe God may be found out of his appointments, or where he has not appointed. The first class, go directly to the Bible, and have no trouble in showing that in all ages those who come to God, or seek him in his appointments, sincerely, without a single exception, find him. This is undeniable. The other class, generally, in the abstract, or theoretically, admit this, but they insist that the Lord may be found, and actually is found, in many instances, where he has not appointed, or where men have appointed. For this, the former class maintain, there is no evidence. Thus the issue stands in the first place. But it ends not here. Those who maintain that the Lord may be found where he has not appointed, soon fall into the habit of directing the seeker where the Lord has not appointed invariably for salvation. They soon give the way not appointed the decided preference over the way appointed. The way not appointed soon becomes the way almost universally practiced. The party going in the way not appointed become the large party, the popular party, and the strong party. With all these, the question whether a man can come to the Lord and find him, *in a way which he has not appointed*, becomes an all-engrossing question, upon which their entire religious claim depends. Their all is at stake. If it can not be proved that a man can come to God in a way which he has not appointed, their entire claim is forfeited. No wonder that they should be somewhat excited in the examination of the question, especially if they should find themselves likely to fail in the argument. On the other hand, those who come to God according to his own appointments, or in his own appointments, not

only know that they are right, that they are safe, but their opponents admit that those who come to God in his appointments, are right, that they find God and are safe. These have nothing at stake in the controversy. They are upon sure footing, as all admit. They can afford to be magnanimous, generous and fair. Their investigations are not for their own sake, as they are admitted right, but for the sake of others, whose position is doubtful. These are difficult to assail. They feel their strength, and others feel it. Their opponents have looked at every conceivable place where an attack might be made. No sophistry, that we know of, has proved more effectual than the old, the one they have so frequently employed, that the doctrine that men must come to God in his appointments, *cuts off so many good people*. They begin by speaking of the large number that have never come to God in his appointments, and are consequently lost, if none can come to God only in his appointments, or if men can not come to God in any way not appointed. They speak at large of the exclusiveness and uncharitableness of such a doctrine. They want you to tell what you think will become of all the good people who have died without coming to God in his appointments! What is the intention of all this? Is it to prove anything? to enlighten anybody? to show any one the truth? or only to prejudice the mind against any light, any reasoning or argument that may be offered?

The first thing to look at is the fact that all have taken a doubtful, in the place of an unquestionable course, to say the least of it, who have attempted to come to God by a way which he has not appointed. If they had come to God in the way which he has appointed, there could have been no doubt started in their case. But as it is, to say the least of it, their case is in doubt, dispute and uncertainty. Who is to blame for this? Their religious instructors, unquestionably, their editors and preachers, undoubtedly, who have directed them in the way not appointed, instead of the way appointed. They could just as well have directed them to the appoint-

ments of God, where all the promises would have met them fairly and plainly, and where they would have been involved in no doubt. Those converted on Pentecost were left in no doubt, for they were directed to the appointments of God, in which they found the salvation of their souls, and the infallible promises of God. Those converted in Solomon's portico were left in no doubt and uncertainty, because they came to the Lord in his own gracious appointments and met his never-failing promise.

This was an end to all doubt, dispute and uncertainty. The same was true of all converted under the Apostles and early evangelists. These holy men directed him to the appointments of God, in which every one, who came honestly and sincerely, found the Lord without a doubt and uncertainty. But how different all those who come in some way not appointed. There is constant doubt, dispute and uncertainty hanging over it. Who is to blame for all these, many of them as sincere as the world contains, being left in doubts, disputes and uncertainty? Who is to blame for their being placed in a questionable position? Nobody but their religious guides. These have involved them in this doubtful predicament, by directing them to appointments not of God, when they could just as well have directed them to God's appointments.

It is of no avail to talk of exclusiveness as a shield for guiding men to appointments not of God; nor will it amount to anything to speak of uncharitable doctrine. No charity can make it right to depart from the plain appointments of Heaven, and make it safe to adopt the appointments of men, or save him from uncertainty who does it. If men would listen to the proper dictates of charity they would be careful to direct honest inquirers to the plain appointments of God, where all agree he may be found. In the popular sense, Christianity is a system, perfect and distinct in itself from everything else. It inquires nothing about what will suit one man or another, one party or another, one nation or another. It is a system such as it *pleased* God to give, and such

as man must accept, if he would have God accept him. As to exclusiveness, it admits nothing else to be right or acceptable to God but itself. As to the law of Moses, Christianity sets it aside by the one sweeping statement, that "by the deeds of the law, no flesh can be justified in the sight of God." Respecting those under the law, and all others, the great Apostle says, "We have before proved all in unbelief;" and, says he, "God has concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all." As to the law, the Apostle says, "It is abolished." The first institution was taken away to make room for the second. As to Pagan deities, institutions and worship, Christianity sets them all aside, and declares them all nothing. The religion of Jesus Christ lifts itself up above everything else, and pronounces all else inefficacious, displeasing and detestable to God. It equally pronounces against all perversions of Christianity, corruptions or mutilations of it, and pronounces favorable to nothing but *itself,* in its native and original purity. It matters nothing about the number who do not practice it, who do not receive it, or oppose it. Its Author can judge, condemn and punish a large number of opposers just as conveniently as a few, and will just as certainly do it.

If every Jew under heaven had departed from Jerusalem, where the name of God was recorded, and gone to Gerazim, where his name was not recorded, God would not have gone there, would not have heard a prayer offered there, nor acknowledged a single worshiper there. If Naaman, the Assyrian leper, in the place of dipping himself seven times in the Jordan, as God' appointed, had dipped himself seventy times seven in the Euphrates or Nile, he would have been a leper still; he would not have been healed; but, in the simple appointment of God, the Lord healed him. If, when Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, that whoever looked upon it might be healed, the people had lifted up a thousand other serpents and looked a thousand times at them, and offered ten thousand prayers, with fasting, God would not have heard nor healed them. They could not come to God only

through his appointments. If, when the Lord commanded the Israelites to march round the walls of Jericho seven days, once each day, then seven times on the seventh day, then blow the trumpet and shout, they had marched twice as far in some other direction, instituted a band of music in the place of the trumpet, and a dance in the place of a shout, the wails would not have fallen, and the blessing of God would not have attended. The circumstance of his appointing any thing gives it a preference, and designates the place where he may be found. Whoever seeks him where he has appointed finds him. His appointments may appear to man very simple in some instances. Such appointments as anointing a man's eyes with clay, and requiring him to wash, is an appointment of that description; but the man for whom this appointment was prescribed found the blessing of God in it. The dying thief on the cross, who could not do anything, but appealed to Jesus; was not required to submit to any appointment, and simply received the response, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." But when the Lord had ascended to heaven, was coronated, crowned Lord of all, had commenced his regular administration, having sent the Holy Spirit to guide the Apostles into all truth, and the first full and clear announcement of the Gospel was made. three thousand inquirers cried out, in intense solicitude, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Here follows the appointment of God: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Here is the clear appointment of God. These inquiring souls sought God in his appointments and found him. No doubt was left over their conversion. Nor Were there any among them who did not find. Why was there no doubt left over their case? Because they came to God in his appointments, where all admit he may be found. The doubts are on the part of those who try to find God, or to come to him, in some way which he has not appointed. Doubts will forever hang over these. Why do so many seek God at the mourner's bench and do not find? Simply because there is not a

promise of God that they should find him there; and because, furthermore, there is not an evidence that any man ever did find God at the mourner's bench. The preachers themselves never promise anything certain at this place, but tell the people to *try it—may be they will find the Lord!* But the Lord says, "He that believeth and is baptized, *shall be saved."*

FOREKNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN AGENCY.

WITH the Infinite One, there is, in the common acceptation, neither foreknowledge nor after-knowledge. With him who "sees the end from the beginning," all things are present. All things are open to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. There is nothing of the past, present or future laid from Him. The mere foreseeing that an event will come is not the cause of its coining. Anybody can foresee that a debt contracted will come due, but foreseeing that it will come due is not the cause of its coming due. It would come due just the same if no one foresaw it would come due. The omniscience of God is only the more wonderful and overwhelming to us, when we consider that he can foresee what an agent will do—one that acts freely, that exercises that wonderful something that we call the *will*, or volition,—that chooses, decides or determines his own actions. But to say that God decreed these actions of men, and that he only foresaw them because he decreed them, is to destroy the chief glory of the Divine prescience, and let it down from the wonderful and overwhelming ability to foresee what a being, acting entirely free, will do to the mere circumstance of foreseeing that a machine which God had made, set in motion, and to which he had applied the necessary power to perform a certain revolution, would perform the revolution which he had decreed. Those who make God foresee certain things, or all things, because he *decreed* them, only make him a wise machinist, who has made a fine machine, decreed it to a certain work, applied to it the power necessary to perform that work, and foresees the work that it will do. This is a small affair, compared with Omniscience looking down through the immense cycles of the eternal ages upon the countless multitudes of men and angels, all acting free, deciding themselves what they will do, and foreseeing all their actions.

But one of the sage questions that troubles those who study more to find and present some speculative questions, intricate subtleties and unanswerable difficulties, than how to perform their duty to God or man, is to the following amount: "If God foresaw the actions of man, could they have been otherwise than he foresaw they Would be?" We answer, that *they could have been otherwise*. There was no necessity upon the agent. He was perfectly free and could have acted in some other way; but had he done so, the Lord would have foreseen that he would have acted in that other way. The foreseeing how he will act, lays no necessity upon him who acts. He acts just as freely as if no being in the universe foresaw how he would act.

In our estimation, the devil never thought of a more stupid device than to put into a man's head the silly conceit that he can not determine his own actions, and therefore is not accountable. All law, both human and Divine, has its very foundation in the self-evident truth that man acts freely. All blame and praise, all vice and virtue, all, our ideas of good or bad are founded in the self-evident principle that a man acts freely, determines his own actions, can do good or bad. Hence, if a man does an injury by accident he is not punishable. The reason is, he did not intend it, or had not the power to have avoided it. If a man fails into poverty by manifest misfortune, when making manly exertions of an honorable and noble character, he is pitied, and has the sympathy of the community generally. But if a man falls into poverty by manifest indolence, no one pities him, for the simple reason that he could have avoided it. If a locomotive runs against a man and knocks him down, he feels no resentment toward it and does not make battle with it. Why? For the simple reason that it had no volition in the case; that it did not act freely, or did not control its own action. But suppose the injured man perceives that the engineer run it against him purposely, resentment rises in one moment, and he feels like seeking some kind of redress. Why does he blame him? For the manifest reason that he

acted freely, that he did it of choice, that he willed it when he could have acted otherwise. He acted *freely,* but the engine by *necessity*. The free action is accountable, but the action from necessity is not.

An insane man kills a man, but no one thinks of punishing him for murder. Why? Because his action is not free. He is not capable of controlling his action. We think proper to confine him, so that he may not kill another man; but no one thinks of holding him accountable, for the simple reason that he is incapable of controlling his own actions. Some men, who talk about *reason* and *consistency,* insist that God will put them, and that preachers of Christ should put them. and all men, upon the same footing with insane persons—that is, upon the ground that they can not act otherwise than they do, or that they are not free, do not and can not control their actions, and can not, therefore, be held responsible. To this we can not consent. We are free to admit their *perversity,* but not their *insanity,* and the Lord makes a difference between perversity and insanity. He will not treat a perverse person as he will an insane person; neither will the civil law, or the community. The perverse man is to be held free and responsible; but the insane man is neither free nor responsible. Of all the little, pitiful and childish places through which men—full-grown men, who profess to be men of reason, consistency and manliness—have attempted to crawl to escape responsibility to God, there is none that we know of so weak, cowardly and unmanly as to come before God and man, and plead to be dealt with upon the same principle as all laws, both human and Divine, and the common sentiment of mankind, deal with the insane—that is, the principle that they are not free in their actions, have no volition, can not resolve to do this or that, and, therefore, the Almighty cannot hold them to an account for their sins! Or perhaps they prefer to be put upon the list with infants. If an infant child should break or destroy anything—if it should set a house on fire—no one would think of punishing it, for the simple reason that it knows no better, can do no

better, is incapable of any better action; therefore, neither God nor man think of holding it accountable. If any one should think of punishing the child, the plea would resound through all the land that the inoffensive creature knew no better, and was not capable of acting otherwise, and could not be held responsible.

How infinitely little, weak and childish for full-grown men to put up the same plea for not being held to an account as would be made for an infant! Their plea amounts simply to this: that *they are not men,* that they are not free, do not decide what they will do, determine their own actions as intelligent, rational and accountable beings. For all this class of men, if, as their doctrine makes them, they are not free, rational "and accountable men, there should be a special provision, and a very extended one at that. They are not eligible to any office. Who would vote for a man to fill any office if it were known of him that he could not determine his own course of action, that was not free, but acted like an insane person, or an infant, from necessity, and could not be held accountable? Such persons are not eligible voters at our polls. How can a man vote that has no volition? that can not determine his actions? that can not decide, or, which is the same thing, make choice who he will vote for? Such a man is incompetent to transact the ordinary business of life, because in that there is accountability and responsibility. It is impossible to deal with a man who is not free, who can not control his own actions, decide what he will do, and what he will not do. If his reason why he can not be responsible to God for his actions is that he is not free, and could not have done otherwise, he has the same reason why he can not be responsible for his actions and transactions between him and his fellow-men.

Such men are wholly incompetent to act as physicians. Who would take medicine from a man not free, not capable of controlling his actions, determining what the disease is, or deciding what the treatment should be, and who, if he should administer medicine that would kill your wife or child,

would tell you that God foresaw that he would do it, and that he could not have done otherwise? Who would trust an important law case in the hands of a lawyer who is not free, has no volition, can not decide on his own course of action, and therefore is not responsible? Such men might be fit subjects for an asylum, or objects of charity and pity, but not for any useful stations in life. Some of them might be regarded as infants, inoffensive, innocent and unoffending, but not accountable, from the fact that they have no ability. This, we again say, is one of the very least of the little places men ever attempted to creep through to escape accountability to their Creator. It is to *unman themselves*, to escape the responsibility of *men*, and put in the pitiful plea before God and the world that they could not determine their actions, could not have acted otherwise, and therefore must be treated as insane persons, or an infant who does an injury—*not to be held responsible! G*od pity the man thus deluded!

EARNESTLY CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH.

AN Apostle has thought it needful to enjoin upon us, "Earnestly contend for the faith formerly delivered to the saints." An old soldier of the cross, when about to put off his armor, rejoiced that he had fought a good fight, kept the faith and finished his course. In the course of his warfare, we are informed that he disputed "two whole years" in a certain school, or contending for the faith. This warfare, disputing or contending, is an advocacy, a defense and maintenance of the faith once delivered to the saints. The first thing, in order to this advocacy, is to ascertain what the " faith once delivered to the saints" is, and the next thing is to advocate it, maintain and defend it with every power. The faith exists in two forms: I. In its concentrated, embodied or constitutional form, as it is presented for the confession of the new convert, in a single proposition, that it may be received or rejected by either an affirmative or a negative answer. 2. In its fully-developed or detailed form, as we find it spread upon the pages of the Christian Scriptures. This is the creed of the Church, by which she is governed and guided in all her journey through this world.

The whole of the detailed or fully-developed creed, so far as its truth or authority is concerned, is in the concentrated, embodied or constitutional creed. Indeed, the whole system of Christianity was in the purpose of God, which he purposed in Christ before the world, in the promise to Abraham, in the good news borne by the angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem, in the last commission, in the same sense that it was in Christ. But it was not put in due form for mankind to confess, receive and place themselves under it. The same that was in the "eternal purpose" of God, in the promise, in the good news of great joy, and in the commission, was in the announcement, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom

I am well pleased," in the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ, *the* Son of the living *God,"* the same that John testified that we might believe, when he said, "These things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," or that God uttered in the mountain when he gave him honor and glory, or the same is contained in any one of these that is contained in "the Gospel." Any one of these expressions, and many others that could be maintained, contain Christianity in its concentrated, embodied or constitutional form. These all embrace Christ. All Christianity centers in him, comes from him; and is authorized by him. Through the holy witnesses of Jesus men are made acquainted with Christ, convinced that he is a Divine person, the Son of God and the Savior of the world; and, in the confession, receive him as their only Leader. This is simply receiving Christianity in its constitutional form, without having examined its details, or knowing what they are. We do not, therefore, read Christianity through, sitting in judgment, as we do, a merely human composition, noticing every expression to see whether it is good or true. When we become acquainted with the Author, find him sent from God, declared his Son in his resurrection from the dead, Divine and infallible, we place ourselves under him, and receive his holy instructions implicitly, only wishing to know that they are from him.

Christianity, therefore, in its embodied, or constitutional form, embraces Christianity in its details. "The faith once delivered to the saints" is simply Christianity, the complete system as the Lord gave it. All who have confessed Christ intelligently have received Christianity—committed themselves to it. This is "the faith," that which is to be advocated, maintained and defended. The man who has received it with the whole heart, practices it, and enjoys it, is a Christian. The requirement of Heaven resting upon him is, to earnestly contend for the faith, advocate it, maintain and defend it. This the adversary has tried to defeat by a thousand stratagems. We beg leave to notice a few of these:

1. One plan to stop the defense of the faith, or at least

to check the force of him who defends it, is to call his preaching "controversial preaching," or the preacher a "controversialist," and then add, that "I do not like controversial preaching." Any man who will discriminate in his preaching what Christianity is, and what it is not, the way to heaven, and the way that leads not there, that which is for God and not for him, for the law of God and not for it, is called a controversialist, and the pitiful and childish complaint comes up that "he has hurt my feelings!" What is the object of such a whining complaint? Simply to induce some weak brethren to hold back the preacher, and beg him not to preach "doctrinal preaching to-day, for some of our friends, the sects, are present." The preacher is duly informed, and if he happens to be a coward, he shrinks, decides to preach a pretty little sermon that will touch no place, have nothing in it and maintain nothing. The audience walk away silently. Some one inquires cautiously, "How did you like our preacher? "Very much, indeed; he is just such a man as I love to hear," is the reply. The enemy has gained his point. He has sealed the lips of the preacher, or, what is the same thing, forbid the preaching of anything that has any force in it, or that will do any good.

2. Another method of the enemy to avoid maintaining the faith is to preach philosophy—bound off into the fog, into mysticism, where the people can not understand what it is. In that case they will not be offended, for they can not tell whether it is right or wrong. They can not understand it, but think it is *deep,* as they can not see into it. Muddy water always looks deep. These do not defend the faith or anything else. They spend their time in nice distinctions, *splitting hairs,* which never was of any profit only to try a razor to see how sharp it is. These puzzle the people to determine which side they are on, whether they are for the faith or against it What an advocacy this! What a defense of the faith! What teaching this! What an advocacy that, which contains nothing, amounts to nothing, and can not be understood! If there is anything to be deprecated, it is a

professed advocacy of Christianity that never states it, never sets it forth, and never shows what it is. No man can advocate Christianity who does not describe it, discriminate between it and everything else, and defend it in its native purity as the Lord gave it. We have listened to whole discourses that contained scarcely a quotation from Jesus or the Apostles, all beautiful, fine and elegant, possibly all true; but no man could tell whether the preacher were a Jew or a Christian, a Mohammedan or a Mormon, an infidel or a Greek, so far as to anything of a distinguishing character contained in it. It had no Jesus in it, no God in it, no Holy Spirit, no blood of Christ, no Bible, no Church, nor anything that could possibly make any man think of turning to God, repenting of sin, or respecting Divine authority. Still, the people were pleased, praised the preacher and loved to hear him! These men do not intend to bear the cross, to endure hardness as good soldiers, nor to despise the shame. They shrink from the defense of the faith, and cater to a vitiated, popular taste and public sentiment. They are determined to please man at the hazard of displeasing God. These are of no consequence any place. They look not into the Bible to know what should be taught, but are simply looking to the popular caprice of the people.

3. Some men want a paper of this kind: one that would circulate palatably any place, touch no place, defend nothing and amount to nothing. We know a few poor, unhealthy, feeble creatures, who would have us send forth a kind of milk-and-water concern, that a man might read half a year without knowing where we stand. This, however, we shall not do. We are not trying to please man, but God. We shall, to the extent of our ability, describe Christianity, discriminate between it and everything else, and defend it. We shall at the same time try to do this in the utmost kindness, the most respectful terms, but as plainly as it can possibly be done. Christianity never was maintained, manfully and nobly advocated, without a struggle. It never will be. We, as a religious body, have fought many hard battles. We have won

a glorious victory, established ourselves in defiance of all opposition. The field is now open before us, and if we push the conquest forward we can do more in one year than we have ever done in five. There is not a place where the cause is advocated, in kindness, affectionately, and with power, without success. On the other hand, no success attends sermonizing or theorizing, that does not define, illustrate and advocate pure Christianity as it was in the beginning. A man who merely *talks*, but does not advocate anything, as a matter of course, does not promote the cause of Christ. Christianity must be maintained, as the Lord gave it, against all encroachments, subversions and attacks of every description. It has its enemies, opposers and corrupters, aiming to defeat it. It is our duty to maintain the ground we have gained, hold fast our begun confidence steadfast to the end, and see that none turn back to the weak and beggarly elements of the world. We are right in aim, and what remains for us is to push on, illustrate, unfold and maintain the cause. We hope the brethren will keep their eye upon every man who shrinks from a defense of the faith, preaches sermons that have nothing in them, and brings not the Lord before the people. The Lord will be ashamed of them when he conies in power and great glory. They would have forsaken the Lord and his Apostles in the midst of their persecutions.

No. 2.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

PROPOSITION I.—There was such a *person* as Christ.

This proposition we mention, not so much to argue it, as merely to refer to it as a universally admitted fact. Christ could not have been a mere fictitious character, manufactured in modern times; for an immense variety of writers, both friends and enemies, mention him in every century of the Christian era, and among them all there is no evidence to the *contrary.* Any position stated and admitted by writers in every age, where not only no contrary *evidence* is found, but no contrary *opinion* is expressed, must be indisputably true. This is the case with the *real existence* of such a person as Christ; it is mentioned and admitted by an immense variety of writers in every age, with no evidence to the contrary, and not even a respectable opinion in opposition.

II. Christ lived at the *time* stated in the Bible.

This proposition is not denied by infidels; but if any one should deny it, we know that it is true, because he is mentioned by numerous writers, both friends and enemies, in every century back to the time when the Bible says he lived. He could not have been mentioned by men who wrote before he lived, unless they were prophets. "He is mentioned by many who wrote soon after he came into the world. This shows when he lived, for he must have lived before the first mention of him. For instance, we read of General Washington in many books, written at various periods between our time and the day when he lived. He must have lived before the writing of the first book in which there is mention of him, for no writer could have mentioned him before he lived. In the same way, the numerous references to Christ, by various writers, who gave the date of his birth, without any material variation, or any *contrary opinion,* establishes the time of his advent beyond dispute. In this argument, the allusion to him

of an enemy is as good as that of a friend. It is a fact known and admitted by all well-informed men, that Christ is mentioned by numerous writers, in an immense variety of ways, both by friends and enemies, in every century back to the time when the Bible says he lived; but he is not mentioned by any one who wrote before that time, except by Jewish prophets, and by them always as a person yet to come. This fixes the time when he lived beyond dispute.

III. Christ lived in the *place* where the Bible says he did.

This is not denied by unbelievers; but if it should be, we know that it is true from the fact of the agreement of all writers, both ancient and modern, and no evidence to the contrary. All writers who have alluded to him, could not have agreed in his *location*, unless guided by some certain evidence. This is a great point in Christian evidence. Whatever doubt, and however serious the doubt may be with reference to some points of evidence, there is not, and has not been, at any period, the least doubt from any quarter that could command respect, as to the place where the Lord lived and died. This is a great and a well-settled point, as admitted on all hands.

IV. Christ is the *Author* of the Christian Religion.

This is evident from the fact that its very name is derived from him. It is also evident from the fact that all writings in every century, both of friends and enemies, back to the time of its origin, that have occasion to mention the Christian religion, agree that Christ is the Author of it, and speak of him as such. It is also further evident that there was no Christian religion before him, and has been ever since, aud his *name* is the center and life of it.

V. The Christian religion, as *now taught* in the Bible, is the same as that taught in the first century:

This is determined from the quotations made from the Christian Scriptures by the various writers, in the different ages of the Church. If the Christian Scriptures had been changed, the quotations made by writers after the change would differ from those made before the change.

Suppose, for instance, some one should assume that some change had been made in the New Testament Scriptures about the beginning of the sixth century. The learned would immediately examine the quotations made by various writers in the fifth century, and if they were found to correspond. with those made in the sixth and seventh centuries, this fact would show that no change had taken place. For it would be impossible for quotations made from a book before a change to correspond with those made afterwards.

Not only so, but if as great a matter as a change in the Christian Scriptures should occur, it would appear upon the pages of history. For instance, the time will never come when faithful history will not give an account of the making of the common translation of the Scriptures, and the time when and the place where it was done. The same is true of the great New translation movement now in agitation. History, in all time to come, will tell of it, and if the version that shall be produced should differ materially from the one in common use, the quotations made by writers immediately before the translation compared with those made immediately after, or those made from the old translation compared with those made from the new, will not only show the exact change, but the *time* when it occurred.

Great researches have been made into this subject by learned men, and the more they have investigated the better they have been confirmed in the conviction that no vital change has occurred. Even the quotations made by the first Christian writers in the first centuries, are all virtually found in our New Testament. The same is virtually true of the quotations of every century—they are all substantially to be found in our common version of the English Scriptures. As an instance, suppose some one should say that the words "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God," were not in the ancient Scriptures, we should know that such a statement was incorrect, for these words have been quoted by writers in every age back to the time when they fell from the lips of Jesus. No writer could have

quoted these words from the Scriptures before they were in them. In the same way, the numerous quotations found in all the Christian writings, and even in the writings of opposers, in every age, from Christ to our time, now found in our Scriptures, show how carefully that book has been preserved substantially the same.

If the Bible had undergone great changes, the quotations found in the book, written at all the different periods back to the beginning of the Christian era, would not only show the changes, but the time when they occurred. But such changes do not appear in the quotations, and evidently have not taken place.

VI. The different books of the New Testament were written by the *persons to whom they are ascribed.*

This proposition is proven by the quotations of the early writers. In the first and second centuries, the authors of the various books of the New Testament were known as the *authors* of those works, as well as Martin Luther is now known to be the author of the various works ascribed to him. In the various productions extant of these early writers are found a great variety of quotations from various parts of the New Testament. In many instances they tell what writer they are quoting. We look into the New Testament and not only virtually find the quotations but find it in the writings of the *person* from whom it was professedly taken. For instance, several very early writers quote Paul. We open what we now regard the writings of Paul and find the quotation, which shows that these writings have been attributed to him, from those personally acquainted with him down to the present time. Numerous instances of this kind are given by Dr. Paley, and other learned writers, that give the utmost satisfaction on this point. Of course, it would transcend the hounds of these papers to elaborate such a point. All that can be clone is to give a clew to this point, and pass on.

In the same way, we look into the New Testament and find the teachings ascribed to our Savior. We may then

look through the productions of the first Christian writers, and where they profess to quote the words of the Savior, we look into the New Testament and find the very passage. This shows not only what the first Christians regarded as his teachings are still regarded as such, but that his teachings remain virtually the same—unchanged. In extensive works on this subject, a large variety of these quotations should be given, and could be given with very little trouble, as they have long since been collected to hand by the labors of learned men. In these short articles, nothing more can be done than to state the principle upon which the point is reached, and leave the reader to examine more extensive works.

VII. The various works of the Old Testament were written by the *persons* to whom they are ascribed.

This proposition rests wholly upon the Divine claims of our Savior and his Apostles. If our Redeemer was with God before the world—was the Son of God—the express image of the invisible God and in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily—if *he knew all things,* he knew what was authentic and who the writer was. When he quotes a passage professedly from the books of Moses, the, Psalms, or any other book of the Old Testament, and we turn to that book and find the quotation, it shows the true authorship of the book; that the book was not changed, and that the book belongs to the sacred canon, for he knew who the proper author was—whether the language was his and whether it was divinely authorized. His quoting any book as the language of God shows that it is such, or his quoting any passage as the production of any Old Testament writer, establishes it as such. The Lord himself makes a great variety of quotations from the Old Testament. If his own claims are just, all he has quoted is sanctioned as divinely authorized, the language of the Spirit or the Word of God; for he knew what was and what was not of the sacred canon, and would not have quoted that as the *word of God* which was not. To represent him as quoting

that for Scripture, or the word of God, which was not, would be to represent him as a deceiver. Every book, then, quoted by him for Scripture must be considered a part of the sacred canon.

In the same way, all the quotations from the Old Testament, made by the writers of the New, sanction the books from which they are made as part of the sacred canon. And in every instance where they mention the author they quote, and we can turn and find the quotation, it establishes the authorship of that book. For, if the Apostles were inspired or divinely authorized—if they spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance, "spoke not their own words, but the words which the Holy Spirit spoke"—all they quoted is sanctioned. As an instance, if Peter quoted David and Joel as the *word of the Lord.* it seals the authorship of the books in which these words are found, and sanctions the writers as Divine. If the Spirit of God spoke through the Apostles when they made these quotations, it was simply the Spirit speaking through an Apostle, and quoting what he had before uttered through a prophet. He knew what he had before uttered, and quoted nothing as the word of God not entitled to that claim.

This throws the whole upon the Divine authority of Christ. If he is God's Son, the Old Testament is divinely inspired, because, in quoting it as the word of God, Jesus and his inspired Apostles sanctioned it. Besides, their numerous quotations show how perfectly it has been preserved since the quotations have been made.

No. I.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: We have for a long time had it in our mind to address you all a series of letters upon the present state of religious affairs, our future prospects, and the possibility of our achieving any great good while in our present condition; but the way has not been fully open for us to do till now. We now have a medium through which we can extend these letters pretty widely over the land, and by the blessing of Heaven, we shall proceed with them. We invite your most respectful attention to them, and state, in the greatest kindness, at the commencement, that our columns are open for any corrections or replies from any respectable source, of men of ability from any party. Our aim is simply that truth and righteousness may prevail, and that our fellowmen may be rescued from the manacles of sin and death, from error and superstition, and introduced into the glorious light and liberties of the children of God. Without further preliminaries, we shall proceed.

1. The Apostle says: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, he will be accursed when the Lord comes." The Lord says: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another." The first great matter of concern upon our mind is, that the religion current does not lead the people to love the Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently here is a capital, a vital and most disastrous mistake scarcely ever thought of loving Christ. Many love their preacher most dearly, while neither he nor they love the Lord Jesus Christ. Thousands love their Church, their creed and their party; will expend their money, give their names and influence to maintain and uphold these, who love not Jesus, have never tried to know his will, or to do it at all. Tens of thousands love their "Church service," the sweet tones of the organ, the delightful per-

formance of the choir, and the respectable audience, that have scarcely ever thought of loving Christ. Hence a large amount of the religious conversation we hear is about the preacher, his fine voice, his easy gestures and graceful manner, without any regard to what is preached, and, in thousands of instances, without knowing what is preached. These have never been taught to love Jesus, to try to please him, to know his will or do it. They are thinking of nothing of this kind. From the day they first thought of identification with a Church to the present time, they have simply been seeking their own pleasure, and not the pleasure of the Lord. The first thing they said to themselves, when they started to meeting, was something like the following: "I will go to Church, for I ought to join some Church. It is respectable to belong to the Church. I should like to bring up my children in some respectable Church, and not allow them to grow up as heathen. I will look around and find a Church that will *please me."* He makes the experiment. He passes round, and talks very liberal as he passes along, saying: "I intend to hear all, and then I shall join the Church that *pleases me."* After he has finished his circuit round, and each Church has tried, in turn, to get him, he sums up the case as follows: "I have now heard all; I have not acted blindly, as some do, but I have looked round, and have found a Church that *pleases me*. The Rev. Dr. _____'s Church is the Church for me. I like the Doctor; he is of noble bearing, fine address, elegant appearance, his sermons *short,* lovely and sweet; nothing in them except his *own* chaste and elegantly-expressed views. He never says anything against the doctrines, views and opinions of his neighbor, and never sets up any exclusive claims, such as that nobody is right but himself. He *pleases me* precisely. The organ is splendid, the performance of the choir magnificent, the Church superb and the members *respectable*. The service is delightful, the discipline mild and the order good. In one word, the whole affair is *my beau ideal* of a Church, It fills *my eye* and *pleases me.* I will join."

In all this, Christ is out of the question: There is no love of Christ in the matter. The man is deluded, deceived, and is no more in the kingdom of God than he was before. The idea of pleasing the Lord has not entered into his mind.

His entire effort has been to *please himself.* This he has succeeded in doing, but he has not pleased God, is not converted, and is farther from heaven than he was before; for he is now shielded under the cloak of religion. We need men now like Peter, who, when they see the people placing their minds upon improper objects, will ask them: "Why look you so earnestly upon us, as if by our own power or holiness we had made this man whole? The *name of Jesus Christ,* through faith in *his name,* has given this man this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." Or, on another occasion, when Cornelius was about to worship him, the Apostle said, "Stand up, I, myself, also am a man." And he immediately proceeded to bring before him the Lord. for whom the Apostle was only a witness. The Apostle Paul, also, addressing a party of *Paulites,* forming in the Church at Corinth, asks them: "Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul? "I thank God," continues he, "that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius and the house of Stephanus; besides, I know not whether I baptized any others." The reason he gives for thanking God that he had baptized only these few of them is "lest any should say I had baptized in nay own name." These holy men took care not to let the people set their hearts upon them, but constantly kept Christ before them as the object of their love. They taught the people to glory in him, to count all things but loss for him, to suffer for him, and set their affections upon him. Hence the Apostle says: "I determined to know nothing among you but Christ and him crucified," and to "glory in nothing save the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"If you love me," says the Lord, "keep my commandments." "Hereby, do we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." Again: "We

know that that we love the children of God when we love God and keep his commandments." Again: "This is the love of God, that you keep his commandments." We talk of *vital* matters in religion. It is a vital matter that we teach' the people to love Christ, to come after him, to follow him, and not to be followers of men. It is not the work of the followers of Christ to learn the *views* of men, the doctrines, theories, philosophies and metaphysics of men, or to try to please men. Paul says: "If I pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." The authority of God forbids that we should be followers of men. Call no man master, or leader; one is your Master, the Messiah. Keep your eye upon him, as we sing,

"Observe your Leader, follow him,

He through this world hath been."

The question now discussed by the popular teachers is not the love of Christ, nor to lead the people to think whether they love him; but the matter with most preachers is to induce the people to love *us,* our doctrine, our views, or discipline, or creed; our Church, our order, service, manner of worship, government, etc. Sometimes the preacher turns aside to point out wherein others are not as good as *ourselves;* but among it all how little effort there is to lead perishing people to love Christ. And yet if they love not the Lord Jesus Christ, they will be accursed when the Lord comes! The evidence, too, by which all men are to know that they are his disciples, is that they *have love one to another.* How much love the professed followers of Christ *one to another?* Many of the preachers themselves will not go into the pulpit with each other, will not preach together, pray, sing, or commune together! Yet they are under a solemn command to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! Is this state of things to continue? We say no. The preachers who love Christ better than partyism will preach Christ, will call the people to Christ and induce them to love him and love all that do love him. They will inquire *his* will, and do it. They will exchange the love

of party for the love of Christ, and find it so much higher, holier, purer and happier, that they will ignore all party feuds, wrangling and strifes, and maintain simply "the faith once delivered to the saints." No doctrinal correction, or corrections in ordinances, or in organization and government, will ever amount to anything, or save a people who have not the *love of Christ.* We may be told that we may be mistaken, that they do love Christ. We can not be mistaken in this, for the Lord says: "From the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks." A man full of the love of Christ will speak of Christ. The theme of his heart will dwell upon his tongue. Where Christ has promised to be the), will be with *him.* "Where two or three are met together in my name, there," says the Lord, *"I will be."* How many go to those places where Jesus has promised to be? How many go to the Lord's table, to remember his dying love? How many of the preachers will sit down together, as loving disciples, and meditate upon his dying love, his great suffering, as he bore our sins upon the accursed tree?

When we have lost friends, we go to the grave and think of them, try to bring them up in our memories. We talk with our friends about them, and about seeing them and meeting them in another state. How often do the professors of religion, in our times, think of the grave of Jesus, his resurrection, his coronation? How often do they commemorate his suffering, and meditate upon his great love to us? His name is almost set aside, his suffering is almost forgotten, his love, even his dying love, scarcely mentioned! Yet the word of the Lord, when translated into English, thunders in our ears: "If any man loves not the Lord Jesus Christ, he will be accursed when the Lord comes." We shall hear these words, and be judged by them, in a day when we shall feel their force. Jesus is the "one Lord," the one object of love, the one head and king. Shall we make an effort to rescue the people from party influence, and win their hearts and affections from all the frivolous objects upon which they are placed in partyism, and place them upon Him who is the

express image of the invisible God, the brightness of the Father's glory, and in whom all the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily? Who, with the love of Christ in his own breast, can fail to see that the work now for good men is to call the attention of all men to Christ, to his word, his cause, his Church, his salvation, his way, that they may love him supremely, and be his forevermore?

The Lord never intended us to love and unite in a certain routine of theories, doctrines and ceremonies. There is no life in these, no saving efficacy and no power of deliverance. They are to be observed, but they are not the bond of union, the center of attraction. The embodiment that engages the heart, and enlists the man as a soldier in the army of God, is Jesus—is the one altogether lovely, and the chiefest among all the ten thousands. He is the embodiment and personification of all love and all goodness. He is the center of attraction, that draws all to him. The true Israel of God are united in him. They all agree that he is their Head, their Leader, their Savior and Deliverer. They may not all see precisely alike in everything, may not all, or any of them, understand all the details of his teachings and his requirements; but they are not united upon *their views* of these details or minutiae of his holy teachings, but *upon Him*. Their views of his teaching, or their understanding of it, is not the foundation of the Church. Christ is the rock laid in Zion, elect and precious. His people unite upon him. They agree upon him. Love *to him* is their bond of union. It binds the whole family in heaven and upon earth in one bond. We love him by whom we are begotten, and those begotten by him. We love not a theory, a system, a train of doctrine, but a glorious person, and receive his doctrine, his teaching, because we love him. Here is a basis for love, union and harmony that can not be objected to. The Lord is the center, the attraction, the rock, the foundation, the way, the truth, and the life, and no man comes to the Father but by Him. All who love him can agree in him, follow him. How many can be enlisted, in our day, who love him above all party

feeling, above all objects, and who desire to be simply *his* disciples, to do his will, to engage in the great and good work of converting men *to him*, and promoting his glory? In this all good men can agree, unite and be one in the Lord. O Lord, help us to love thee, and be thine!

No. II.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

PROPOSITION VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son. This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to *deceive men.* If he performed works entirely above the power of man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders, requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." (John iii. 1.) When this ruler said "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc," he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did that he was from God. John ix. 16: some of the Jews inquired, saying: "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?" Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he had just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him: "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I *now see."* (John ix. 24, 25.) In this passage, we have the concession of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles (Mark iii. 22.) His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils

by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance they admitted the doing of a miracle, but attributed the power to an evil agency. To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies, with reference to the Apostles doing a miracle. They say: "What shall we do with these men? for that, indeed, a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we *can not deny it."* (Acts iv. 16.)

IX. Many of the miracles were of such a character that they could not have been denied if done; but, on the other hand, if not done, the statement that they were done would certainly have been refuted. For instance, the miraculous feeding of five thousand persons, the raising of Lazarus, the resurrection of saints when Christ rose, said to be "seen of many in the holy city," his own resurrection, the sundering of the vail of the temple, splitting the rocks, the earthquake, the darkening of the sun, etc., mentioned by his own authorized witnesses and publishers at large, while thousands were yet living who could testify in the most unequivocal manner that these things *were true* or *not true.* This circumstance proves beyond all doubt that these wonderful events occurred. for the refutation of the statements concerning them would have sealed the character of the whole profession. The fact that no such refutation, or even an attempt at it, is in existence is an irresistible evidence that they could not be refuted. Such statements, in reference to a matter in which the whole community were not only deeply interested, but greatly excited, if refutation had been possible, would not have passed without an effort. But they did pass without an effort at refutation, and have been thus transmitted to us.

It is also a well known historical fact, that the miracles of Christianity were not denied by even opposers for several hundred years after Christ. All the early opposers of the first ages continued their schemes of opposition with the admission that Christ and the Apostles did miracles.

X. The teachings of Christ prove him to be a Divine person.

Excepting a few important events connected with Jesus in his infancy, and that one at the age of twelve years, nothing in his life seems to have claimed the attention of the sacred historians till he arrives at the age of thirty. His life was of an obscure and humble character up to the age of thirty years. During a greater portion of the years of his minority he probably toiled at the carpenters' trade. "When he reached the age of thirty years—the termination of minority at that time in that country—he at once left his obscure life, and in a few days stood before thousands, speaking in such a commanding manner as to astonish all who heard him. He emphatically spake as never man spake—-he spake as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

His holy teachings were not only superior to all who had spoken before him, but they were *perfect*. They consisted not of a combination of the various systems previously developed, but something *new—Divinely original. H*is system was not only a great one—a good one, a better one than had gone before—but a *perfect* one. Other systems had some good in them; indeed, they all had some good, but it was left for Him who came from heaven, and has since been made higher than the heavens, to unfold a system *containing nothing but good.* This he did. His holy teachings have stood the scrutiny of all the reason, philosophy, and science of both learned and unlearned, great and small, eighteen centuries, without an imperfection being discovered. This is as great a miracle as the raising of the dead or calming the sea, and equally as manifest an evidence that God was with him. This feature of his teachings alone shows that they were vastly above human. But we proceed at once to the proposition concerning Christ.

XI. Jesus is a Divine person.

When Jesus lay in the manger in Bethlehem, he. was the embodiment of Christianity. Judaism, with its learned scribes, priests and rabbis, on the one hand, was in full power" Paganism, on the other hand, with its thirty thousand gods, numerous temples and altars—its numerous priests, doctors

and philosophers, was upon the throne. These formidable powers we are to look upon as combined against the rise of a new religion. A mighty contrast this!

Here, on the other hand, so far as any human power was concerned, lays a helpless infant in a manger. An humble birth was his. Poverty surrounds him. He is wholly destitute of all worldly advantages. But, on the other hand, his mighty foe holds the wealth, the honors, the civil governments, religious powers, the pride and talent of the whole world. In one word, all worldly advantages were in the hands of the opposers of Christ, and none of them in his hands. What unequal power, to all human appearance, to enter the arena of conflict! When God enters into controversy with man, he gives him all advantages, that poor, blind man may see his hand and recognize the work as *his.*

But to contemplate this scene more fully, we must look at it from another point. That Christ was crucified between two thieves was admitted by all, both friends and enemies. Look, then, at the unequal conflict when he expired. His poor, timid, discouraged friends retired from the shocking scenes of the cross, saying, as they pass away: "We thought it was he who should have redeemed Israel." His dead body is conveyed to the tomb! His enemies, fearing that some imposition will grow out of it, and to cut off all possibility of that kind, place an armed Roman guard over it. Here, in the hands of rude enemies, lay the mangled and lifeless body of him who is to establish an everlasting kingdom. The powers of darkness are combined and set in a determined opposition to the rise of a new religion, and, to add to the struggle, death has laid his iron grasp upon Jesus. Can any power but that of Omnipotence give the victory to that lifeless corpse against such fearful odds?

"Or, if the reader please, we will advance a little from this scene. Look, if you please, at the Apostles when Jesus had left them. They were called from the most obscure and humble pursuits of this life—fishermen of Galilee. Though men of good character and common sense, they appear to

have been uncommonly dull and slow to learn. Some of the plainest and simplest lessons Jesus taught them were wholly misunderstood. Even the simple and liberal statement that he would rise from the dead was as dark as midnight to them. Their wonderful dullness shows that they never could have succeeded without Divine aid. They were poor, without learning, worldly honor, popularity, civil or religious power, set before the world in defense of a doctrine that attacks all the pride of life, the love of the world, of pleasure, worldly honor, and, in one word, every sin under heaven—a religion that pronounced Judaism, on the one hand, *abolished*, and all Paganism, on the other hand, *null and void*. They are to stand before kings, governors, lords, philosophers, doctors and lawyers—the powers of wealth, popularity and the combined influences of the world. Was there ever a more unequal contest? They stood, however, against all this, and in defiance of all opposition, established Christianity in all the principal parts of the world. How is this to be accounted for? These weak, unlearned anti, simple-hearted men never rose against such fearful odds and. accomplished all this in their own strength. Such a thought is preposterous in the extreme. How did they accomplish it? The fact that they did accomplish it is undeniable. How, then, was it done? They must have done it in their *own* strength, or God was with them. This latter is the only conclusion that will stand the scrutiny of investigation. God chose the weak things of this world to confound the mighty, that the excellency of the power might be clearly seen not to be of man, but of God. It was nothing less than God himself raising up a system condemning the world and counting all men sinful—declaring all the world guilty before God.

Under these unequal circumstances, however, Christianity did rise and spread with a rapidity unknown to any other system on earth. This is admitted by the most obstinate unbelievers. What was the cause of its rapid progress? Not wealth, for they were poor. Not popularity, for they

had none. Not worldly honor, for they were strangers to it. Not human learning and ingenuity, for they possessed nothing of the kind. The whole secret is found in the fact that it was *infallibly true*, as they could show to any honest man and none could be saved without it.

XII. An enemy testified that Jesus was an *innocent person.*

Our Lord never had a greater enemy than Judas Iscariot He was one of the chosen twelve, and a bosom companion of Christ for about three years. If Jesus had any wicked schemes on foot among his disciples, he knew it. He was initiated into all the private councils and secret plans, if there were any, having been intimately associated with the Lord and the Apostles so long. Just before Jesus approached the last test, this man turned traitor—became a bitter and most treacherous enemy. He sought an opportunity to betray Jesus. He who could do this would evidently have disclosed anything injurious to the reputation of the Lord and his cause. And with what avidity some disclosure from this quarter would have been received by his enemies! But nothing of this kind is disclosed. On the other hand, something very different. He could not enjoy the money—in amount about fifteen dollars—he received for betraying Christ. His poor soul is pierced with the awful crime he had committed. "Then Judas, who had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the *innocent* blood." Here is the last testimony, of the greatest enemy Jesus had. After betraying him he pronounces him *innocent* and himself a sinner, and is so distracted about it that he violently puts an end to his own life.

XIII. Impartial persons declare him *innocent.*

When Jesus expired, a centurion who was standing by and saw the darkness of the sun, the earthquake, etc., said:

"Certainly this was a righteous man." (Luke xxiii. 47.) To the same amount, Pontius Pilate, who sat as judge in his case

upon his last trial, said to the Jews: "Take ye him and crucify him; for I find *no fault in him. (*John xix. 6.)

We have now given the testimony of one enemy and two impartial persons, to show the innocence of Jesus. They were persons, too, immediately interested and personally acquainted with the grounds of his persecution and death. Any man acquainted with books knows that thousands of admissions that Jesus was an innocent person could be found in both ancient and modern works, written by both friends and enemies. This, then, is a point that needs no extended argument.

XIV. Christ was *really dead.*

This proposition has never been denied by those worthy of much consideration. Not one, so far as we are informed, near the time of his crucifixion denied that he was really dead. The reason why the legs of Jesus were not broken, as in the case of the two thieves, was that "they saw that he was *already* dead." (John xxi.43.) Another testimony to the same amount comes from the chief priests and Pharisees. They say to Pilate: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was *yet alive,* After three days I will rise again." (Matt. xxvii. 63.) Here is a clear admission that he was dead. This is a point admitted by all, and need not be argued here.

XV. He was *missing from the tomb* on the morning of the third day.

This we only state that the reader may think of it, not to argue it. It was universally admitted on all hands. We have no controversy at this point, for no one denies that the body of Christ was missing from the tomb On the morning of the third day. Our next proposition brings us to the dividing point. It is the great point that all depends upon. Let us approach it with care and watchfulness.

XVI. Christ rose from the dead.

Here is the point where a dispute rises, and here we must call into court and examine witnesses. All believers in Christ account for his absence from the tomb by alleging that he

rose from the dead. Others deny this, and attempt to account for it in another way. The various claims must be considered.

Immediately after the departure of the body of Christ from the tomb "some of the watch came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests al! things that were done," (Matt. xxviii. 11.) All what thing? Evidently what the historian had just spoken of: that there was an earthquake, an angel descended-from heaven, rolled back the stone from the door, sat upon it, fear caused the keepers to shake and become as deadmen, that Christ was risen, etc. The watch, then, were the first witnesses of the resurrection. This was their *unbiased* testimony. They changed afterward, and gave a different testimony when under other influences than their own unbiased will.

No. II.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: In our first letter we endeavored to show that the religion of our times is defective, vitally defective, inasmuch as it fails to infuse the love of Christ among its adherents. If we are correct in this, we must amend our course, or ruin, desolation and destruction must inevitably follow. We shall, therefore, proceed to another point.

2. The second matter of concern with us, and one of deep and momentous concern, is the effect our present position and course is having upon the world. The Lord prayed that we *might be one, that the world may believe that the Father had sent him.* This passage teaches, by implication, that the tendency of union among believers is to induce the world to believe; and that the tendency of disunion among believers is to induce the world to disbelieve or to run into unbelief. This is not only plainly implied here, but as an evidence that the Infinite wisdom is in this teaching, we have its literal fulfillment both upon the pages of faithful history and in what is now before the eyes of the world. When the Church was one, perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment, and no divisions in it, it gained with wonderful rapidity. Believers by the thousand were made on every hand, and the triumphs of the faith among the nations were overwhelming. But, since the apostasy, the great declension, falling away, the departure from the Lord, the alienation produced by the man of sin, the idea of a human head on earth, as the representative of the invisible head in heaven, having stolen the healers of the people from the Lord, and produced schism among them, as well as created numerous parties in the midst of all our boasted light, advancement and improvement of every kind, infidelity is increasing in our midst every day. Cold and

cheerless, blighting and blasting, withering and destructive, ruinous and corrupting, unbelief is gaining on us with wonderful and fearful rapidity, prowling at our very doors, and winding its way into the hearts of our fair sons and daughters, only fitting them for the eternal burnings! Here is a matter calculated to make the heart of every man, whose soul has ever been animated by the love of Christ, ache, sicken and bleed. The good man deplores to look at the subject, and tries to throw it off. But he can not. The prayer of Jesus, in tones of pity for man and great love for our race, in most convincing accents, falls upon his ear and sinks deep into his heart: "I pray for them who shall believe on me through their word, that that they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us, that *the world may believe that thou hast sent me."* With this before him, he can not deny but the oneness or unity of the Church is here considered a means of the world's believing, or of the world's conversion. On the other hand, he can not fail to see that it is distinctly implied here that division, disunion or schism is a means or cause of unbelief. He looks again, and finds that while the Church was united, one, and presented an unbroken phalanx, unbelief gave way before it, and the faith of Christ triumphed most gloriously. Once more he lifts his eyes and looks, and is compelled to see that, above the middle of the nineteenth century, in the fairest portion of the whole earth, with the means of the greatest and most universal enlightenment man ever knew, in a land of perfect toleration, where division has spread devastation around, unbelief is winding in all the nooks and corners of the land. He is compelled to lay his hand upon his heart, and admit that *division is the cause of all this.*

We look into the New Testament, and the words of Jesus, "He that believeth not shall be damned," "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," thunder in his ears. Here is the result of unbelief. How tremendous the thought that vast numbers in our midst, those with whom we have associated more or less in this

world, are recklessly rushing on to such a result as this! How fearful the responsibility, too, when we think that the conduct of those who profess to be the people of God, in dividing, alienating the feelings and producing strife, has contributed to this cold, cheerless and ruinous unbelief, and consequently to the damnation of those for whom they pray! What does it avail, that we preach to unbelievers against infidelity, and pray for the conversion of the world, while we practice that which our Lord has clearly taught us contributes to unbelief, and consequently to the ruin of men? This is not letting our light shine before men, that they may see our good works and glorify our Father in heaven, but letting our evil divisions show forth to the creation and propagation of unbelief, which is resulting in the ruin of men! It is in vain that we pray for the. conversion of the world, while we keep up, foster and perpetuate division among the followers of Christ. The world will never believe till the Church is united, one, representing the one body of Christ. Till then the question of the Apostle will thunder in our ears, "Is Christ divided?" If Christ is not divided, why are those who claim to be his people divided?

Where is the man of the world who does not feel the difficulty arising from division, when he thinks of making a profession of religion? He listens to the various cries of "Lo, here! lo, there!" One saying, "Come, go with us!" and another, "Come, go with us!" Each party puts forth its claims, explains its peculiarities, shows its supposed advantages and attempts to obviate objections. In the midst of these conflicting opinions,-confused notions and absurd pretensions, Jesus is lost sight of entirely. The man never thinks of making his choice between heaven and hell, Jesus and the world, life and death, but he is perplexing his mind to make choice among these parties. He turns the question this way and that. Many of their little distinctions and petty party peculiarities he can not understand at all. He gets some of their books, and puzzles his brain with what they call *doctrine.* But this he can not understand. After vas-

cillating for weeks, may be for years, two roads are before him. Some take one, and some the other. One road is to launch into some party blindly, not knowing what its doctrine is, nor understanding it at all, and go for the party right or wrong. The other is, to become disgusted with the whole thing, deny that there is any reality in any of it, declare it all an imposture, and settle down into a gloomy, unhappy and miserable determination that he will hear no more of it! Who is to blame for all this? Modern partisans, as certain as certainty itself. Had the unity of the Spirit been maintained nothing of this kind would have happened. The man never would have been puzzled in making choice among partisans. He would have confined his mind to the simple matter of deciding between the Bible and unbelief, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil, the Lord and the world, heaven and hell, life and death, and had these transcendent matters been kept before him, he would have been a believer. But in our time the choice is not made in reference to these mighty issues, but frivolous issues, of minor importance, and, in many instances, of no importance, between parties.

In the religion of Jesus, the matter of conversion is between a man and his Savior; and the matter of his Church membership is also between him and the Lord, between the Church of Christ and the world. No man has a choice to make among different institutions of Christ, for *he has but one*. The question is simply whether a man shall receive that one, or not receive Christ at all. Christ has but one Church, one body, one temple, one building of God, the habitation of God through the Spirit. The man who receives Christ enters that body as a matter of course. There is no such work as making choice between Churches. Nor is there any such thing as making choice among doctrines. The man who receives Christ receives his Church, his doctrine, his ordinances, his commandments, and does his will. He gives himself no trouble about the comparative merits of other Churches, other doctrines, ordinances and ways. He

has settled the entire matter. He has chosen Christ for his Shepherd; he knows his voice, but the voice of a stranger he will not hear. He knows him in whom he has trusted, loves him, has chosen him for his portion and everlasting trust. He is not leaning upon a Church to save him, nor a system of doctrine or the theories of men. He has put his trust in Him, who was dead and is alive, and behold he lives forever and ever. He daily looks to heaven in most solemn, fervent devotion to Him who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, who sympathizes with us in all Our sorrows, trials and afflictions, and who has said: "I will never leave you nor forsake you, but will grant you grace and glory, and no good thing will I withhold from you." He has learned not to fear what man can do to him—not to fear them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but to fear him who, when he has killed the body, is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. He is trying to resemble his Divine Master, who came not to do his own will, but the will of him who sent him. His prayer is that the *will of God* may be done in earth as it is in heaven. The will of God is the same as the will of Christ, and his will is that all who believe, through the holy teaching of the Apostles, *may be one,* as he and his Father are one, that the *world may believe* that the Father has sent him.

Do you desire, dear reader, that the world may believe? You certainly do, if you are a child of God. Do you, then, pray, as the Lord did, that those who believe through the word *may be one,* as Jesus and the Father are one, that the *world may believe?* And do you, as the Apostle commands, "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?" Here is the beginning corner-stone, if we are to convert the world, to obtain and keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. More labor should be expended here than at any other point, in the present predicament of affairs. We should never rest till this great impediment to the world's belief is removed out of the way. Do you inquire how this is to be accomplished? We shall not go into the

details now, as we intend elsewhere to discuss them at full length, but simply say, that we must cease troubling ourselves about the comparative merits of the present parties. and make a godly, sincere and most solemn effort simply to know and to do the will of God. If we all turn our attention, prayerfully, devoutly and candidly to the Savior, anti determine to know his will and do it, we shall soon find ourselves one. We shall then aid each other in finding the way, in walking in the way, and shall become helpers of each other, and realize that we are indeed brethren.

That the ministry know that it is right to set on foot a solemn state of inquiry, simply to know the will of God, that we may do it is as certain as that they are living men. That it is their duty to do this, knowing it to be right, not a man in the whole rank doubts. That such a course would lead directly to the union of the people of God is as clear as noon-day sun. Keep their eyes off of partyism, off of partisan interests, and upon the Lord and his will, all learning and diffusing all we possibly can of his holy teachings among men. In one word, we must imbibe a love for the truth, a supreme love for the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Our researches must not be to prove doctrine, to prove that we are right, or somebody wrong, but purely to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, receive it into good and honest hearts and obey it. God is right. Jesus is right. The Holy Spirit is right. The Bible is right. This far we are all agreed now. Let us then come to God, to Jesus, to the Holy Spirit and to the Bible, and commit ourselves to Heaven to guide us, sustain us, to make us one, useful and happy while we live and crown us with eternal glory in the world to come. We appeal to all Who love Jesus, in his most precious name, to enlist in the great work of promoting peace on earth and goodwill among men, in one mighty endeavor under the gracious guidance of the Spirit, to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. O that those who believe through the word *may* be one, that the world may believe that thou hast sent our Emanuel!

No. 4. —EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

LUKE says of Jesus, that "he showed himself alive after his passage, by many infallible proofs, being seen of the disciples forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts i, 3.) The Apostle Peter, in his first discourse to a Gentile audience, said: "Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." (Acts x. 40, 41.) Paul says "he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once," of whom the greater part remained to the time of his writing. (I Cor. xv. 8.)

The only testimony we have on the other side is the testimony of the watch—the same persons alluded to" above. They afterwards changed and contradicted their first testimony. Their last testimony is that "the disciples came and stole him away while we slept." This is all we know of on this side worth mentioning.

From this testimony we must make up our minds. The testimony of the watch is very objectionable, and, we think, can not be regarded by any persons who do not wish to be deceived. To their testimony we make the following objections:

1. They had previously given a contrary testimony, when they were unbiased, of their own choice, and when they had no motives to tell a falsehood. Their first account, given before they had any conversation with anybody, was more likely to be true than any after testimony. The first objection, then, to their second account is that it contradicts the first. Both their accounts can not be true, and it is more probable that the first is true than the second.

2. The second objection to their last testimony is that they had been tampered with by the chief priests and Phar-

isees, who were known to be enemies, which precisely cor responds with their telling a different story from the first.

3. Their testimony is objectionable because it precisely corresponds with the anticipations of the chief priests and Pharisees. They commanded the guard lest the disciples should steal the body and say, He is risen from the dead. It was natural that their minds should fall back upon the expedient they had previously thought of.

4. Their testimony is objectionable because if they were asleep, as they say, they did not know what went with the body. They could not know whether it was stolen or had actually risen. Their own admission that they were asleep destroys their testimony, for men can not testify to what occurs when they are asleep.

5. Their account is objectionable because the guard came under most rigorous laws, inflicting the severest punishments upon them for delinquency. They would have risked their lives to have been found asleep. It is not probable that they would have risked all this, to have all fallen asleep, if they had felt a little drowsy.

6. They knew the time when he said he would rise. Of all other periods, they certainly would have been the most unlikely to have been asleep at this particular crisis.

7. Each watch only had to be on duty six hours in twenty-four. They could not have needed sleep.

8. Their story is incredible, because they would have been brought to punishment, if they had been asleep. But not one word is said about punishment. The matter is all suffered to pass quietly, which shows that the rulers did not attach any blame to the guard.

9. The story is incredible, because the disciples were timid, cowardly and discouraged, so that they were the last men on earth to have undertaken such a hazardous enterprize. It is believing against all reason and analogy to believe they would attempt such a thing.

10. The story is incredible, for the rulers would have compelled the disciples to have brought the body back, it

they had believed it to be in their possession. This they certainly had the power and disposition to do, and the fact that they did not do it is a clear evidence that they did not believe they had it.

11. This story is incredible, because the disciples could have done nothing with the body if they had stolen it. They could not have raised it from the dead. To have kept it in their possession would only have opened the way for their own exposure. They had no inducement to steal it.

12. They were too weak to have forced the guard and taken the body, They could not, therefore, have obtained it in that way.

13. They could not have bribed the guard, for they were too poor; they had no money.

14. They could not have persuaded the guard to give up the body, for they had no influence with them. In all these respects, the story of the guard, and the common report of the Jews for years, that *the disciples stole the body while the guard slept*, is not only objectionable but wholly incredible, and as such must be repudiated by men of sense and reason everywhere. With these very brief considerations, we shall dismiss their testimony and turn our attention to 'the testimony that alleges that he rose from the dead. We Shall find something true of a very different character.

The testimony that goes to prove the resurrection of Christ from the dead is of a most indisputable character, and only needs to be well considered to be regarded by all reasonable men. In the first place, we shall call attention to the testimony of his chosen witnesses—the Apostles. Concerning these men, it should be observed:

1. That they were not only personally acquainted with Christ for three years, but his most intimate associates and bosom companions. If he had any wicked or treasonable designs, to say the least of it, they must have known it. Not only so, but this intimate acquaintance must have enabled them to know him readily, and to recognize his person with-

out difficulty or hesitation at any time when he might a before them.

2. The Apostles appear to have been uncommonly dull and slow to receive any instruction from him, unless it was something of the most simple, literal and temporal nature.

Though he taught them that his kingdom was not of this world—that it was a spiritual kingdom—that its entrance was by a spiritual birth–that he would be betrayed into the hands of his enemies and crucified, and that he would rise again the third day,—yet his disciples did not recollect or believe a word of it. Their minds were so riveted to the idea that he was to be a mere earthly and temporal ruler and king that they did not believe or understand anything that looked beyond this.

3. When Christ was crucified, they were discouraged and said, "We thought it was he who was to have redeemed Israel." This was equivalent to saying that they were disappointed; and the fact that they returned to their former occupation—their fishing—shows that all idea of establishing a new religion was abandoned.

4. The Apostles were slow to believe the story of the resurrection, when they heard it. It seemed to them as idle tales. One of them declared that he never would believe it unless he should see the nail prints in his hands and place his hand upon the scar in his side. This shows that they not only had no thought of deceiving others, but that they were determined not to be deceived themselves.

5. It is to be observed that they could have had no temporal or worldly interest in saying that Christ rose from the dead; for no one would give them money for it. They could gain no love of the world by it. It was the most unpopular thing they could have told. It pleased nobody to hear it.

6. It was in direct opposition to their worldly interest and comfort to preach the resurrection. Of this they were admonished by the Lord previous to his death. He told them that they should be hated, despised and persecuted by men even

unto death. All this they found fulfilled to the letter soon after they commenced preaching.

7. They were naturally timid men, such as could not be expected to have the boldness and effrontery to start out and face the world with a lie upon their lips. Certainly such a man as Peter, who denied his Lord three times when faced by a damsel, could not be expected to face the great and mighty scribes and Pharisees, doctors and lawyers, lords and kings, with what he knew to be a lie in his mouth, and suffer the most intense persecutions, utterly refusing to give it up!

8. They were men of very ordinary powers, without any cunning, wit and shrewdness, such as evidently would be demanded in palming off an imposture upon the community.

9. They were illiterate men and their general information limited. They knew but little of human nature and of the ways of the world, and of course were not calculated to impose falsehood upon human society.

10. From all we know of them, they were not orators or attractive speakers, but simple, plain men, capable of telling a plain, unvarnished story correctly, but not at all capable of the twistings and devices necessary to the promulgation and defense of a falsehood.

11. It is to be observed, that they knew whether or not they were telling the truth. They could not have been mistaken. If Christ did not rise, they knew it. If he did rise, they knew it. This is a very important point, and must not be passed without strict attention.

That the reader may see that we are not mistaken here, we must make a few statements. The testimony of the Apostles does not relate to abstruse and ambiguous matters, such as required the utmost stretch of intelligence to comprehend, but one of the simplest and clearest matters of fact. They state concerning a person, with whom they had been intimately and personally acquainted for three years, whom all admit to have been dead, that they saw him alive again, were with him, ate with him, handled him, and heard his voice on various occasions, during a space of forty days. Not

only so, but they state that he enabled them to speak m an immense variety of tongues, such as they had never learned, and that he gave them power to raise the dead, to heal the sick, and a great variety of matters of this kind, which they must have known to be either *true* or *false* as certainly as that they were living men. It follows, therefore, that they could not have been mistaken in their statements concerning the resurrection of Christ. Twelve men could not think they saw him repeatedly, ate with him, handled him, and heard his voice during a space of forty days, after an acquaintance of three years, when there was nothing of it. They could not think themselves endowed with all the wonderful powers claimed by them, if they did not possess them. There is no possible chance for mistake here. If they told what was not true, they knew it. No man who can and is willing to reason on the subject can say the Apostles were *honest* but *deceived* men—that they thought Christ rose from the dead when he did not. This is out of the question.

Could the Apostles have been dishonest men? Let us inquire what evidence we have that they were honest men. We claim that they must have been candid, for the following reasons:

1. They all agree in telling virtually the same story, viz.: that Christ rose from the dead. This was the burden of their theme wherever they went.

2. They were never charged with any crime; with any evil done to society, or with any misdemeanor of any kind except preaching Christ and the consequences that followed it.

3. All they suffered goes to show the value they placed upon the doctrine they taught, and the importance of their integrity to it. Their statement that Christ had risen from the dead was the point at issue. All was suspended upon this one point. Was their statement true? Their enemies demand of them to renounce it, or to be cruelly beaten. They prefer to be beaten. Could we think them dishonest when they would thus suffer for their word? If they knew their

statement to be false, can we believe they would suffer themselves to be cruelly beaten sooner than renounce it?

4. If the statement that Christ rose from the dead was not true, it was the most useless and silly statement that could have been made, and nothing could have been lost on their part by renouncing it at any moment. Can a man in his senses believe that they would, under all the circumstances, and on such various occasions, have suffered as they did, sooner than to have renounced a statement that they *knew to be false,* and that could not be of any value to them or to. anybody else?

5. Can any reasonable man believe that twelve men would unite in making and maintaining such an unprofitable and useless statement as that Christ rose from the dead, if they knew that he did not rise, stick to it, suffer for it through long toil and hardships, and at last give their lives for it? If this statement was not true, *they knew it;* and yet not one of them, by any threat, persecution, or even the taking of life, could ever be induced to utter a falsehood?

What motive could thus induce them to stick to, suffer, and even die for what they knew to be false? Why should men be thus devoted to a falsehood? Greater faithfulness and integrity to the truth itself can not be found in all history. Men can not act without motive. If they knew this statement was not true, what motive had they for making it, maintaining it, and dying for it? If not true, it promised them nothing but hatred, malice, poverty, persecution and death. Is it possible that they Would have endured all these for no other privilege or benefit than that of stating what they *knew to be false?*

9. But if we insist that these men were uncandid, then all men must be uncandid; for no man ever gave higher evidence of candor and sincerity than they who gave their lives sooner than retract their statements. Or, if we say they were liars, then all men may be liars, for no men ever gave higher evidence of confidence in their statements than they who died sooner than retract their words. This the holy Apos-

tles did, and, if we treat with disrespect their word, we may upon the same principle despise the word of all men; none ever have or ever can give greater evidence of honesty and integrity than did they.

7. The conclusion is that, if these witnesses were not mistaken, but actually knew whether they told the truth as we have seen they certainly did; and if they were honest as we have seen they must have been, their statement that *Christ rose from the dead* must inevitably be true. If this be not the case, we can come to no certain conclusion from any evidence in any case; for no witnesses ever testified who knew more certainly whether they told the truth or not, and no witnesses ever gave higher or more indisputable proofs that they were honest men. But here we dismiss this point, as the limits of these papers will not allow us to discuss the question at greater length. Reader, *your* resurrection from the dead hangs upon this point!

No. III.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: In our second letter, we endeavored to show, from the history of the case, and from our Lord's solemn prayer, that our divisions tend to infidelity, and that the conversion of the world depends upon the *union of Christians.* In this, our third letter, we shall approach one of the most shocking errors of our generation.

3. Blindness has befallen a large portion of the religious world, in reference to that which, above all things, should be clear to all, both great and small, learned and unlearned, rich and poor, high and low, viz.: *the way into the favor of God.* That men should have somewhat perverted the ordinances, the worship, ceremonies or the morals of religion, is not so strange. But that they should have obscured the clear way to God, the way of admission into Christ, the process of initiation or the terms of pardon, and involved the whole matter in the dark, is one of the most singular and strange things in all the mystic workings of the apostasy. Yet such is the fact. Though several Churches unite in saying: "To these Church officers the keys of the kingdom of" heaven are committed," and it is declared in their standard works that "they can remit and retain sins," they can no more show the sinner the way to pardon than if the Bible had been entirely silent on that important theme. One Church in our horizon has annexed to it a kind of portico for its unbaptized seekers, mourners or inquirers, who are "not full members," not converted or regenerated. These are serious persons, seekers or inquirers, received on trial. Why is this provision made? It is made out of sympathy for well-disposed, serious and sincere persons, who are earnestly seeking the Lord, but who *can not find him*. The preachers have given them all the light they have, done all they can for them, and have

failed to show them the way to God, and, out of pity, they receive them, not as "full members," but "on trial." Many of these, as sincere souls as live, as truly penitents and as fit subjects for reception in Christ's kingdom as are on earth, are kept here seeking, inquiring and mourning, *without finding,* without a preacher that can show them the wav. or that *knows* the way himself to God, for weeks, months, years, and, in some cases, more than twenty years!

One lady more than fifty years of age, who lived neighbor to us, of as unquestioned reputation as any lady, whose name can be had if anybody desires it, not more than two or three hours before she died, told us that she had been identified with a Church more than twenty years as a *seeker,* and had numerous times conversed with the best preachers in her Church, but they could not show her the way to God, and assured us that she was now dying without pardon and without God. Such was her language as long as she could speak. Who is to be responsible for such as her? We have known preachers to hold what they styled a "Session," the object of which was for inquirers to meet with the preacher for the purpose of obtaining information. Many serious, honest persons, as desirous to serve God as any that live, attend these sessions time after time, but find no relief. The preacher can no more show them the way to the Lord than if he had never read the Bible. Probably he exhorted them to read the Bible, to attend Church, to pray and continue seeking, and the Lord will bless them, probably soon, but it. may be a long time first. Thus hundreds and thousands of as honest, sincere and penitent souls as the world contains, are kept seeking, inquiring and mourning, year after year, without ever finding, who die without the consolations of the Gospel. These are all believers, penitents and inquirers, ready at any moment to come to God, when the *way* shall be pointed out. You may say the minister is *sincere,* that the preachers *are good* men; but what does that avail? If they can not show a believing penitent how he can obtain pardon, how he can enter into covenant with God, how he can obtain

the salvation of his soul, he has no commission from Jesus Christ.

If ever there is a time when poor, erring creatures, as we are, should be dealt with tenderly, it is when they become believing penitents and desire to come to God. If ever there is a time when they need clear, reliable and satisfactory instruction, it is at this point. A system that stumbles the poor sinner, the believing penitent, here, involves him and leaves him in the dark, to wander and perish in despair, as thousands have done, is not only *not divine,* but is *cruel in the extreme.* We are not looking at extreme or exceptionable cases, but we are looking at the legitimate workings of this practice, not in a few, cases, that might be accounted for, hut a vast multitude. No practice on earth, that we are acquainted with, is liable to such frequent, constant and serious failures. Even admitting that, in all cases where they profess to find pardon at the anxious seat or mourner's bench, the relief they feel is a genuine conversion—pardon is obtained, which no man can prove—what proportion of the seekers are safe? Lift up your eyes, and seriously look over the whole practice; sac, candidly, what proportion of all that seek in this way even profess to obtain pardon? Your heart responds, *not one-fourth.* Some of the most sincere and abiding persons among them continue to come again and again for years, and *never find.* Some come a few times, and turn away to the world, and become much more hardened than ever. Some turn from it, saying they have been deceived, disappointed, and deny the Bible. So far as religion is concerned, they are ruined. Who is to be held responsible for this horrible work? What would we think of a physician who would lose three-fourths of all the patients who confided themselves to his medical advice? You would declare his practice a *failure.*

The reader will observe, we do not hold the ministry responsible for any only those put under their treatment—penitent believers—who do what the preacher directs, or follow his prescription. These he is justly responsible for. He

preaches with great power of the sinfulness of man, and of the all-sufficiency of the Savior, and they come to the preacher, inquiring, *What shall we do?* He tells them what do. They do what he tells them. Three-fourths of them do not profess to find pardon or any relief. Here is a failure! They come again, and again fail! Again they come, but fail! Thus they are disappointed, over and over again, and many of them never find. Where did any persons ever come the Apostles, or any preacher of Christ in their time, inquiring, What shall I do? and fail to find? Never, in a single instance. Every person that inquired of them, What shall we do? was forthwith told what to do; and every human being that did what they directed was pardoned, or saved from sin. There was not a failure in the first hundred years of the Church. When Peter preached his first discourse in Jerusalem, three thousand seekers inquired of him: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" He told them what to do. They were believing penitents. He commanded: "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." They did as he commanded them, and every one of them found pardon or salvation from sin. This was realizing the promise of Jesus, "They who seek shall find." Again Peter preaches in Solomon's porch. An immense assembly hear him. Five thousand come to the man of God and inquire the way. He shows them all the way to the Redeemer, or to pardon. Not a man went away seeking. All who sought found. In a short time Philip is making his way to Samaria. All the believing penitents that came to him inquiring the way were shown what they must do. Not a believing penitent came to this man seeking salvation that did not find it. Not a seeker went away seeking. The man of God is commanded, by the Spirit of God, to join himself to the chariot of the Ethiopian nobleman. He joins him as commanded, and finds him reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. The officer inquires of the preacher: "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other

man?" The preacher "began at the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus." "They came to a certain water." The nobleman inquired what he should do, and the preacher forthwith told him. "See, here," said the Ethiopian, "is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" The preacher replied: "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." He said: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The historian says: "They both went clown into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him; and when they came up out of the water, the eunuch went on his way rejoicing." He was shown the way to the Lord in the first interview with the preacher.

We have not an account left, in the Bible, nor out of it, written in the first century, of a believing penitent coming to a preacher of Christ, in the entire period of the Apostolic age, inquiring the way into the kingdom of God, or the way to salvation or pardon of sin, who was not shown the way on the first interview with the preacher. The preachers of Jesus, in that day, kept no believing penitents seeking, mourning and inquiring for weeks, months and years, without finding God. Such a thing was not known in that day. They never disappointed any sincere, believing penitents, by giving them directions in which they would fail to find pardon. Every person that followed their directions found salvation. There was never a solitary failure. There never was a failure in anything that God promised; not a single failure in an appointment of heaven, from the beginning of time till now. Where God has promised to meet the poor, sin-sick soul—the believing penitent—he will meet him, All those places where honest and sincere souls seek, are disappointed and find not, are places where God has not appointed nor promised to meet them. Not a single case is mentioned in the New Testament of any person doing what the Apostles directed and being disappointed. Every person that followed their directions found salvation. Nor does any person now, that follows their directions, fail. These failures are all in following other directions.

No wonder that the public confidence is so shaken in religious matters. When the preacher, professing to show the way to heaven, gives his directions to the believing penitent, inquiring what he shall do, in full confidence he proceeds to do as directed, but receives not the promise, is not pardoned or saved from sin! He is disappointed, deceived and discouraged. The preacher tells him to "try again." He comes again, and most sincerely, solemnly and earnestly from the bottom of his heart, complies with the directions; does all he is commanded to do, precisely as the preacher prescribes, but fails again — finds not! The preacher exhorts him to "try again!" Again he tries! but in vain; he finds not God! The preacher thus continues with him for weeks, months, and, in many instances, for years, and thousands of these believing, penitent souls, as sincere and desirous to serve God as any human being can be, die seeking, without ever even *thinking* they are pardoned! Such a practice as this is a failure, a delusion and a deception that has ruined, and is now ruining, many as honest, sincere and well-meaning persons as can be found; and it is the duty of all good men to forsake it, abandon it entirely as soon as possible, and use their utmost exertions to save all from its baleful influence.

How can the people have any confidence in a practice that has, in so many thousands of instances, proved a failure, and is constantly proving a failure before their own eyes? How can preachers have the assurance to ask the people to come to the mourner's bench, anxious seat, or altar of prayer, as a part of the process in conversion, knowing as they must that there is neither precept nor example for it in all the Bible; and when they know that there are scores in almost every community that have come again and again, "tried it" over and over, without finding salvation? How could a physician have the assurance to ask you to take a medicine which he has been administering for weeks without affording any relief? How can a preacher have the assurance to ask persons in search of salvation of their souls to follow directions that have failed in so many thousands of

instances, as they admit themselves? Must the infallible directions of the inspired Apostles of the Lamb, that never failed in a single instance, be set aside and supplanted by such a practice as this? Why should any preacher prefer such a practice to the unfailing practice set before us upon the holy pages of the Bible? O that the time may speedily come when the desire of men shall be to practice as the first Christians, not only in conversion, but in everything else!

No. 5.—EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

PROPOSITION XVII. It is infallibly safe to believe in the Christian religion—to rely and practice upon.

1. The holy martyrs valued it above all worldly gain, and even life itself. Some of these had seen Christ, and were well acquainted with his teachings, his life and his death. Many of them knew the Apostles personally, knew their doctrine well, and knew well all their claims to supernatural power. They knew the doctrine and practice of the Churches, as well as the life and death of many of the members. In view of the whole premises, these men coolly and deliberately gave up the pleasures of the world, wealth, all the comforts of life, friends, and life itself, for the faith of Christ. If these, then, knowing the whole premises, valued it thus highly, and gave such a price for it, is not he, to say the least of it, infallibly safe who receives it into a good and honest heart, in our times, and practices it in his life?

2. Many men renounce infidelity in the immediate expectation of death. This shows that it is unsafe and that it rests upon a tottering foundation. If there is any time, too, when we need to rest upon a firm rock, it is at this last and most solemn trial. What a thought, then, to find all confidence destroyed, and to be vacillating in that awful trial! When the mortal structure is emaciated, the limbs enfeebled, the strength declining, the mind weakened, the heart sickened with death, the cold sweat upon the face, and eternity just in view, what a thrilling thought that the nonsense that dwelt upon a man's lips through life, has vanished from his soul, and the mists dissipated from his eyes, and all that he rested upon is gone—is sunk forever! He is tossed to and fro on a boisterous ocean! If the Bible could prove untrue, it only darkens the future and destroys all hope. If it proves. true, he is condemned forever!

3. We have never heard of any man renouncing the Bible in the immediate expectation of death. He who rested upon it in life in every instance, could rest upon it in death. This is a wonderful fact. Why does not the Bible give way when we approach death? Because it is reality. Reality only appears the more *real* as we consider it under more solemn circumstances. The Bible is a most solemn hook, and the more solemn the circumstances under which we are placed the more certain we feel of its truth. Hence at death no man renounces the Bible. It is not only a demonstration of one of the most solemn truths, but a realization of it. If, then, it has never been known to fail, to give way, to sink and leave any person in death, but has invariably furnished the brightest hope, borne up the spirit in the most triumphant manner, and given it a glorious victory in that great and trying hour—it is infallibly safe to rely upon the Bible.

4. It is infallibly safe, because no man has ever been able to show any evil consequences that could possibly follow the believer, upon any hypothesis. No man of any reason has ever doubted the safety of relying upon the Bible, if it be true. But we go beyond this, and declare, without hesitation, that if it were possible for it to prove untrue, it is infallibly safe to believe and rely upon it. Its moral precepts, to say the least, are as good as any on earth. Its requirements in all our present relations are competent to make us as good and happy as we are capable of in this life. And, certainly, if it could possibly prove untrue, the belief of it could not endanger our happiness in the life to come. Beyond all controversy, he who believes and practices the Bible attains to the highest perfection and happiness of which his being is capable in this life, and stands as good a chance for happiness in the life to come as he who rejects it. And if, in the end. the whole could be shown to be a mistake, no man living can show that the believer in the Bible can possibly be in any danger, in this world ,or in the world to come. No evil consequences can possibly follow the believer in any event. It is strange, if that which is infallibly safe should not prove true.

5. He who rejects the Bible risks losing everything without the possibility of gaining anything, either in this life or that which is to come. What an unhallowed project this! If, in the end, the Bible shall prove true, as it most certainly will, he who disbelieves it is gone, and gone forever] He gains nothing for all his pains in this life—does no good to one human being by disbelieving the doctrine, but evidently does much injury, the consciousness of which will upbraid him forever, and he will leave the world with the positive assurance that he has lost all and is undone forever! What a project! What an experiment! Let no young man, into whose hands these papers may fall, ever embark in an experiment, in which all admit that nothing can be gained in this world or in the next, and where all may be irrecoverably lost.

6. If such an irrecoverable loss will certainly be sustained by the unbeliever, in case the Bible prove true, and no loss can possibly accrue to the believer, even if it should prove untrue, men should have great certainty of its untruth before they risk to reject it. If nothing can be gained, as we have seen is the case, in this life or in the life to come, by rejecting the Bible, even if it should prove untrue, and, if everything shall be lost, in case it prove true, a man should be infallibly certain that it is not true before he should reject it; and, even in that case, he should feel no interest in it, for that which has no serious consequences can not be of much importance. This must be self-evident to all.

7. The question then comes up: Can any man be infallibly certain that the Bible is false? We insist that no man can be certain of this. No man was ever certain of it, or ever will be, and but very few get *to feel* certain of it. There is a vast difference between the man who *doubts* the truth *of* the Bible and the man that *knows* it to be false. A man could doubt its truth and it still be as true as if he had never doubted it; but no man can ever *know* it to be false unless it *really is false.* In such cases as these, we should look to matter of fact. How many men do we find who even *feel*

certain that the Bible is false? They are comparatively few: and yet how easy it is for men to *feel* certain of things that are not so! The truth in the case is this, about as far as men usually get is to *doubt* the truth of the Bible. Here and there, one works himself up *to feel* certain that it is not true, but no one is or can be *certain* that it is not true. Here is precisely the difference between a Christian and an unbeliever. The Christian is established upon a rock, where he can remain unshaken and without any misgivings, in the severest trials that can befall him in this life, and even in death. In this last trial, he may have doubts as to his being faithful to his profession, but he can have no doubts of the truth of the profession itself. Faith in Christ never fails in death. Here is an immovable basis upon which the soul may rest in the last and severest trials.

8. On the other hand, it is our conviction that, in nine cases out of ten, those who have been skeptics renounced it before death. At that last, most trying and solemn hour in this state, when, above all others, the man needs support, unbelief fails and leaves the poor sinking mortal without any support for his soul! How shocking the scene! He has fed his soul upon doubts through life, in death they were dissipated; and that Bible, that he previously doubted, appears now an awful reality. The Savior whom he had so frequently derided and despised, is the only mediator of whom he can think, by whom he can approach to God. What an awful state, too, for a dying man to be compelled to repudiate and reject the nonsense that had dwelt upon his lips all his life! Yet such is the inevitable result in death, with an overwhelming majority of unbelievers. Will men continue to talk infidelity when, in the ordinary course of things, so many of them will have to retract with shame in death?

9. If, then, men never renounce Christianity in death, but such an overwhelming majority do renounce unbelief, there must be a reason for this difference. That reason grows out of the certainty on the one hand and the uncertainty on the other; the safety on the one hand and the danger on the

other; the reality on the one hand and the fiction on. the other; the faith on the one hand and the doubts on the other; the good on the one hand and the evil on the other. In the last solemn trial, it is more probable that certainty, safety, reality, faith and goodness should stand the test, than uncertainty, unsafety, fiction, doubts and evil. The man who stands upon the former, stands upon the rock of ages; the man who builds upon the latter, builds upon the sand and can count upon nothing but an inevitable and an irrecoverable fall—a fall to rise no more.

10. If Christianity be proved true, it must be by testimony; or if it be proved false, it must be by testimony. If we are asked for the evidences of its truth, we hesitate not to appeal to the highest historical evidence, both ancient and modern; to its stupendous miracles; to the testimony of its own proper witnesses; to the testimony of its enemies; to its internal evidence; and to the character of those who adhere to its precepts. But to what evidence, does any man appeal to prove the Bible to be false? Not to ancient or modern history; for infidels have long since repudiated the "evidence of old musty books." Not to miracles; for they repudiate miracles. Not to any internal evidence; for there is no system of unbelief possessed of one particle of internal evidence. Not to the effects of unbelief upon the lives of its adherents; for they always condemn it. Not to the great number of great men who have opposed the Bible, nor to any evidence that opposing the Bible has proved a blessing to mankind in any age or country. Not to any proof that unbelievers have been great in numbers, or that they have furnished great benefactors of our race, or that believers in the Bible have not been great in numbers, and furnished an innumerable number of benefactors of mankind. Infidelity has a dark list to look at in this direction.

11. If we had the prophets, Apostles, and all the martyrs before us, standing in a rank on the one hand, and their opposers on the other, could we feel any hesitation which to believe? Could any man have more confidence in those who

persecuted the prophets than in the prophets themselves? Could any man have more confidence in those who persecuted Jesus than in Jesus himself? Could any man have more confidence in those who persecuted the Apostles than in the Apostles themselves? What man in his right mind would sooner rely upon those who put the martyrs to death than upon the martyrs themselves? What reasonable man of intelligence can have more confidence in Hume, Volney, Gibbon, Paine, Voltaire and Owen, than in Paley, Watson, Locke, Newton, Clarke, McKnight, Dodridge and Horne? Who, in his right mind, can doubt that these latter knew vastly better than the former what the truth was, and that they would be equally as likely to tell it?

12. It is frequently the case that young men reject the Bible without ever having read it once through. Nor have they ever read ten other books through. What do such know about what they are rejecting? It must he absolutely certain that they know nothing about what they are doing. The act, on their part, is a mere act of indifference, without any reflection, and is entitled to no influence in society. It is, further, a piece of rashness, unworthy of imitation. Some parts of the Bible have been regarded as sacred more than three thousand years, and the whole eighteen hundred years. It has been regarded as of Divine authority by an immense number of the most wise, profoundly read and learned men on earth. The number who have rejected it, who knew anything about it, has been comparatively small, and even these have never made it a subject of study like those who have received it. The man, therefore, who relies upon what those who have rejected the Bible know about it, and follows in their footsteps, depending upon what they knew, and now know about it, relies upon what no man of reason would rely upon for the most inconsiderable pecuniary consideration. He has no evidence that he is right that could possibly justify him in making the smallest risk upon it. Yet he relies upon what little he knows about it, and upon others equally unprepared to judge, and upon a few intemperate opposers,

such as Hume, Voltaire and Paine, who gave but very little more attention to the main evidences in the case, for his rejection of the only book believed by the wise, the great and the good, to contain eternal life for man! Yet the decision he makes is so important that if he makes a mistake he is ruined forever! Is not this rashness of the first degree? No man is governed by reason who rushes blindly into such eternal consequences. He can gain nothing by it, in any event, and must, if mistaken, lose everything; and yet, touching the point of mistake, he knows comparatively nothing! This is the hight of madness!

No. IV.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: Many things among us are so bad, in themselves, and the evils they entail upon society so deplorable that we know not how to point them out satisfactorily, and show them up adequately without giving offense. It is always unpleasant to correct wrongs that have become prevalent, sanctioned and established by general usage, or even to point them out. When any attempt at the correction of error is made, no matter by whom, how solemnly or conscientiously done, the effort will be regarded as innovation, and he who does it as an innovator. A lady, a few weeks ago, where we were delivering a series of discourses, said that she did not think it was right to hear us preach, for our preaching was calculated to "unsettle *the minds of the people."* We know this is true in some respects; hut the question is, whether it is wiser, better or more in accordance with the will of God to unsettle the minds of the people than allow them to remain in the most ruinous errors. That there are ruinous errors now practiced, errors that involve people in the most serious difficulties and perplexities, not only while they live, but *at death,* is as manifest as day to any man that thinks.

Many parents are led on by their preachers, and by the practice of the Church, to involve their children in troubles from which they never get free in this world, in matters as wholly unauthorized as worshiping relicts, praying people out of purgatory or granting indulgences. Matters of this kind can not be allowed to slumber now. The plea for reformation is demanded as much now as it was thirty years ago; and no man. not dead in trespasses and sins, can fail to see it; and no man, but a spiritual and theological coward, who has ever engaged in the good work of reformation, will

relax his energies. The plea must be urged for a return to Christianity as it was at the beginning, and reformation from everything not authorized in the word of God. If they speak not according to these oracles, it is because there is no light in them.

But we shall not continue to speak in this general way. A specification must be made, and good reasons given for what we have said. The most ruinous and corrupting practice that has ever gained footing in the Church, upon a benevolent pretext, *is the practice of infant membership.* It is doing more now, has done more ever since introduced, and will, so long as practiced, to corrupt, carnalize and secularize the Church, and has involved more people in difficulty and serious trouble than any practice ever known. It affects the Church in the following particulars:

1. It is at war with personal responsibility and account. ability. If anything is evident from the Scriptures, it is that entering into covenant with God is a personal matter—that a person must, *for himself,* enter into covenant with God. There is no such thing in Christianity as one person putting another into the covenant without his knowledge and consent.

2. It is at war with preaching to sinners to convert them, or to bring them to God. If the practice were to prevail at large, all would he brought into the Church before they eve, heard any preaching, before they knew God, or knew there was a God. This would contradict the language of the prophet, who says, speaking of those in the new covenant: "They shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest." There is no such thing in Christianity as bringing persons into the Church first, or before they have ever been preached to, and then preaching to them.

3. It is at war with, and sets aside faith. There never was a person in the primitive Church without faith. No man can show how any person can be brought into the Church without faith, according to the Scriptures. For the first two centuries not a preacher, so far as the Bible and all

history informs us, ever proposed such a thing as receiving any person into the Church without faith. Not a preacher now in the world has any authority for receiving one soul into the Church without faith. Such a thing as receiving persons into the Church without faith is not only a dreadful perversion, but a monstrosity in religion. In the primitive Church it was said: "We are all the children of God by faith in Christ."

4. It subverts repentance, and sets it aside. No preacher of Christ was ever authorized to receive any person into the Church without repentance. Repentance is before entering the Church. Such a thing as entering the Church first, and then repenting, is unknown to the New Testament. This is a dreadful and fearful perversion of the Divine arrangement.

5. It sets aside private judgment, choice or volition, in. the following particulars: 1. Whether to be a member of a Church at all or not. This is a matter in which God has , left all free to *choose for themselves.* All must decide whether they will be in the Church or out of it for themselves. No one can decide this for another. To rob persons of the right to choose or decide for themselves whether they will enter a Church at all, by committing them to one before they know it, is robbing them of that which makes them moral agents. It is cruel in the extreme, and subversive of all moral influence. 2. What Church they shall identify themselves with. If people wish to be identified with a Church, they have the right to choose or decide what Church they shall be identified with. It is robbing them of this right to identify them with a Church before they know there is a Church, or a God. It is cruel and wicked to deprive our children of the same right to decide for themselves that we have for ourselves. What father or mother knows that a child will choose the Church of its parents? How do any parents know, when identifying their child with a Church, that it will not be in the most direct opposition to the choice of the child? No parent can know this, and it is cruel and wicked to identify a child with any religious system before it can

think and choose for itself. 3. Whether it will have infant baptism. No man knows that his child will believe in infant baptism. Why shall infant baptism be fastened upon the conscience of a child before it can choose or decide between that and *believer's* baptism! It is tampering with the dearest rights of the child to impose such a ceremony as this upon it, before it is known whether it will believe in it. It is taking advantage of it before it can think, act or decide for itself, and tying it down to something that may be contrary to its entire consciousness of what is right, and may be a means of keeping it from doing what it believes to be right to the day of its death, and cause it to mourn in deep grief when dying Parents had better think what they are doing here, or they may find themselves responsible in matters greater than they are aware of. 4. Whether it will have sprinkling or immersion. How does any father know that his child will choose sprinkling? No father knows this, or can know it at all. The child he is having sprinkled may never believe sprinkling to be baptism at all. Why, then, impose a ceremony like this upon the child, before anyone knows, or can know, that it will ever have any confidence in it? If it has any influence upon it, that influence may be to lead it to defend and try to maintain an unauthorized ceremony, because it is involved in it; or it may be, to prevent it from doing what it conscientiously believes to be right. What good parent desires to involve children in any such dilemma?

6. Infant baptism subverts and sets aside all conscience in baptism. No one thinks of such a thing as an infant having any conscience in baptism. Yet the holy Apostle says: "It is the answer of a good conscience." How can it be the answer of a good conscience to an unconscious child? There can not be a particle of connection between baptism and the conscience of an infant, for it knows nothing about baptism or conscience either.

7. Baptism, the initiatory rite, or the act of entering the Church, is a command. All commands must be preceded by faith. The Divine authority requiring baptism must be

recognized before the command can be obeyed; and the Divine authority can only be recognized by"faith. How, then, can a command be obeyed by one without faith, without a consciousness of Divine authority, or even the knowledge that the command exists? Such a practice subverts the command of God in every case where it obtains, and if it should become universal would set aside and annihilate all obedience to the command to be baptized. In every case, where an infant is baptized and prevailed upon in after life to be content with its baptism and infant membership, one person is effectually prevailed upon never to obey the command to be baptized, and never, personally, to bow to the authority of Jesus in voluntarily entering into covenant with him. The person is deceived, and made to think, when come to the years of accountability, that two things have been done, viz.: First—That the command to be baptized has been obeyed. Second—That the requirement to enter into the Church has been complied with. Neither the one nor the other has been complied with at all.

8. Infant membership subverts the heart-work in entering into the Church. There is no such thing as heart-work in infant membership. The heart has nothing to do with it. Christianity begins at the heart, and not at an external ceremony. No external ceremony is worth anything not preceded by a preparation of heart. It is one of the most astonishing things that we are acquainted with that men, professing faith in God and the work of God upon the hearts of those brought to God, should think there is any virtue in a mere external rite. an empty ceremony, without the heart or affections in it! A greater cheat has never been palmed upon the Christian world nor upon the souls of children than that they have been given to God and received into the Church by sprinkling a few drops of water upon the face, without the heart and soul having anything to do with the matter.

9. Infant baptism fills the Church with unconverted people. No preachers in apostolic times, ever proposed to receive

any unconverted persons into the Church. If any unconverted person found way into the Church, it was through hypocritical pretense; but now the effort is to baptize and take into the Church as many unconverted persons as possible, then tell them, as soon as they can understand it, that you gave them to God in baptism and that they are members of the Church, and thus rock them to sleep in carnal security, making them believe all is well, without ever having been regenerated, converted, or a Divine impression ever being made on their hearts at all. How parents can more stupidly ruin their children, is difficult to perceive. What a vast number are now wrapped in carnal security in precisely this way—going to Church, thinking they are in the body of Christ, that have never been awakened to a sense of their. sinfulness and unsaved state! And in the place of their parents trying to awaken them to a sense of their sinful condition and the necessity of repentance and bowing themselves to Heaven, they are trying to lull them to sleep with the notion that they have been given to God, and that all is well! Should not such a practice he discarded?

No. V.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: In our Letter No. 4, we treated of the evils resulting from infant Church membership, the difficulties it involves, and the result that follows. The idea of making Church members of persons who know not God, nor Jesus the Savior, nor the Holy Spirit; without faith, repentance or a single spiritual 'impression or impulse, is so preposterous, ridiculous and absurd, that we unhesitatingly maintain that all pious men who love God and desire to maintain the purity of the Church ought to discountenance it. The idea of the clergy not being satisfied with the number they can induce to go into spiritual bondage, by argumentation, in their writings and pulpits, of those capable of hearing, reading and thinking for themselves, but determining to bind down infants in spiritual despotism before they can think, know or act in reference to the matter at all—secure them down in spiritual bondage before it can be known whether it will be their choice or not—-is one of the most abhorrent ideas ever countenanced by civilized people. It is robbing them of their freedom in the highest and most responsible act of their lives. It ignores their right to choose God for their portion, Jesus for their Master, the people of God for their associates, the house of God for their home, and the law of God for their rule of faith and practice, and binds upon their souls, before they know or can know anything, whatever system of spiritual despotism, the ignorance or superstition a mother, or her preacher, may see fit to impose upon them.

We deny that a Church membership, without faith, without repentance, confession, the knowledge of God, of Christ, the Holy Spirit—without the person's own heart, consent or knowledge—Is known to the law of Christ. There can be no such thing as Church membership in Christ's kingdom

without the knowledge, consent and heart of the person. A pretended membership, without the knowledge of the person, the heart, the consent and act, is an empty deception, a miserable delusion. We put it to any man to show where any religious ceremony or rite in the kingdom of Christ was ever of any value, or acceptable to the Lord without the knowledge of God, without faith, repentance, the heart, consent or personal action of the individual. Such a thing is wholly unknown to the New Testament. The entire New Testament is destitute of any mention of a member of the Church without faith. We find not there an intimation of a member without repentance, without having personally yielded to Divine authority, and given up the heart to God. What a horrible delusion to make people believe that they were made members of the body of Christ by the simple ceremony of sprinkling a few drops of water upon the face, without faith, repentance or any knowledge of God—without their own hearts being in it, without their consent or knowledge! Nothing can be more effectual in opposing Jesus than the propagation of the preposterous notion that persons can be made members of his mystical body without knowing Christ!

What mighty talents, too, it must require to make Church members of unconscious infants, before they know whether they are made Christians, Jews or Mohammedans! How learned such a ministry should be, to proselyte, sprinkle and make members of infants before they are conscious beings! What mighty talents are required to come in to an unconscious infant and sprinkle a few drops of water upon its face in the name of the Trinity!! Numerous hosts of ministers themselves, now styled doctors of divinity, maintaining with great pertinacity the doctrine and creed of their Church, had no more choice in the Church, creed or doctrine with which they should be identified than they had in the time and place when and where they should be born, or the persons who should be their parents. They were in their Church, identified with their creed and doctrine, not only without their

choice and consent, without faith or a spiritual impression, but before they knew their right hand from their left! They were received into the Church first and then, some ten years afterward, made choice of the Church they were already in! They were identified with a system of religion first, and then, many years afterward, informed what that system was. They were in the Church some ten or twelve years not only without faith, but without knowing what the faith of the Church was, and then taught to believe. They were in the Church first many years, and then taught to give their hearts to God!

Protestants blame Romanists for depriving the people of the right of *private judgment,* and step right into the footprints of Romanists, and deprive their own children of this same inalienable right, in binding upon them not only unauthorized rites and ceremonies, but systems of religion, without any more knowledge whether it will be in accordance with their "private judgment" than they have what State their children will choose to live in. What an insatiable desire for proselyting a people must have, and what a determination to bring others under their religious system, right or wrong, to join with their priests in branding their children with the mark of the beast, and, as far as in their power, binding them down in the same spiritual bondage with themselves, before they can have any choice, consent or knowledge! No person is spiritually free who did not for himself choose the religion for his adoption, the Church he would enter and the doctrine with which he would be identified, and, by his *own act,* for himself enter into covenant with God. The idea of fastening religious systems and binding them upon the souls of infants as soon as they are born. before they can make any choice, act for themselves or know what is done for them, is more in keeping with the character of a cowardly, sly and insidious Romish priest, who knows that he can not maintain his practice in fair, open and manly argumentation and pulpit efforts, hut who pretends, and makes silly parents believe that he can make a *Christian* of

all infant, without faith, or even the knowledge of the Deity, than the character of a noble Protestant, preaching that "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants."

Into the kingdom of Christ no man can enter without being born again—" born of water and of the Spirit." He who applies this to infants, teaches that infants must be regenerated or they can not enter into the kingdom of God. If this is the case, it is not baptism they need, nor Church membership; for neither of these is regeneration. Hence that creed that perverts the words of Jesus: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," and makes them read, *"None* can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost," and applies them to infants, not only does injustice to the passage in *changing the language,* and misapplying it, but regards infants unregenerated, or needing regeneration, and encourages the notion that they are regenerated by baptism, and, as a matter of course, that unbaptized infants are unregenerated and unsaved. Hence the Romanists, from whom all Protestant parties, so far as the practice goes, have obtained the doctrine of infant membership: held that all unbaptized infants are pagans and will be lost. Those Protestants who believe in infant membership are constantly using terms that imply the same. How frequently you hear them speak of "dedicating their children to the Lord," "consecrating them to the Lord," and "giving them to the Lord," as if they were not his before in the fullest and highest sense, till they by personal, or, as the theologians say, by *actual* transgression, depart from him. Whose were they before they were thus "dedicated," "consecrated," or "given to the Lord?" Were they not the Lord's as much before as after this unmeaning ceremony? Surely, they were. What, then, does the ceremony do for them? Nothing under the shining sun, only to commit them to, fasten upon them, "and bind them down under a system, before they can know right and wrong, good and evil—before they can have any choice, give any consent, or

act for themselves? This is as irrational as it would be to bind them to live in the same State and the same county where their parents live, and more so, for it is a matter of so much greater moment.

But did they not bring young children to Jesus? They did; but not to make Church members of them, or to have them baptized, but "that he might put his hands on them and bless them;" or, as one writer has it, "put his hands on them and pray." The circumstance that our Lord "put his hands upon little children and blessed them," "put his hands upon them and prayed," is a slender prop for infant baptism, or membership. The words "blessed them" are not precisely identical with *making them Church members,* and the words "put his hands on them and prayed" are not precisely identical with *sprinkling a little water in their faces in the name of the Trinity.* But what reason did our gracious Lord give for saying: "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not?" Was it that they might be "dedicated to the Lord?" Was it that they could not enter into the kingdom of God, "except they be regenerate and born of water and of the Spirit?" Was it that they were sinners? No; none of these reasons, nor any like them. Why, then, suffer them to come, and forbid them not? "For," says the Lord, "of such is the kingdom of God." And to others, who had come to the years of accountability, he said: "Except you repent and become as a little child, you can not enter the kingdom of God."

"There were households made members, not excepting even the infants," says one. There is not an intimation of an infant in any of the households mentioned; but, on the other hand, conclusive evidence that there were no infants in those households: as is the case in thousands of instances now. The angel of the Lord that appeared to Cornelius directed him to send for a man who when he was come should tell him words Whereby he and his house should be saved. Surely words did not have anything to do with saving infants. Not only so, but Peter in the first sermon, restricted the whole

matter to faith, in saying that "all the prophets bear witness of him, that through his name whoever *believeth in him* shall receive remission of sins." The Philippian jailor, also, "rejoiced, *believing in God with all his house."* Whenever a whole house *believe,* there is no reason why they should not become members of the Church; but we are not in favor of any members of the Church without faith. In the ancient Church they were "all the children of God *by faith." N*one but believers, in the Bible sense, can know God. "He that cometh to God *must believe"* is the statute of Heaven. *Faith* is the limitation—the boundary line—the restriction. "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." None can come to an ordinance, or enter the Church, according to the New Testament, *without faith.* We demand in the name of our Master's cause where, in his word, is an intimation of disciplining one soul, of admitting one to an ordinance, or into the Church, *without faith. N*ew Testament justification is by faith; baptism is preceded by faith and performed in faith, when rightly performed; entrance into the Church is by faith, and all in the Church walk by faith. There is no such thing as being in Christ without faith, nor enjoying the hope of the Gospel. We walk with God by faith, enjoy the Savior by faith. A human being can not be a member of the body of Christ without faith. An infant can not believe, and, therefore, can not be a member of the Church. It is not accountable, because it *can not* believe. It needs no Church; it is not a sinner.

DIALOGUE ABOUT THE PREACHER.

The following dialogue between Dr. Pietus and Dr. Fastidious occurred in a social company in a parlor, and thinking it might be profitable to some brethren, and even Churches, we have concluded to publish it entire, without recommending or condemning it; therefore, we let it speak for itself :

DR. FASTIDIOUS. —I have for some time desired an opportunity to say a few words, though confidentially to you, Dr. Pietus, touching our preacher. I think he is not a suitable man for such a prominent place as this. You know that we frequently have men of distinction here. Besides, our city is one of prominence, and we ought to have a man of distinction.

DR. PIETUS.—I think our preacher is a good man, Doctor, a sound man, and a man of great moral worth. I thought he gave us one of the best exhortations at the prayer-meeting on last Wednesday. night I ever heard. Did you not think so?

DR. F.—I was not there. He is so uninteresting that I but rarely go to hear him. I know that he is a good man and sound enough. But then he is a very *common* man, and not sufficiently showy for us. We need a first-class preacher in a city like this; a man who can draw out an audience.

DR. P.—I never think of such a thing as a preacher to *draw Christians out to meeting*. The Lord draws me out to meeting. He has promised to be there, and I have never found his promise to fail. I am never disappointed, for I go to meeting believing that he will be there, and I always find him. But those who only go because they love some preacher frequently get disappointed; for the preacher, being a fallible creature, often fails to attend. But I do think our preacher is a good preacher. I do not know where we could get a better man.

DR. F.—We need a man of distinction and notoriety, who will attract attention and draw out an audience. I would then go out and try and do something. But I have no faith in doing anything till we have a more attractive preacher.

DR. P.—My dear sir, we will never get a preacher who can draw out an audience unless *we draw too.* As much depends upon a Church in drawing out all audience as the preacher. No preacher can draw out an audience unless the Church does its part. We must do our part as a Church, or no preacher in the world can do us any good. I still think our present preacher has done about as much for us as any man could have done under the circumstances. It is not a different kind of preacher we need, *but a different kind of a Church.* We need members that will attend the public worship, sing, pray, exhort and stand at their post. In one word, we need a Church that will stand by the preacher, encourage, sustain him and hold up his hands.

DR. F.—I never saw such a man as you are. "You can be satisfied with any kind of preaching. I never saw you present when any man preached When you did not appear satisfied no matter how bungling he was.

DR. P.—I think but little about preachers, have fewer favorites and more rarely speak in praise or complaint of preachers than almost any man you can find. I am not thinking of the *messenger,* but of the *message.*

DR. F.—-I can not bear a prosing, stammering and dry preacher. I have not heard our preacher present anything *new* in three months. I like to *learn something* when I go to hear preaching.

DR. P.—When were you at meeting last? I do not recollect seeing you for some three months in the meeting-house.

DR. F.—I have been pressed with—I have not been very well—the preaching has not suited me, and there are many in the Church that should have been excluded long since.

Dr. P.—No wonder you have heard nothing *new* from our brother, for you have not heard him at all. If his preaching had been the best in the world, it would have done you

no good, while vou did not hear it. I will tell you, nay dear brother, how to make preaching better to us. Read the Scriptures every day; pray night and morning; talk to every one you meet *about religion*, and your heart will be full of the theme. You will then like to hear any man who can preach at all. Attend all the meetings, participate in the songs, prayers, exhortations, and all the other parts of public worship, and you will then be interested in all that you hear from good men.

DR F.—Your notions of preaching will not do. Our city is one of intelligence. This community, you must recollect, is highly enlightened, and we must have a man here that keeps pace with the age. We frequently have statesmen, lawyers, physicians and men of the first rank in attendance, and it is useless to think of interesting these with any *common* talents. We must have a man of taste, refinement, and highly accomplished.

DR. P.—When did our Lord ever try to arrest the attention of the elite of this world by *show*, by mere human *polish and flourish? N*ever, never, Doctor, as you certainly know. Are you not aware, my dear sir, that the wisdom of God is not in this vain and worldly thing that you speak of ? Sensible people, those truly enlightened and great, can understand the Gospel, appreciate and receive it, when it is simplified and made appreciable to the masses of the people. Not only so, Doctor, but the class you aim to please, though enlightened in the things of the world and accomplished, they are more unenlightened in the things of the kingdom of God than many that you never think of pleasing. I am for a preacher that will try to please the Lord, whether he pleases your distinguished men or not.

DR. F.—We have had some of the best speakers in the world here, and the truth is the people here know what good talent is, and they will not be satisfied with ordinary men. The people here have been well taught. No man can attract attention here unless he is a superior man.

DR. P.—That the people here have heard some men of

good preaching talent is true; but that they are well-read and well-taught in Christianity is far from true. That they understand Jesus or the Apostles well is far from true. Many perfectly country places and rural districts contain far more Gospel light than may be found in the bounds of our congregation. We presume that we are wise, while many plain men from the country are astonished when they converse with us that we are so ignorant. To be plain with *you*, my dear brother, I know of no place where there is; at this time, more need of plain, old-fashioned, New Testament preaching than here. It is not worldly show that we need; we have that now in abundance. We need the simple teachings of Jesus, solemnly and affectionately impressed upon our hearts, by some good man who loves us. and will try to save us. In the place of being inflated with the conceit that we are well-taught, far advanced and highly elevated in Christian attainments, so that no man, except one of the most exalted accomplishments, can teach us, we should be sensible of what is the true state of the case, viz.: that almost any plain and good man who preaches among us can teach us many useful lessons that we do not know.

DR. F.—I can not agree with you. I have had my face to burn more than once in listening to some ignorant brother blundering and trying to preach, who evidently did not understand his mother-tongue, and that, too, in the presence of some distinguished persons. I can never countenance such a state of things.

DR. P.—Doctor, I had rather hear some good man, who can not speak his mother-tongue correctly, tell the plain story of the cross of Christ, in the love of Jesus, and in the spirit and power of a holy man of God, a thousand times, than to listen to one of your *showy men*, who can preach a beautiful sermon without any Jesus, Holy Spirit, love of God, or anything else, but *the man himself*, in it. I desire preaching that will convert men to Jesus—to Christianity and not to men. The converts will then love Jesus, meet and worship

him, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. We do not want a man here to *worship him,* but to preach Jesus to us and teach us to worship him.

DR. F.—With your views of the subject we shall never do any good. We shall never draw out an audience, nor accomplish anything. I am in favor of procuring a man at a salary of two thousand or twenty-five hundred dollars, that will command the respect of our city. Then we shall do some good. I am willing to give liberally when such an arrangement can be made, but I do not think our preacher is doing any good and shall not give anything for his support.

DR. P.—I am sorry to hear you speak so. Nothing, fil my estimation, could be more disastrous to us. This would consume about all we could possibly raise, so that could not raise a dollar for missions, for colleges, the poor, or anything only to pay a man to preach *to us.* At this rate our large congregation would only just be able to support itself and bear its own weight! Who is to convert the world at this rate? If we can not do anything more than sustain ourselves, who are to support missions, build colleges and take care of the poor? If you had such a preacher as you want, he would have to do everything himself, or you would not be satisfied. Not a brother in the Church would ever pray, exhort, or do anything that would call forth a gift or develop any talents that might be among our numbers. Hence, in all these city Churches, where some great man is the center of attraction, they rarely ever bring forward any young preachers, or develop any new talent. They simply monopolize talent brought out and developed some place else. I am in favor of preachers of ability, not only in our city Churches, but as far as possible in all the Churches. But the way must be opened among us for the development of talent in the Church. Our pride must not despise insipient efforts—plain and humble men, nor human weakness. It is in all men, more or less, though not always developed in the same form.

DR. F.—I think if we had such a preacher as I wish, we

would draw out an audience, convert many people, and greatly extend the cause in one year.

DR. P.—No, Doctor, that would not be the case. The preacher we have is just as good as any man we can get. He is a man of unquestionable talents and piety, and if we stand by him, aid him and encourage him, thus showing to the world that we respect him, those without will also respect him, and he will succeed. If we had the most gifted man on the continent, and the members of the Church would treat him as they have done our present preacher, he would do nothing. By our absenting ourselves, we virtually say, what you have in so many words said, that *our preacher can do no good here.* When the members of the Church thus speak and act, neither a man nor an angel can do anything; and if I were the preacher I would not stay a moment with brethren who would thus treat me. I would go where I could be appreciated. Doctor, come to meeting, and let us make one good effort and see if we can not bring our Church out. Let us produce a change in the Church, and then probably our preacher will do well enough. I think we need a change in the Church more than in the preacher or preaching.

REPORTER.

NO. VI.—LETTERS TO ALL RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

DEAR BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: There is much confusion among us upon some matters that certainly ought to be very plain. That which the Lord has made incumbent upon all, should certainly be defined very clearly, and laid down very plainly. We claim for the law of the Lord that what is required of men in it, that which is enjoined upon all, is very clear. With an honest effort, any person with mind enough to be an accountable being, can understand what the law of God requires in order to salvation. But this clearness and simplicity is not in your standard authorities. Let us take a glance at them on the subject of baptism. Your authorities attach *an undue importance to baptism, ascribe power to it not in it, and have laid the foundation for the odious doctrine of "baptismal regeneration."* Much of our present jargon and confusion has grown out of this sad error. We shall make this charge the ground of several letters. "Without further explanation, we shall proceed to our authorities for the above charge:

The following is Question 8lst of the Shorter Catechism, from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, page 392: "What are the outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption?" The following is the answer: "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption are his ordinances, especially the word, sacraments and prayer, all of which are made effectual to the elect for salvation." The 91st question is as follows: "How do the sacraments become effectual means of salvation?" Here follows the answer: "The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them, but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit in them that receive them." Here we

are taught that the sacraments become *"effectual means* of salvation," by the blessing of Christ and the working of the Spirit. In answer to Question 93, we are taught that "the sacraments of the New Testament are Baptism and the Lord's Supper." Baptism, then, by the blessing; of Christ and the working of the Spirit, becomes "effectual *means of salvation.*

Let us hear the Confession again, chapter 28, page 144: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn 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 ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." Let us hear the same book again: "Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated and saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated."—page 148. From these teachings the reader will see that baptism is a *means* of salvation—an *effectual means,* by the blessing of Christ and the working of the Spirit, and "for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church"; and the disclaimer against the notion that salvation or regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism, and the statement that the party baptized rises to walk in newness of life, shows that the understanding is that salvation or regeneration, ordinarily, is in baptism or connected with it.

The next authority we shall appeal to is the Methodist Discipline, page 103, edition of the year 1856. The minister is required to say, when about to baptize an infant: "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, I beseech you to call upon. God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his

bounteous mercy he will grant to *this child* that thing which by nature he can not have, that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church and be made a lively member of the same." Here is most shocking misapplication, alteration and perversion of Scripture, in a book almost as widely circulated in the Methodist Episcopal Church as the New Testament. To this language we take the following exceptions:

1. Our Savior never uttered this language. It is most shocking that in the Discipline of a Church—a book to be in the house of *every Methodist*—a standard authority open to the inspection of all men—such a manifest garbling of our Lord's word should pass with so little attention paid to it. We know not of a more bold and daring corruption of the language of Scripture, nor a corruption that is more evidently the work of *design* than this. The Discipline changes the words "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," and make them. read, *"None* can enter into the kingdom of God except *he be regenerate* and born *anew* of water and of the Holy Ghost." Where is the authority for this change in the words of Jesus? Not a man in the world can give any. Not only will the men who palmed off this most glaring corruption in the first place have to give an account for it, but all who have assisted in circulating it among men. If men may thus alter the word of God, then farewell to all Divine authority.

2. The design of this corruption was most wicked. It can not pass as a mere oversight, for it has been too long before the people, gone through too many editions, and been pointed out too frequently. Not only so, but the object is too apparent. It would not be appropriate to the occasion, when baptizing an infant, to read: "Except *a man* be born again, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," nor would this furnish much *Divine* authority for baptizing *an infant.* But to make the passage appropriate to the occasion, in baptizing an infant, the accommodating clergy not only twist their consciences but twist the words of Jesus, by excluding the

phrase, "a man," and inserting the word *"none."* This makes pretty strong authority for baptizing an infant. If our Savior says: *"None* can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost," even our infants must be born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, or they can not enter into the kingdom of God. But if our Savior simply says: "Except a *man* be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," it has nothing to do with infants.

3. The Discipline aims to make our Lord teach infant regeneration, and that this regeneration takes place at baptism. Hence the Discipline sets out on the occasion of baptizing an infant with the assertion "that all men are conceived and born in sin," and then makes our Savior say of the infant, except he be "regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." We deny that our Savior ever said one word about infant regeneration, or infant baptism either.

4. The Discipline applies this passage to baptism, and to the baptism of infants, too, and consequently makes our Lord say that they can not enter the kingdom of God, except they are baptized. This we do not believe. The Lord did not say: Except an *infant* be born of water (baptized) and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," nor did he ever say of an infant: "Except he be regenerate, etc., "he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This is making too much of baptism, in extending it beyond its place, to those who are not subjects, and making it essential to an entrance into the kingdom of God—declaring that without it even *infants can not enter into the kingdom of God*. The same is inculcated in the prayer the preacher is required to offer, or to instruct the people to offer. He is required to instruct the people to "call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child *that thing which, by nature, he can not have."* What is that thing which, by nature, he can not have? "That *he* may be baptized with water and the Holy

Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made *a lively member* of the same." The Discipline makes "born of water" mean baptism, and it is evidently right in this; but then applies it to infants, and thus makes the Lord say of them: "Except they be baptized they can not enter into the kingdom of God." This the Lord never taught. This is making too much of baptism.

But this is not the worst. The Discipline requires the preacher to pray as follows for an infant: "We beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this *child,* wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being *delivered from thy wrath,* may be received into the ark of Christ's Church." Here we have the implication clear and strong that infants are under the wrath of God, and that they are saved from it in baptism. How different all this from the teachings of the holy and blessed Jesus, when he said of infants: "Of *such is* the kingdom of God," and to those at the years of accountability: "Except you be converted, and become *as a little child,* you can not enter into the kingdom of God."

The Romanists come square out and declare that the unbaptized are all pagans—that they can not be saved. Nay, more than that: that all who are baptized by any who have not received authority from Holy Mother Church are not baptized at all, and will be all lost. This is making it both the visible and the invisible line between the Church and the world. We intend quoting other authorities on this subject before we are done with it, but for the present shall conclude with a few words for the Baptists.

Our Baptist friends are poising everything almost upon baptism. Baptize, translated *immerse,* or baptism, translated *immersion,* has become the central idea of a party. Hence, in place of holding fast the Lord's name and of calling the Church the bride, the Lamb's wife, after her husband or her head, they call the Church after the administrator of baptism. This is making too much of the ordinance, when the Church is to be called after the administrator of the ordi-

nance—the Baptists—In place of being called after the Lord, the head of the Church. It is wicked, and bordering upon idolatry, to set the Lord's name aside, and call his people after an ordinance, or the mere official designation of the administrator. Does any one inquire what the difference is? It is literally this: Baptist means *immerser;* Christian means a *follower of Christ; or* Disciple means a *learner of Christ.* In the sectarian sense, Baptist means a *believer in immersion. A* Christian is one who has been immersed, but is a *believer in Christ.* Faith in immersion will not save anybody. Faith in repentance has no power to save; nor will faith in any commandment save one soul of our race. Faith in Christ will save the soul, and justify the sinner. It is faith in Christ that leads a man to repentance, confession, baptism, prayer and all the commandments. It is not faith in commandments that saves the soul or induces men to obey the commandments.

Our Baptist friends make baptism the grand test of membership, and almost always put baptism before faith in describing the terms of membership. When they are telling who the Church consists of, or who may commune, you will hear the old sectarian term, "immersed believers." Why do they not say *"praying* believers," "*communing* believers," *"thanksgiving* believers?" Because praying, communing and thanksgiving are not terms of membership. No one of these, nor all of them, can be regarded as the central idea of the Baptist Church. It is *Baptist,* which, being interpreted, *is immerser.* Baptists are *immersers,* and no more. That absorbs the whole meaning of the word. They may be believers in Christ, or they may not. There is nothing in the word Baptist about believer or unbeliever. It means simply *immerser,* and nothing else; and many, in the Baptist Church, are certainly not immersers; for not one out of one hundred ever immersed anybody. An ordinance can not be the central idea in a Church. Christ is the central idea in the Church, and everything must revolve around him.

ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS.

MANY among us have long desired to know how we can answer all our opposers, and succeed in defiance of all opposition. We shall, therefore, proceed to point out briefly how this may be done. We do not say how we *think* it may be done; but, unquestionably, how *it may be done*. We shall, however, state first that the elements of success are not in a single idea, a single feature in practice, or a single principle held. It was a great achievement when the first reformers released themselves from Romish unwritten traditions. But still there was no vitality in the mere work of protesting against unwritten traditions, works of supererogation, worshiping relics and images. Men could protest against all these without being born again, without being Christians, or having any living principle in themselves. Yet it was right and necessary to protest against these superstitions. In the same way it was right, and is right, to protest against all human creeds, as bonds of Christian union; against all authorities in religion but the Bible. It was, and is, equally right to protest against all sectarianism and party, or unscriptural and unauthorized names for the people of God. But then, all this is merely negative, and can never make a Christian. Protesting against error, no matter how great the error in itself, can never make a Christian, nor sustain the cause of Christ Nor can all the disproving and disclaiming error ever, in itself, make any man a Christian, or maintain the cause of Christ.

The Christian religion, while it protests against and disclaims all error, is an affirmative system. It requires something to be believed, something to be done and something to he hoped for. If we wish success, the right kind of success, and the approbation of Heaven, we must proceed as follows: 1. Preach that which is to be believed, with earnestness

and power, developing it in all its parts, exhibiting it in all its excellencies and surrounding it with all its testimonies. Spread the whole theme out, with all its wonders, and in all its details, and with such spirit and life as shall carry conviction to the hearts of those who hear. Make this the great point in all preaching, to exhibit the all-conquering power and glorious majesty of truth, in its own native simplicity and force. Preach it as *it is*, the pure truth of heaven—the power of God for salvation to every one that believes. You will find hearts to respond to it, honest souls, who will believe With all the heart.

2. Enforce the obedience of the Gospel. Show that Jesus is the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him. Exhibit and illustrate the great principle of obedience, subordination and submission to God, in every possible way; not simply in a single act, but in our whole Christian life, obedience commences in our first submission to God in our conversion, but is worth nothing unless carried out in our Christian life, exhibiting the spirit of the Lord when he said "he came not to do his own will, but the will of him who sent him;" or as he said again: "It is my meat and my drink to do the will of my Father who is in heaven."

3. Set forth and" illustrate the blessed hope of the Gospel —the assurance that we shall see Jesus—that we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is—for the comfort and encouragement of the children of God. Teach them to look for the blessed hope, the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile bodies and fashion them like unto his glorious body.

4. Have faithful men who will preach the truth in its purity, as the Lord gave it, and have confidence in it, and they will inspire confidence in the people. We want no doubting preachers, who do no more than half believe, who have no confidence in the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation. We want no envious souls, not in harmony with their brethren in the ministry, not congenial in feeling, nor devoted in work; murmurers, complainers and fault-finders;

narrow-minded, little-hearted and timorous souls, who hanker after the earthly honors enjoyed by the lovers of popularity in the partisan establishments around us. But we want truehearted men—men of God in the true sense, lovers of Jesus, devoted to him and determined to honor him, "not ashamed to own his cause," and do "not blush to speak his name"-men of enlarged souls, who can take Christianity into their horizon, the whole of it, as the Lord gave it—men who can appreciate the benevolence of God and realize that it is indeed of God, perfect and distinct from all other benevolence, and the only Divine benevolence. We want preachers who can realize that Christianity is a complete, perfect and Divine system in itself, and independent of all others. We want men of strong and unwavering faith—men of unshaken integrity and sound principles, in whom the brethren can confide. Such men we have in great numbers, men in whom we can confide to any extent—men who can not be swerved from the good and the right way of the Lord. Thanks to God that we have such!

5. We must have *living* Churches. The members must be living members, active, energetic and persevering. There are some Churches complaining that they "can not get the right kind of a preacher," when the trouble really is, that they are not "the right kind of Churches." Preachers, if they had the power of angels, could not make interesting Churches, where no advice that they can give can be received, but where members remain inactive. What can a preacher do for a Church where he can not prevail upon the members to meet to commemorate the Savior's dying love more than once in a month? or where he can not induce them to meet for prayer once a week? or where old members can not be induced to enter the place of worship till a half-hour after time? or where old and prominent members take so little interest in the worship that they fall asleep while he is preaching to dying sinners to save them? What preacher can do anything for a people who will take so little interest in public worship that they will not practice singing the

praises of God enough to enable them to sing with any spirit and understanding? If some of our Churches that "can not get a preacher who can *draw out an audience,"* would apply themselves to heir own improvement in singing, exhortation and prayer, and thus make themselves interesting and useful, they would assist mightily in drawing out an audience, and make it infinitely easier to preach when an audience is out. Here is where we must work, if we succeed. The moment men of the world come into the assemblies, let them hear the praises of God. Let the disciples not be content with two or three pieces which they can possibly sing with a plainly-printed book before their eyes; but learn scores of pieces, that they can sing in the spirit and with the understanding, without any book. Let the word of exhortation be ever on, their tongues, and be ever ready to call upon the name of the Lord in prayers and devout supplications. No spiritually-minded man can make himself believe, to say nothing of spectators, that members of the Church love Jesus who love not to meet with his disciples, to unite in his praise, participate in the prayers and exhortations, or will not come to his table. But how different the preacher feels when he sees glad members pressing into the assembly before the time, and Chiming in, as they enter, with their brethren in the joyful song of praises, he is supported and strengthened by the friends of Jesus, and is borne up to heaven upon the prayers of saints.

6. We must show real brotherly kindness to the children of God, not in word and in tongue only, but in deed and in truth. Not merely in meeting brethren and speaking to them kindly and affectionately, or simply inquiring for their welfare, but visiting in their afflictions, ministering to their wants and Supporting the needy. Some brethren are much troubled with secret orders, such as Masons, Odd Fellows, Sons of Temperance, etc., and we have never felt the need of belonging to anything of the sort—but we can assure brethren that if they do not approve these orders, the most effectual course they can pursue is to make the Church do

all the good works—works benevolence and of humanity—better than they do, or can do, and thus show its superiority. Let the men of all these orders see that our sick are looked after affectionately and cared for, that our widows and orphans are well and liberally provided for and that the wants of the poor are supplied; and thus show the benefits of Christianity in the good it bestows, not only in reforming the characters of men but in bestowing temporal benefits. Let those without be compelled to say, as they did of old: "See how these Christians love one another."

7. Let the Christian man's word be as good as his oath. In all his business transactions, let the Christian man stand on his honor, evincing to all around him that he will descend to nothing low and unworthy of his high calling.

8. Let there be piety at home, the reading of the word of God, prayers and the singing of the praises of God. Let all around see by your devotion to the cause, love to the Redeemer and to the people of God, that the Lord is with you. Then you will stand forever. There is no such thing as arguing down, sneering down, or persecuting down a people among whom is preached and believed nothing but the word of the riving God—"the word of grace"—"the faith once delivered to the saints"—the "one faith." No opposition can rise up against men who plead honestly "for obedience to the faith "—obedience to the Author of the faith. All men who believe the Bible know that it is" right to "obey the Gospel," and that the "Lord will take vengeance on them who know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." No set of men on this earth can withstand a people whose only hope is "the hope of the Gospel," which was preached to every creature under heaven. This blessed hope is an anchor to the soul, sure and steadfast, reaching to that within the vail, where Jesus, the forerunner, has for us entered. This hope is called "the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." There is no rising up against preachers whose only aim is to preach and maintain nothing but the pure

Gospel of the grace of God as the Lord gave it. They know their intentions are pure and that their work is good; and that they will stand forever if true to the end. There is no opposition that can rise up and withstand living, spiritual Churches, meeting In love, devotional and heavenly-minded. There is life in them that will carry conviction to those who come in contact with it. There is and can be no gainsaying of a congregation possessing real brotherly kindness. In one word, if we wish to stand, let us study to be more and more like Jesus. Never mind the world nor their contrivances; never mind their policies and appliances. They will come to nothing. But they who wear the image of Jesus shall live, and shine as the stars forever and ever. The Lord will never leave them nor forsake them. He is able to keep the trust committed to his hand against that day.

BLINDNESS, NOT IN PART BUT IN FULL, HAPPENED TO SECTARIANS.

SINCE some of our religious neighbors have tried to raise a little sectarian fog, we have concluded to take a glance at them and show our readers where they stand. Notwithstanding all the complaining, whining and cringing of the parties around us, we have never made half such an expose of them as we can make, when we please to try. They are vulnerable at every point, the personification and embodiment of weakness, and when we please to expose them we have only to open the hooks, dip our pens into the ink, and set them in motion. Their whole ranks are open to us on every hand, exposed to our scathing and raking fires. They have no girdle of truth, helmet of salvation, nor shield of faith. They have no breast-plate of righteousness, and their feet are not shod with a preparation of the Gospel of peace. They can wield no sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. They are at our mercy all the time. The best plea they can make is that it is wrong to debate, that they do not believe in argument, and insist upon every man going along, peacefully preaching his own doctrine, and that it is wrong to say anything against other denominations. This most safe and wise policy on the part of our opponents has been adhered to most closely, as a general thing, for some years. But of late the case has become desperate. A death spasm has come upon them. A death struggle has been made. The matter became insupportable among our Baptist brethren first, and has since been followed by our Presbyterian neighbors. It is true, in their extremity, our Baptist brethren do not agree among themselves. Some of them, where the pain has been most intense, the agony most terrible and the symptoms most violent, have resolved that baptisms administered by Reformers are not valid, and should any thus

baptized desire to unite with the Baptists, the), must be baptized again! This is grounded on the supposition that the ordinations of reform preachers are not *regular*. The Presbyterian preachers have fallen into a similar trouble, in a half dozen cases probably in that many years.

Now, it is a little singular that these two *most orthodox* parties should have fallen into this trouble about a "mere non-essential," a "mere external ordinance," and thus draw off the minds of the people from the heart-work, the great matter of an *"inward* change"—"a work of grace in the heart!" But one thing is certain, and that is, that if there is any *"official* grace" among Baptists or Presbyterians, we *have it*. Alexander Campbell came from among the Presbyterians with all the "official grace" they have, and was received and indorsed by the Baptists. When he left them, he left with all the "official grace" they had. All the ordinations and baptisms from his hands have all the official grace in both the Baptist and Presbyterian Churches. Barton W. Stone had all the official grace in the Presbyterian Church, as he had received his ordination from them. All the ordinations and baptisms from his hands had all the "official grace" in the Presbyterian Church. Walter Scott, John Smith and others came from among the Baptists, received their ordinations and baptisms from them, and had all the "official grace" they had. From these sources came our ordinations and baptisms, and if they are not valid it is not because they have not all the human authority in these Churches. We have that which they think makes the ordinance valid, viz., *their human "official grace."* But this, in our estimation, is worth precisely *nothing.* So far as we are concerned, if they had *disconsecrated* every one of these men, *unordained* them and *unpriested* them, we should have cared nothing. With us, there is no grace from God except in the Divine authority, and no Divine authority except in the Bible.

We regard all this as a dying gasp, a death struggle, a last effort to alarm the people about our baptisms. They

have tried raising fog, making baptism not essential, denying its designs, and all this, and now, finding that all we teach on these topics is clearly taught in the word of the Lord, and that the people by the thousand are being baptized, the last and least of all their efforts is to try and get up a distrust in the public mind about the validity of the baptisms administered by us. But what confidence have the public in all this? What confidence have their own Churches in it? Not one particle. In the very sections of the country, in the very State, where these ultra measures have been taken, our success has been greater than any other place. Their bulls are all a dead letter. Their dogs of war are all harmless. Their loudest thunders are empty sound without power. Their members are coming over to the Bible faster than ever. The entire matter is working for our good and to the glory of God.

Since, however, these parties have taken in hand to enter this new war, we think it is well to serve them as men do bees when they get to robbing other hives, that is: *break the comb in their own hives,* and give them something to do without meddling with the affairs of their neighbors. The only way we know to teach these parties around us, is to turn in and expose their absurd and unfounded claims. Let us, then, look at them. The popular parties generally, if not universally, agree *that man is justified by faith.* If that is so, then no man can be justified who does not believe. Then the question arises, what must man believe? The Presbyterian Confession of Faith contains what the Presbyterian Church believes. But the Baptist Church does not believe the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. How, then, is the Baptist Church to he saved? The Presbyterian Church is justified by faith, and faith is the belief of something, and what is the something to be believed? The Confession is the flag under which that Church sails—it contains the belief of the Church. Those, then, who believe the Confession are justified by faith, and those who do not believe the Confession are not justified. The Baptists and Methodists do not believe it, and therefore are not justified.

But this is not the worst of it. Not one member of the Presbyterian Church out of fifty knows what is in the Confession. They have never read it, know not what is in it, and know not whether they believe it or not. What faith are these justified by? No faith at all; and they are not justified at all. They can not tell what they believe, from the simple circumstance that they do not believe anything. They know they are *Presbyterians, from* the fact that they belong to the Church bearing that name, but not because they know the doctrine of that Church. That they have never read, except here and there one, and then scarcely ever till they are in the Church. They come into the Church first, and then, if ever, they learn what the Church believes! Now, if there is anything self-evident it is that no *one can believe who does not know what he believes*. There can be no faith without first hearing and knowing what man is required to believe. When we know what is to be believed, we can believe it or disbelieve it; but the idea of a man being justified by faith who does not know what his faith is, to say the least of it, is perfectly ridiculous.

The difficulty we are talking about, the reader will perceive, pertains to the more intelligent class in the Presbyterian Church—to those who have become members after they have come to the years of accountability. Those who hear the preachers and become members voluntarily have, in nine cases out of ten, done so without knowing what they believe, and could not tell if their souls were at stake. Indeed, in this matter of *faith* the soul is at stake. "He that believeth not shall be damned." It is, then, of the first importance that a man should know what is to be believed and know that he believes it. It is indisputably certain that it is not the Confession of faith that a man is to believe to save his soul, for Presbyterians themselves admit that persons can be good Christians and be saved who do not believe the Confession. They, at the same time, admit that a man can not be a Christian and be saved who does not believe the Gospel. This shows that in their own estimation the Confession of

Faith is not the Gospel, and the belief of it is not the saving belief; and consequently they do not hesitate to admit that persons can be saved who do not believe it.

It is the easiest thing imaginable for a man to plead that justification is *by faith,* and then assume that he is a believer, and consequently justified. But no man is a believer who does not know what he believes, and not one out of one hundred who have their faith printed in the Confession know what it is. They have never read it or heard it read, and do not know what it is, and if they did know what it is they have to admit that it is not the saving faith, or none would be saved without it. The saving faith is not the confession, or those of other Churches who do not believe the Confession could not be saved. The saving faith is not the Baptist creed, or those who do not believe the creed could not be saved. It is not the Methodist Discipline, for those who do not believe the Discipline could not be saved. Thus we might go on to all the human creeds. Not one of them contains the saving faith, or they would not, as they always do, admit that you can be a Christian and be saved without believing the creed. What a ridiculous and preposterous absurdity for a set of Churches to league together, hugging each other for *orthodox*, with their faith embodied in a human creed, and at the same time do not believe each other's creed, and each party admits that its own creed contains not the saving faith, and that you can be saved without believing it! This demonstrates not only that these systems are not the Gospel, but that these parties themselves *know they are not the Gospel.*

This shows that it is not the Presbyterianism, the Baptist-ism nor the Methodism that saves the soul, or that it is the *saving faith,* for a man can be saved without these systems, but he *can not be saved without the saving faith.* The saving faith is something separate and distinct from these, which all admit is indispensable to salvation. This saving faith is orthodox, common ground, held in general by all who have any claims to Christianity, and without which they all admit

a man can not be saved. This faith is not belief in Presbyterianism, Baptistism or Methodism, but in the Gospel—in Christ. "He that believeth"—that is, he that believeth *the Gospel—"* and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not *[the Gospel]* shall be damned." This is the faith in Christ. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "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."* "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." "Whoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father and the angels." This is the saving faith and the only saving faith, the common-ground faith, the orthodox faith and the catholic faith, without which all admit no man can be saved. Preaching this faith and receiving it never made a Methodist, a Baptist, or a Presbyterian. It makes Christians and nothing else—disciples of Christ. We preach the word of faith preached by the Apostles and nothing else, and upon the word and faith preached by the Apostles we are uniting many from all the conflicting parties around us, and by the blessing of the Lord, we trust the time will soon come when the only true faith shall be established and prevail throughout the land. We know we are in the good work, in the work of God, the work of humanity, in maintaining the only pure and Apostolic faith, the only saving faith—that faith without which all admit we can not be saved, and uniting all the children of God upon it. There are thousands who bless God that there is a common faith that all can receive, agree in, and that none can repudiate, and without which all admit none can be saved. This is the faith, and the only faith, upon which all the pure and holy can unite, and which they can push through the world. Let the people of God rid themselves of all lumber, every weight, every human theory and doctrine, maintain and push through the world the only true and Apostolic, the only evangelical and holy,

the only Divine and saving faith, the faith once delivered to the saints, and God will be with them; the Lord of life will be with them; the Spirit of God will be with them; all heaven will be with them; and they need not fear what man can do to them. We need more bold men—men of decision, who love the faith, who love man, and who have confidence in the work as the work of God—men of vigilance, enterprise and energy. The field is open before us, and we need the laborers. Who will go forward and reap the harvest? Let us go, brethren. The Lord says: "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel." We know what the Gospel is; shall we obey the voice of the Lord and go and preach it? *"Go,"* says the Lord.

MIRACLES.

1. What is a miracle? A miracle is not, as Hume defined it, "something *contrary to the laws of nature,"* but something above the laws of nature, or something that the laws of nature, in their legitimate and ordinary operations, could produce. For instance, the laws of nature, in their legitimate and ordinary operations, from parents can produce offspring, and bring them to manhood and womanhood, but the laws of nature, in their legitimate course of operation, never produced a man and a woman without parents, or never brought into existence a man and a woman at sufficient maturity to care for themselves and live without parents. No law of nature, in its legitimate and ordinary course of operation, brought Adam and Eve into existence at maturity and without parents. In other words, no law or laws of nature, in their legitimate or ordinary operation, ever began the human race. In the plainest terms, no law of nature ever produced a human being without parents. In other words, it is not a miracle for children to come from parents, but it was a miracle to create the first human pair All who admit that the human race ever had a beginning, must admit that it began by miracle. It is not a miracle for an oak to produce an acorn, nor for an acorn to produce an oak; but it is a miracle to produce an oak without an acorn, and equally a miracle to produce an acorn without an oak. The laws of nature, in the legitimate and ordinary course of their operation, never produced an acorn without an oak, or an oak without an acorn. The first acorn or the first oak was unquestionably a miracle. The first man was a miracle. The second man, the Lord from heaven, was a miracle. Isaac, the child of promise, and the only son of Abraham, as Jesus was the child of promise and the only begotten of the Father, was a miracle. To sum all up and

express it in one sentence, everything—every species of animal, insect and vegetable began by miracle. The laws of nature, create nothing, give us no new species or kind, but simply propagate and perpetuate that which was given by miracle at first. By the established laws of nature, the human race have been propagated and perpetuated, but the human race had its commencement in miracle.

The laws of nature never raised a man from the dead, instantaneously gave hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, or sight to the blind. No laws of nature can heal a leper in an instant, multiply "five loaves and a few small fishes" till the amount will be sufficient to feed five thousand persons, leaving *"twelve* baskets full of fragments," or enable men to speak in some fifteen or seventeen languages never studied or learned in the ordinary way. A miracle may suspend laws of nature for the time being, do something above them, or something that they never perform; but to be a miracle at all something must be done above all human art, device or ability, and something which we know the laws of nature, in their legitimate course and ordinary operation, never perform. When anything of this kind occurs, we know that it could not have taken place without foreign and direct interposition. This is a miracle; it is above and superior to all human art or device; above and superior to anything ever done by the laws of nature, as well as different from anything they ever do.

Pretenders to miracles Sometimes succeed in their work of deception, duplicity and sin, and sometimes they fail. Those whom God invests with the power to do miracles, in cases where they have a Divine and benevolent purpose, never make a failure. Whatever they undertake, they perform. After all the flaming pretensions of the ancient magicians to the possession of power to reveal secrets, when Nebuchadnezzar demanded of them to tell him what his dream was that he had forgotten, and the interpretation of it, they shrunk from their high claims and meekly responded: "Let the king tell his dream, and we will show the interpre-

tation of it." But when the king persisted, saying: "Tell me the dream and I shall know that you can show me the interpretation," they replied: "There is not a man in the earth that can show the king's matter." Here was an acknowledged failure, and the king became enraged at their lying pretenses, and Said: "There is but one decree for you: make known to me the dream, with the interpretation thereof, or ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill.". (See Dan. ii. II.) The Lord then confuted these lying pretenders by enabling Daniel to make known the dream and interpretation. If some of our modern lying pretenders were vigorously subjected to the same test, the whole tribe would soon be exposed. It is astonishing that their graceless pretenses should remain unexposed, when the ability to expose them is at hand all the time. How utterly ridiculous their pretenses to reveal things from the spirit-world, when they can reveal nothing in this world in advance of the mails, dispatches, and other ordinary means of communication! If Queen Victoria would demand of all the spirit-rappers, spirit-mediums, soothsayers, and all other pretenders to revelation of every sort, to furnish the war news from Italy, in advance of the mails, or the ordinary means of communication, or be put to death, the world would soon see the end of their silly claims. Why can they not bring us the news of a single battle in advance of the ordinary means of communication? If they can not do this, what are all their silly claims worth?

Miracles were wrought in different ways, as follows:

l. By Christ, or at his bidding—calming the raging sea, feeding the multitude, raising Lazarus, etc.

2. In some instances, so far as can be seen, without his bidding or solicitation. Cases of this kind are seen in the parting of the heavens above him, the descent of the Spirit upon him, and the voice of his Father acknowledging him at his baptism, the earthquake when he died, the darkness of the sun, the sundering of the vail in the temple, and rending the rocks.

3. By the Apostles, or at their bidding. Cases of this kind are seen in the healing the cripple at the Beautiful gate, the raising of Tabitha, and healing of the sick.

4. In some instances, as far as we can see, in connection with the Apostles, without their bidding, solicitation or expectation. For instance, the releasement of Peter from prison, the earthquake and opening of the Philippian jail, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius.

5. By others besides Apostles, at their bidding. The Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius, spoke with tongues and prophesied, and Philip performed miracles in Samaria.

6. Miracles were performed in connection with others besides Apostles, without their bidding or expectation. When they had, on one occasion, been scattered by their persecutors and had again come together, knelt and prayed, the place was shaken, the outpouring of the Spirit on the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, the opening of the heavens when Stephen was stoned to death and the death of Ananias and Saphira.

Such is a brief outline of what a miracle is, and the associations when miracles were performed. We now proceed.

II. To the design of miracles. The grand and leading design of miracles was to call attention to and confirm the mission of Christ. This general and leading design was in all the miracles connected with the introduction and founding of the kingdom of God. But there were immediate and direct objects to be accomplished, somewhat different from this though in harmony with it. The great proposition, lying at the foundation of the Gospel, or the kingdom of God, is that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. Two classes of miracles bear directly upon that grand proposition:

1. The first is included in the expression: "The works that I do, they testify of me." The calming of the sea, healing all manner of diseases and raising the dead, evinced

that God was with our Savior—that what he saw the Father do he did also.

2. The second class of miracles bearing directly upon the proposition, that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,* consists of the miracles surrounding Jesus, not directly performed by him, nor, to all appearance, by his request; such, for instance, as the parting heavens above him, the Spirit descending upon him and the Father's acknowledgment of him before the people of Israel, and his introduction to them at his baptism, and again in the mountain of Transfiguration, with the command to HEAR HIM, as well as the stupendous, grand and awful surroundings at his crucifixion. Of all this class of miracles his own resurrection from the dead was the *crowning one.* It lies at the bottom of all the balance. It being true, all the balance are sealed; it being false, all the balance amount to nothing. Such momentous, august and sublime displays of supernatural power as the rending of the vail in the temple, the sundering of the rocks about Jerusalem, the darkness spreading over the whole land from the sixth to the ninth hour, and the great earthquake when Jesus died, are as far above the insignificant tricks of ancient magicians, wizards and necromancers, or those of modern mesmerizers, spirit-rappers and spirit-mediums, as high and holy heaven is above this earth. He who would turn away from the former and give heed to the latter is a mere dupe of delusion, a willing victim of deception and a perfect exemplification of the poor, credulous, gullible and wandering stars of modern times. The machinations of all ancient and modern pretenders sink away into the shades of insignificance and nothingness when mentioned in contradistinction with the overwhelming, commanding and august displays of the Almighty hand surrounding our glorious Lord Jesus Christ. Let no poor, driveling, slobbering and deluded spirit-medium, with his or her stupid dreams and. silly devices, lift his or her head among the sons of God, while they are meditating upon the grand and glorious surroundings of the Christian's Lord and Prince, as lifted up among men,

shown to be Divine and received up into glory. If the testimony surrounding him is not reliable, then nothing in this universe is reliable, and there is nothing upon which man can rest his poor soul. All is lost; the world is in ruin; we are in our blood; there is no Savior to whom man can come and upon whom he can call.

3. The third class of miracles was wrought by the Apostles for the confirmation of their mission as the Apostles of Christ. They healed all manner of diseases, raised the dead, spoke languages they had never studied, etc. These works of their hands were designed to arrest attention, as in the case of the man at the Beautiful gate, the raising Tabitha from the dead, and healing of the sick. This class of miracles was done by the Apostles. But another class was wrought *for* them, frequently when they were not expecting it. Of this class, Paul says: "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit." As instances of this kind, take the releasing of Peter from prison, and the opening of the Philippian jail. These grand surroundings showed that the Lord was with them, doing his glorious work of benevolence by them. He chose the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, that the excellency of the power might be seen to be of God and not of man.

There was another class of miracles performed by the Apostles that had a more extended object than those just mentioned or the mere demonstration of the Divine mission of the Apostles. We allude to such an instance as smiting Elymus the sorcerer with blindness, or the death of Ananias and Sapphira. These instances were to demonstrate the Lord's disapprobation of certain wicked actions; in the first instance a man trying to turn one away from the faith, and in the second instance of a man pretending to a greater liberality than he possessed, in which he not only lied to men but to God. If all were smitten blind, in our time, who tried to turn away persons from the faith, we fear there would be more blind than were ever known at one time; or if deceiv-

ers, pretending to liberality which they do not possess, were all smitten with death, the number of deaths would be alarming; yet the same God now lives that did then, and is no more pleased with such men now than he was then, and though he does not now visit them with the same miraculous visible judgments he did then, he will as certainly punish such men who live in our day as those who lived in that day. In the founding of the Christian religion, the Lord gave a sufficient variety of miracles to arrest the attention of men, confirm the mission of Christ, the Apostles, first Christians, the Church, and to demonstrate his disapprobation of certain wicked actions, that they might go to the record and stand as beacons to all future generations. This we shall, the Lord permitting, elaborate more fully in our next.

MIRACLES—WHERE THEY CEASE.

WE have had the ordinary and extraordinary in everything. That which creates is extraordinary. That which only perpetuates is ordinary. It requires the extraordinary to bring into existence something new in kind and species, but the ordinary can perpetuate the kinds or species we now have. The commencement of all things was by miracle; but the perpetuation of all things is without miracle. In the very nature of things, a Divine dispensation could neither commence nor terminate only by miracle. The beginning and the closing of the patriarchal dispensation, or period, was by miracle. In the same way, the beginning of the Mosaic dispensation and the closing of it was by miracle. The creation of the New Institution, or the Christian dispensation was by miracle. The attention of the nations of the earth could not have been arrested, the mission of Christ could not have been demonstrated, and the new dispensation could not have been confirmed and shown to be of heaven and of Divine authority, without miracle. In one word, a kingdom not of this world could not have been given, established and confirmed without miracle, or without extraordinary means; but the extraordinary means required to bring this kingdom into the world, establish it and confirm it, are not required for its propagation and perpetuation. We maintain, therefore, and especially from the following considerations, that it was not the Divine intention that miracles should continue with the people of God.

1. In all cases since the beginning of the world, when the proposition, or the mission of a person, is once proved, it remains proved for all time to come. The proof that established the guilt of a man in court fifty years ago establishes it yet, and will continue to establish it to the end of the world. The proof, or the confirmation, as the reader may

choose to style it, that established the mission of Christ, and consequently his religion, and made it credible, or made it capable of being believed in the first century, establishes and makes it just as credible and capable of being believed now, and will till the Lord shall come, as it was in the first century. As the object of miracles was to arrest the attention of man and prove the religion of Christ, when that object was accomplished their mission was finished, and of course they ceased.

2. If miracles had continued for the last eighteen centuries, the unbelieving long before now would have considered them a matter of course, and they would have been no evidence of anything, any more than a tornado, a thunderstorm, or an earthquake. Their continuation would have defeated their intention. This shows the lack of wisdom on the part of those who think they should have continued in the Church.

3. Miracles could not have ceased but by the will of God. They are not done, and miracles proper never were done, but by the hand of God; and they never could have ceased only because the Lord did not think them needed, and therefore ceased to perform them. Are we told that they ceased through unbelief? That can not be, for two reasons: First. the performance of miracles, in many instances, did not depend upon the faith of anyone. It was not the faith of anyone that caused the earth to shake, or the sun to darken, when Jesus died. It was not the faith of anyone that caused Jesus to rise from the dead, for no one believed that he would rise. Second, there has been faith all the time. In the very same Scripture where we are assured that, miracles should cease, we find it distinctly stated that faith should abide. The Apostle says: "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." Here it asserted in the" clearest manner that the supernatural gifts of prophecy, tongues and knowledge shall all cease. In the same connection, and at the conclusion of

the same subject, he says: "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." (See 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13.) In the time of these spiritual gifts, the Apostle said: "Covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet show I unto you a more excellent way." (1 Cor. xii. 31.) A more excellent way than what? A more excellent way than when they were dependent upon these supernatural gifts for instruction. That more excellent way was the full perfection of revelation, when nothing was in part, but when God had completed his communications to man—when the canon of revelation was perfect.

We now have a few things for those who have gone on "to visions and revelations," in our time, as follows:

1. They do no miracles, any more than those who oppose them. They only *talk about* miracles, but never do them. The constant talking of a thing that they never do is idle and empty, vain and silly.

2. They never communicate any new revelations to us. There is not a man in the whole tribe of pretenders to revelation, and there has not been one since the Apostle John closed the Apocalypse, who has received and communicated a revelation from God to man, not found in the Bible. We challenge the whole tribe of them to produce a single revelation received and communicated from God to man by a single soul of our race, not found in the Bible, since John the Apostle died.

3. If they have nothing *new* or *more* than we have in the Bible, their revelations are useless, for we have those in the Bible in a more authentic and authoritative form than that in which they produce them.

4. If they have anything more than is contained in the Bible, the anathema of Heaven rests upon them for adding to the Bible. "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Do you reply, that that language applies to the Book or Revelations, but to no other portion of the Bible? Your view of it is, then, that you may not add to the Book of

Revelations, but you may add to the writings of Paul, Peter, James and Jude. Shame upon him who would suggest such a weak and silly conclusion! The Book of Revelations contains the last revelation from God to man, the close of the sacred canon, the conclusion of the communications from God, till the Lord shall come, and the last lines contain the most fearful and awful words the Lord ever uttered, intended to shield and guard us against impostors of every grade.

5. We have one more thing for all the pretenders to miracles and inspiration in our time, with all making extra professions to spirituality, found in the following words of Paul: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write to you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Cor. xiv. 24.) Let all these modern pretenders show a proper respect for the language of Paul, Peter, James, John, Jude, Matthew, Mark and Luke, and they will do more to convince us of their piety than they ever can, a thousand times over, by pretenses to inspiration and miracles themselves. The sentence may sound hard, but we doubt whether a pretender to revelation and miracles can be found who is faithful to the revelations contained in the Bible, and who will not cavil and in some way seek to subvert the Scriptures. We are inclined to the opinion that just about in proportion as a person becomes persuaded and tries to persuade others that he is inspired, or that he can do miracles, his regard for the Scriptures will be depreciated. If it is otherwise in any case, it is where our observation has not gone.

6. Nor is the idea that a man is inspired to explain the Bible much less mischievous or wicked than that a man is inspired to make new revelations to man. For such an idea must commence with the wicked and mischievous assumption that the Spirit of inspiration, when he spoke through the Apostles, did not explain what he meant, or that he did not say what he meant, and that he was now come, after some eighteen centuries, and inspired a modern man to explain what the same Spirit meant when he spoke through

inspired persons in the time of the Apostles! A bolder push, and at the same time a more silly one, than this to subvert the oracles of God, has not been known from the beginning of the world; and yet it has been by no means an unsuccessful one. There is not a more wicked, a more corrupting and dangerous influence now operating in the subversion of the Gospel than this perpetual interpreting and explaining of the word of God. Many people seem to act and talk as if the Spirit of all wisdom never did say what he meant, and His words must undergo a constant torture of *explaining* and *expounding.* If the father of lies had seated himself to see how many ways he could invent to subvert and set aside the Scriptures, he could not have thought of more ways than have been, at one time or another, introduced under a garb of great sanctity and piety. We have certainly had the following devices, if no more.

1. Men inspired like the Apostles to communicate revelations to man. These you must hear, not because you find their teachings to accord with Scripture, but *because they are called, sent and inspired.*

2. Men inspired to explain the language of the Spirit spoken by the Apostles. The explanations of these must be received, because they are called, sent and inspired of the Lord.

3. Men with a smattering of learning, but pretending to great learning, who care for no authorities, rules of interpretation or dictionaries, and who have no honor, no integrity, and will assert anything. This class of pretenders have done a world of mischief. They will never he brought straight till they stand in the last judgment.

4. Men who say the word is a dead letter, and it can do nothing till the Spirit quickens it, and gives it life, and makes it the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. This class do not *"preach* the word," but really preach against the word.

5. Men who preach that the sinner is so dead that he can neither believe, repent, nor do anything acceptable to God

till he is moved upon by some miraculous power to quicken him and give him power.

All people have to do to get rid of these tormenting theories is to open their eyes, and, at the same time, open their understandings and look at a few plain passages of Scripture, such as the following: "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed, lest at any time *they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converged, and I should heal them."* (Matt. xiii. 15.) The wayside man (Matt. xiii. 19) is one "who heareth the word and *understandeth not."* He whom the Lord compares to good ground is "he that heareth the word, and *understandeth* it." "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image. of God, should shine unto them. (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.) The god of this world blinds the mind, and his object in doing it is that the light of the Gospel may not shine to them. Again, Paul says: "Whereby when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." (Eph. iii. 4.) Philip said to the eunuch, as he was reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah: "Understandest thou what thou readest?" Lord, help us all to understand and be wise!